

City of Bishop
377 West Line Street
Bishop, CA 93515

(Proposed) MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

PROJECT TITLE: Neighborhood Church

PROJECT APPLICANT: Ken Abbott

PROJECT CONTACT PERSON: Gary Schley

ADDRESS: City of Bishop
377 West Line Street
Bishop, CA 93515

TELEPHONE: (760) 873-8458

PROJECT LOCATION:
315 East South Street, Bishop, California 93515
County of Inyo
State of California

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The Applicant is seeking approval for an 11,000 square foot Gymnasium/Fellowship Hall, a 29 space (9,000 sq ft) onsite parking lot, and two (2) - two (2) bedroom residential units to be used as parsonages. An area of approximately 52' by 41' (2,013 square feet) will include supplementary uses of an office, a conference room, a pastor room; a youth pastor room and youth education room.

FINDING

On the basis of the initial study on file in the Current Public Works Office:

The proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment.

The proposed project COULD have a significant effect on the environment, however there will not be a significant effect in this case because the mitigation measures described in the Mitigation Monitoring Program on file in the Public Works Office were adopted to reduce the potential impacts to a level of insignificance.

The proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

Mitigation Measures

- 1.1 Require that the proposed building footprint be designed so that the existing residences will not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista. Keep the visual area of negative impact for any single building for a scenic vista to less than 30%.
- 1.2 Design the proposed project to minimize the potential for interior or exterior noise to escape the project site. The project will include additional noise suppression methods as necessary including new or higher block walls separating the project area from adjoining residential uses.
- 1.3 Require all activities to occur indoors unless special permission or approval for outdoor activities is first granted.
- 1.4 Require all leased parking to be for a minimum of five years or comparable; and have contingency plan in place in case leased parking area become unavailable.
- 1.5 Require all special events that would prompt worse case scenario to activate secondary parking plan for ride share and carpooling.

Completed by: Ruben Mejia
Title: Associate Planner
Date: 6/25/07

Determination Approved:
Title:
Date:

PUBLIC REVIEW PERIOD:
COMMENTS RECEIVED ON DRAFT: Yes No
INITIAL STUDY REVISED: Yes No

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

- 1. Project Title:** The Neighborhood Church Expansion
- 2. Lead Agency Name and Address:** City of Bishop
377 West Line Street
Bishop, CA 93515
- 3. Contact Person and Phone Number:
Lead Agency** Gary Schley
(760) 873-8458
- 4. Project Location:** 315 East South Street, Bishop, California 93515
(APN: 01-192-31)
- 5. Project Sponsor's Name & Address:
Applicant** Ken Abbott- 550 Central Avenue, Bishop, California 93515
- 6. General Plan Designation/Zoning:** Medium Density/ Single-Family Residential (R-1)
- 7. Description of the Project:** The Applicant is seeking approval for an 11,000 square foot Gymnasium/Fellowship Hall, a 29 space (9,000 sq ft) onsite parking lot, and two (2) - two (2) bedroom residential units to be used as parsonages. An area of approximately 52' by 41' (2,013 square feet) will include supplementary uses of an office, a conference room, a pastor room; a youth pastor room and youth education room.
- 8. Surrounding Land uses and Setting:** The project site is located on an existing church site along South Street at the northeast corner of Third Street. The lot is 261 feet by 139.9 feet (approximately 36,514 sq. ft.) The project area is mostly residential to the north and east with general commercial to the west and a vacant undeveloped lot leased by the church to the south used exclusively for overflow parking. Surrounding zoning and land uses are as follows:

North: R-2000 (Multi Family Residential) Zone

South: Vacant parcel, Inyo County (LADWP owned)

East: R-1, (Single Family Residential) Zone,

West: C-1 (General Commercial)
- 9. Other public agencies whose approval is required:** City of Bishop, Planning Commission- Conditional Use Permit,
City of Bishop- Building 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.

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Geology/Soils |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology/ Water Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use/ Planning |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Noise | <input type="checkbox"/> Population/ Housing |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Transportation/ Traffic |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities/ Service Systems | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance | |

DETERMINATION: 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

6/25/07

Date

Ruben Mejia- Associate Planner, Willdan

Printed Name

City of Bishop- Public Works

For

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES:	Sources	Potentially	Less Than	Less than	No
		Significant	Significant		
		Impact	With Mitigation Incorporation	Impact	Impact

1. AESTHETICS. Would the project:

(a)	Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(b)	Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(c)	Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(d)	Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

(a) The project as proposed will have the potential to obscure views of residences; however, even a two-story residence would obscure some views of the outdoors. There are no specific outcroppings, or historic buildings observable in the immediate area that would be affected. Approval of the proposed project would not have a substantial adverse effect on any scenic vista in the area. The project as proposed would include a roofline higher than most single-family residences, but even a two-story residence would block the views of a smaller single story residence. Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Measures (c,d) The project as proposed, with colors and design, will not significantly impact or degrade the visual character or quality of the site and the surrounding area, because it already contains a large non-conforming church in a residential area. The size of the proposed project may impact the views of some neighboring residences (approximately 15-30% perspective, but with appropriate design and additional landscaping some of the negative visual impacts can be minimized. The proposed project will be developed in conjunction with the existing buildings to unify the site and coordinate the existing color, style and design theme. As proposed the project will have a minimal number of lights, windows and doors with glazing to significantly minimize the affected day or nighttime views in the area. Any impacts from glare can be lessened through proper design and non-glare coated materials. The developer shall submit for approval by the Public Works/Planning Division an Exterior Lighting Plan indicating the number, types and location of proposed lighting fixtures and the illumination levels of all proposed lighting on the property. All such lighting shall be shielded or down directed in a manner to prevent spill over lighting impacts on adjoining properties. Less than Significant Impact

(b) The entire site is within an existing flat urbanized & mostly developed site with little or no vegetation and therefore no substantial damage to scenic resources is anticipated to occur as the result of increased development on this site. No Impact.

2. 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(b)	Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act Contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES:	Sources	Potentially	Less Than	Less than	No
		Significant	Significant	Significant	Impact
		Impact	With Mitigation Incorporation	Impact	Impact

(a-c) The proposed project site is located in a developed residential area with no existing or planned farmland. There are no existing or proposed agricultural uses for this site. Expanding the existing development of this project site would not result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural land use. No Impact to Agricultural Resources.

3. 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(b)	Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(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 threshold for ozone precursors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(d)	Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(e)	Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

(a,b,e) The applicable air quality plan for the project area is in an attainment area for most categories, excluding ozone and particulate matter with the highest number of Good Air Quality day of any area in the Basin and does not conflict with any applicable air quality plans. As proposed the project site is anticipated to utilize a portable refueling propane service on a regular as needed basis and will not produce a significant number of trips to the site or create noticeable and objectionable odors. No Impact

(c, d) The City of Bishop is within a Non-attainment area for two (2) categories; Ozone and Respirable Particulate Matter. The proposed project is anticipated to utilize multi-occupied vehicles, thereby reducing the need for significant ambient air quality reductions. As proposed the project will not significantly increase the Ozone or Respirable Particulate Matter. Therefore, the proposed project is not anticipated to create significant additional trips that would result in air quality impacts from additional traffic congestion along South Street or Third Street and create air quality impacts to sensitive receptors (local residents). The Great Basin Unified APCB regulates air quality pollutants for Inyo County. Less than Significant Impact

4. 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 regulation, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(b)	Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES:	Sources	Potentially	Less Than	Less than	No
		Significant	Significant	Significant	Impact
		Impact	With Mitigation Incorporation	Impact	Impact

regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

- | | | | | | |
|-----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| (c) | Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| (d) | Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| (e) | Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| (f) | Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

(a-f) The project site is developed and located within the City of Bishop except for the leased parking area in Inyo County. There are no undeveloped natural resources such as rivers and natural habitat areas for native plants and wildlife in the project area. The proposed project site within the City limits is developed with no wetland area to be disturbed by human activity; thus, it is not likely to contain biologically sensitive species. The proposed project along with the compatible ancillary uses (main structure) has no foreseeable or anticipated impacts to adopted conservation plans or biological resources. No Impact

5. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

- | | | | | | |
|-----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| (a) | Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| (b) | Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| (c) | Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| (d) | Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

(a-d) There are no state or federally registered/recognized cultural resources within the project area. There are no known archeological resources, unique paleontological resources, or geological features known to exist on the site. Therefore, no foreseeable or anticipated impacts to cultural resources exist. If during grading any evidence of cultural resources is uncovered, then all activities within the immediate area shall cease until an archeologist, paleontologist, local tribal representative or other specialist can assess and remediate the site. No Impact

6. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES:	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant		No Impact
			With Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	
(a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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.		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(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?		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(d) Be located on expansive soil, as identified in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

(a-e) According to Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zones, SW ¼ Bishop Quadrangle Official Map there are no known or existing fault lines within the project area. The development of the site will require some grading and soil compaction. As per the City's requirement the project will require precise grading plans to be reviewed and approved by the City Engineer before grading can commence. No impact

(ii) The project site is in a Seismic Zone 4 Area and seismic ground shaking is always a possibility at some point in the future. Although, seismic ground shaking is possible, but ground failure and liquefaction are not normal or typical. The proposed project will be required to comply with the City of Bishop's development regulations of Building and Safety Codes. The Applicant would also need to comply with State Building Codes and State Development Standards. The project site is developed and has no record of expansive soils. The City of Bishop will continue to provide wastewater treatment for this project site with no need for septic or other disposal system. Anticipated geological and soil impacts are expected to be less than significant.

7. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:

(a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES:	Sources	Potentially	Less Than	Less than	No
		Significant	Significant	Significant	Impact
		Impact	With Mitigation Incorporation	Impact	Impact

materials?

- | | | | | | |
|-----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| (b) | Create significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| (c) | Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| (d) | Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| (e) | For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| (f) | For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| (g) | Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| (h) | Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

(a,b) The proposed project is associated with a known hazard or hazardous material- propane. The proposed facility use of propane is not anticipated to impact the established uses on site unless there is a shortage of propane. In the event of a spill the gaseous material will dissipate through evaporation into the atmosphere. There are no foreseeable impacts to the environment or the public pertaining to hazards or hazardous materials associated with the operations of this project. Delivery personnel are trained on safety issues related to the transportation and use of this hazardous material. Potential impacts Less than Significant
(c-h) As proposed, the project will not affect the existing or proposed schools, airstrips, or people working in the project area. The proposed project will not impair the implementation of any adopted emergency response or evacuation plan. There are no identifiable significant risks associated with the urbanized residences intermixed with wildland fires. No Impact

8. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:

- | | | | | | |
|-----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| (a) | Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| (b) | Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES:	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
-----------------------	---------	--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

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)?

(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-site or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(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 that would result in flooding on-site or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(j) Inundation by Seishi, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(k) Potentially impact Stormwater runoff from construction activities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(l) Potentially impact Stormwater runoff from post-construction activities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(m) Result in a potential for discharge of stormwater pollutants from areas of material storage, vehicle or equipment fueling, vehicle or equipment maintenance (including washing), waste handling, hazardous materials handling or storage, delivery areas, loading docks or other outdoor work areas?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES:	Sources	Potentially	Less Than	Less than	No
		Significant	Significant	Significant	Impact
		Impact	With Mitigation Incorporation	Impact	Impact

- (n) Result in the potential for discharge of stormwater to affect the beneficial uses of the receiving waters?
- (o) Create the potential for significant changes in the flow velocity or volume of stormwater runoff to cause environmental harm?
- (p) Create significant increases in erosion of the project site or surrounding areas?

(a-j,l,n-p) According to the General Plan, portions of the City are located within a designated floodplain, but the project site is not in a designated floodplain as identified by FEMA. The current proposed project will additionally involve an application for a Conditional Use Permit for the continuation of the uses at the project site. All construction will be required to comply with applicable City of Bishop development regulations and Building and Safety Codes. There are no foreseeable or anticipated hydrology or water quality impacts. No Impact

(k,m) The site currently has established drainage patterns and BMPs (Best Management Practices) will be implemented during and after construction to minimize runoff. Developments of this magnitude typically are required to install oil/water separators to treat wastewater prior to discharge into the city storm drain or gutter. The developer will be required to submit for approval to the City Engineer a comprehensive grading and drainage plan prior to issuance of grading and building permits. Less than Significant Impact

9. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:

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

(a,c) The proposed expansion of the Neighborhood Church project is consistent with the needs of an established community. Since the proposed expansion will be located in an area that is currently urbanized, it will not reduce the amount of usable open space for parks and recreation. The proposed project will further the goals of the General Plan, which include providing new recreation facilities and opportunities for the community. No Impacts to Land-Use Planning

(b) The project site is currently a legal non-conforming use because it is within an established residential zoned district. Although the existing use is entitled to continue to operate as legal non-conforming, any expansion or intensification of use would require additional review and approvals through the Conditional Use Permit process. Less than Significant Impact

10. 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?

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES:	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
-----------------------	---------	--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

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

(a-b) According to the General Plan, there are no mineral resources of local, regional, or statewide value that have been identified in the project area. Therefore, there are no foreseeable or anticipated impacts to existing mineral resources. No Impacts to Mineral Resources

11. NOISE. Would the project result in:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| (a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| (b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| (c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| (d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| (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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| (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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES:	Sources	Potentially	Less Than	Less than	No
		Significant	Significant	Significant	Impact
		Impact	With Mitigation Incorporation	Impact	Impact

(a-d) There may be sensitive receptors (residential uses) located to the east and north of the project site closest residential areas from the nearest proposed building. The proposed project may periodically or temporarily increase ambient noise levels generated from people, music, vehicles and equipment coming and going from the site. All activities are or will be required to occur indoors unless special permission or approval for outdoor activities is first granted. As proposed there are no other predictable or anticipated noise impacts from this proposed project that would be generated either indoors or outdoors. The proposed project will be required to comply with the City of Bishop's noise standards (Section 8.12) as would any other project. The proposed project is expected to comply with all local or regional noise ordinance. As designed the proposed project will minimize the potential for interior noise to escape the project site. The project will include additional noise suppression methods as necessary including new or higher block walls separating the project area from adjoining residential uses. *Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Measures*
 (b-c, e-f) No substantial permanent increase in ambient noise level in anticipated from this project. This proposed project should not expose persons or generate excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels. As designed the proposed project will not affect the existing or proposed schools, airstrips, or people working in the project area. Short-term noise levels may increase during grading and construction activities associated with the development of the project. However, this phase of the project is relatively short in length and conducted during the daytime hours when the majority of people are awake or at work. The proposed project will not impair the implementation of any adopted emergency response or evacuation plan. *No Impact*

12. 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)?
- (b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?
- (c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

(a-c) As proposed there are two (2) residential units that will be replaced by two (2) new residential units. There are no other residential uses on the site, thus, residents will not be displaced, but just relocated to the new units. The only impacts to residential housing are the lack of current housing in the area. This proposed use is not anticipated to alleviate or substantially exacerbate the current need for or solve the housing shortage. There are no other foreseeable or anticipated impacts to population or housing. The project will not induce growth directly or indirectly. *No Impact*

13. PUBLIC SERVICES

- (a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered government 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:
 - (i) Fire protection?

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES:	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant		No Impact
			With Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	

(ii) Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(iii) Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(iv) Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(v) Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

(a i-iv) The proposed project would not result in the need for new or alter any government facilities. Since the proposed project is located within the City boundaries, it will not reduce the amount of usable open space in any city park. There is no anticipated need for additional public services above the levels established in the General Plan. No Impacts

14. RECREATION:

(a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

(a-b) The comprehensive land use pattern and density for the entire City are set forth in the Land Use Element of the General Plan. The proposed project will not change the established land use pattern or cause a population growth in the area or the City. The proposed project is located next to the County line there are many opportunities for parks or recreation facilities; therefore, there will be no loss of usable open space in the park. There are no foreseeable or anticipated impacts to existing parks or recreation facilities. No Impacts

15. 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 or vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES:	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
			With Mitigation Incorporation		

- | | | | | | |
|-----|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| (e) | Result in inadequate emergency access? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| (f) | Result in inadequate parking capacity? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| (g) | Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

(a-e,g) The circulation pattern for the entire City is set forth in the Circulation Element of the General Plan. The proposed project will not change any established circulation patterns in the area or the City. The construction phase of the project would produce limited traffic increases to the project site; but the increase would not be considered a significant impact. Once construction ceases, traffic patterns would return to normal with very little additional increase in traffic load from current levels. There may be some increase in traffic generated by the proposed facility during special events i.e., funerals, weddings and recreation competitions, but these events will be booked during non-church service hours only, therefore the traffic generated by these special events will not increase much beyond those generated by normal or holiday services. Traffic impacts were looked at by LSA Associates and determined not to be significant enough to report. The proposed project must still comply with police and fire requirements for emergency access prior to obtaining building permits. There are no other foreseeable or anticipated transportation or traffic related impacts from this proposed project. No Impacts

(f) The proposed project will at times need to provide both on and off-site parking for the church or special events. On May 2, 2007, a parking study was submitted by LSA Associates to determine if there was an adequate parking supply for the demand. The findings and recommendations conclude that only on the worse case scenario would the demand exceed the supply. In that case the overflow would be required to park on the street. The "Religious Land-Use and Institutionalized Persons Act of 2000" (RLUIPA) prohibits governments from imposing a land use regulation in a manner that imposes a substantial burden on the institution. The effect of this legislation allows religious institutions to circumvent government regulations unless the government can demonstrate that the imposition of that burden is in furtherance of a compelling governmental interest. This may be the case when trying to get improvements to fully develop the auxiliary parking lot. Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Measures

16. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:

- | | | | | | |
|-----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| (a) | Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| (b) | Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| (c) | Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| (d) | Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| (e) | Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES:	Sources	Potentially	Less Than	Less than	No
		Significant	Significant	Significant	Impact
		Impact	With	Impact	Impact
			Mitigation		
			Incorporation		

in addition to the provider's existing commitments?

- | | | | | | |
|-----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| (f) | Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| (g) | Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

(a-g) The Applicant will be responsible for complying with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System requirements, during and after construction. There is no anticipated need for additional utilities and service systems above the levels established in the General Plan. Existing drainage will not be affected by the proposed facility, but the increase in storm water should be designed to be filtered onsite before entering storm drain system. Best Management Practices will be required and no substantial amount of storm water will be generated downstream. There is adequate landfill and wastewater capacity to accommodate the proposed project. No Impact

17. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE:

- | | | | | | |
|-----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| (a) | Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| (b) | Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| (c) | Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

(a-c) The proposed project is not anticipated to result in any conclusive, associated or cumulatively, adverse environmental effects. The proposed project does not have any significant environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings either directly or indirectly. The LADWP is a major landowner in the area and does not appear to be willing to release large amounts of vacant land for development in the near future. The lack of available land within the city increases the significance of all small projects either directly or indirectly. No Impact

18. EARLIER ANALYSIS:

None

19. SOURCE REFERENCES:

1. City of Bishop Environmental Information Form
2. City of Bishop Municipal Code.
3. WQMD/ NPDES Implementation Plan and Drainage Area Management Plan.
4. City of Bishop Staff.
5. Great Basin Unified APCB- November 2006
6. LSA Associates Neighborhood Church Parking Analysis 5/2/07

20. ATTACHMENTS:

Neighborhood Church Parking Analysis

Location Map

