

DRAFT NEGATIVE DECLARATION



CITY OF BISHOP PROPOSED 2012 MOBILITY ELEMENT UPDATE

LEAD AGENCY:

City of Bishop
377 West Line Street
Bishop, CA 93514
Contact: Gary Schley (760) 873-8458

Background, Authority and Purpose

California law (Government Code Sec. 65300 et seq.) requires every California city to develop its own plan for the future, a plan that helps its resident's document how they want to grow, develop and prosper. At a minimum this plan, called a general plan must address seven basic elements:

- Land Use
- Circulation
- Housing
- Public Safety
- Open Space
- Conservation
- Noise

Bishop last adopted a Circulation Element update in 1994 and there has not been a comprehensive technical review and update of the Circulation Element since that time. The City Council has determined that the existing Circulation Element must be updated to better address the technological, environmental, economic, and demographic changes that have affected Bishop since the 1994 plan was adopted. The updated Circulation Element has the new name Mobility Element.

Discretionary Actions

No approvals, improvements or entitlements are currently proposed in conjunction with the Mobility Element or this Negative Declaration. At such time as a discretionary Mobility Element component is proposed for implementation, project-level CEQA analysis will be prepared to evaluate potential impacts on the environment. In addition to the City of Bishop review and approval requirements for individual Mobility Element projects, a variety of permits and approvals with associated environmental review procedures may be required from local, regional, state and federal agencies including but not limited to the following:

- California Department of Transportation
- County of Inyo
- Bishop Paiute Tribe
- City of Los Angeles Department of Water and Power
- California Department of Fish and Game
- Great Basin Unified Air Pollution Control District
- Bureau of Land Management
- U.S. Forest Service
- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

Project Description

The City of Bishop is proposing an update of the General Plan Mobility Element. The purpose of the Mobility Element update is to identify and analyze existing and projected transportation needs and opportunities for all travel modes, and to identify goals, policies and actions which the City intends to implement to address those needs.

In reviewing the existing Circulation Element, the Planning Department determined that growth within the City is relatively stable and generally consistent with the adopted General Plan. The 2011 update should therefore refine the community's circulation goals by focusing on environmental, design and quality of life standards. Compared to the 1994 document, the proposed update places more emphasis on public transit, bicycle and pedestrian circulation options, long-term economic and community goals that are supported by an effective circulation system, and early planning to take advantage of opportunities that may facilitate long-term circulation improvement goals. This broader framework is reflected in the new title of 'Mobility Element.'

The Mobility Element contains a roadway component that describes the City's arterial street system, a component that describes 'opportunity areas' where long-term solutions are proposed for traffic issues, a component that addresses 'other transportation modes (including bicycles, public transportation, air services, and pedestrians), and a component that sets forth goals, policies and implementing actions. The Mobility Element is supported by a separate Transportation Report that is not part of the General Plan but provides technical information in support of the Mobility Element and can be updated regularly to ensure timely and accurate consideration of existing and future conditions, current studies, and recommendations regarding implementation projects and other actions.

The draft Mobility Element provides information relative to arterial design standards, traffic calming, local community circulation and access, long-term opportunity planning areas, public transit and cycling and pedestrian movement, the relationship between circulation and economic development, and other initiatives designed to respect the high quality of life in Bishop and its scenic and environmental resources.

The draft Mobility Element does not propose an alternate truck route; this was dropped in response to input received during community workshops and open house meetings. The Mobility Element proposes no increases in overall intensity or capacity beyond the numbers envisioned by the 1994 Circulation Element. None of the proposed road system improvements would require that existing land uses be displaced, rezoned or obtained through eminent domain: projects that would impact existing land uses have been grouped into the Opportunity Areas where improvements would be pursued only if needed properties are made available by the owners. Finally, physical improvements associated with the Mobility Element cannot be implemented without further review: each future project will be subject to environmental review consistent with requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) at such time as it is proposed for consideration.

Project Location

The City of Bishop is a scenic community located on the eastern slopes of the Sierra Nevada mountains in the northernmost part of Inyo County. Principal streets in the study area include 3 State Highways (Highway 395, which also comprises Main Street and North Sierra Highway), Highway 168 (West Line Street within the City), and Highway 6 (North Main Street near the northern city limit). The Mobility Element study area includes all of the City of Bishop as well as lands within the ownership and/or jurisdiction of the Bishop Piute Tribe, the County of Inyo, the City of Los Angeles Department of Water and Power, and the California Department of Transportation. **Exhibit A** depicts the City of Bishop corporation boundary as well as the larger Mobility Element study area.

Proposed Findings

After completing the initial study analysis, the Planning Department found that this project is consistent with the basic growth assumptions of the original Circulation Element. Additionally, the update provides for a wider range of mobility improvements within the City but does not change existing General Plan land use designations. The plan proposes no changes in densities, building or population intensity, but is designed to improve and refine circulation and mobility within the context of the adopted land use plans for Bishop. Many of the Mobility Element recommendations are 'self-mitigating' in that they are specifically intended to reduce impacts that current

circulation patterns have with respect to traffic, air emissions, public safety, municipal services and community cohesion. Finally, physical improvements associated with the Mobility Element cannot be undertaken without subsequent project-level environmental review that complies with requirements of CEQA. For these reasons, the City has concluded that the Mobility Element can be adopted without causing significant adverse environmental effects and determined that the Negative Declaration is the appropriate type of CEQA documentation.

Public Notice, Scoping Consultation and Citizen Participation

The Mobility Element has been subject to a wide range of citizen participation tools and techniques, including:

- Two Open House meetings
- One joint public workshop with the Planning Commission and City Council
- Presentations before community groups and organizations
- An on-line comment survey at the City's website
- A series of 12 working meetings with key agencies that could be impacted by future Mobility Element improvements (Bishop Piute Tribe, Caltrans, the County of Inyo, and the Eastern Sierra Transit Authority)
- Local news announcements
- A 30-day public review of the first draft Mobility Element and Transportation Report documents
- Preparation of revised texts to reflect community input
- Posting documents on city website for public review
- A informational mailing to over 2,400 addresses in the city

In addition, both the environmental evaluation and the final draft Mobility Element and Transportation Report will be subject to a second round of citizen participation including:

- Formal noticing and posting of the plan and environmental documents
- Notice to responsible and trustee agencies in accordance with the City's environmental Guidelines
- A 30-day public review and comment period on this environmental review and the draft final Mobility Element, and
- Public hearings before the Planning Commission and City Council

How Can I Respond to This Environmental Evaluation?

This report was prepared by the Planning Department at the City of Bishop. You can reach us at (760) 873-8458, or submit your comments directly to:

City of Bishop
377 West Line Street
Bishop, CA 93514
publicworks@ca-bishop.us
Contact: Gary Schley (760) 873-8458

Comments will be received for a 30-day period, through January 10, 2012, and public input will be encouraged throughout the public hearing process as well. Final action on this environmental determination will occur after the public hearing process, in conjunction with adoption of the proposed Mobility Element.

ENVIRONMENTAL INITIAL STUDY

	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?
- b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?
- c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?
- d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

	◆		
		◆	
		◆	
			◆

DISCUSSION OF AESTHETICS: Although the project does not involve a specific proposal and is a policy level document, mobility improvements present a potential new source of light, changes to historical resources, landscape and transportation design patterns. Each specific proposed transportation project will follow the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) to review and process potential aesthetic impacts in detail. Therefore, the 2011 Mobility Element presents a less than significant aesthetic impact.

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

	◆
	◆
	◆

DISCUSSION OF AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES: Although agricultural activities are found throughout the Owens Valley, including areas adjacent to Bishop, The City's General Plan does not incorporate agriculture into the adopted Land Use Plan. The amount of land available for any new land use within the City limits is extremely constrained. Implementation of the Mobility Element would therefore not have the potential to impact agriculture activities.

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:

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

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



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



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)?



d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?



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



DISCUSSION OF AIR QUALITY: Air quality in the City of Bishop is generally good due to the absence of significant pollutant sources in or near the planning area. Actions contained in the Mobility Element and Transportation Report would not significantly change the level of air quality. Some actions would have the potential to increase emissions: these potential effects will be evaluated at the time that project proposals are considered by the City. At a policy level, the impact of the Mobility Element implementation on air quality will be less than significant.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?



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?



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?



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?



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

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



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?



DISCUSSION OF BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES: As a planning document, the Mobility Element would not in itself result in impacts to biological resources nor does the Mobility Element obligate the City to undertake future improvements that may result in significant adverse impacts to biological resources. However, there is the potential that future development projects and actions associated with the proposed Mobility Element may result in significant impacts to biological resources. Implementation of the plans outlined in the Mobility Element will require subsequent discretionary approvals and environmental review pursuant to CEQA, at which time project-specific impacts related to biological resources can be more specifically defined and site-specific mitigation measures can be identified to reduce those impacts. Because the project is a policy level document and future discretionary projects would be reviewed on a project-specific basis consistent with CEQA and the City's General Plan, the 2011 Mobility Element update would not have a significant environmental impact to biological resources.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

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



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



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



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



DISCUSSION OF CULTURAL RESOURCES: The City will require that the proposed Mobility Element development proposals be subject to environmental review to survey for important historic, prehistoric and cultural resources, at which time any potential site-specific impacts would be identified, and any necessary avoidance or mitigation measures to reduce potential impacts would be recommended. Because the proposed Mobility Element is a policy level document and its future discretionary development projects would be reviewed on a project specific basis consistent with CEQA and the City's General Plan and Municipal Code, the draft Mobility Element would not have a significant environmental impact to historic, prehistoric and cultural resources within the community.

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:



	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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.			◆	
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?			◆	
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?				◆
v) Landslides?				◆
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?				◆
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?			◆	
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?			◆	
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?				◆

DISCUSSION OF GEOLOGY AND SOILS: The City of Bishop is located at the north end of the Owens Valley between the Sierra Nevada and White Mountains. The valley is a seismically active region of eastern California. There are no fault lines identified within the City limits and the City is not within an Alquist-Priolo designated zone, so the risk of seismically induced ground rupture is low. The Bishop area topography is generally flat and sloping to the east. The soils in the City area are not considered to be expansive and are suitable for sub grades. Because the proposed Mobility Element and accompanying Transportation Report are policy level documents no significant geotechnical impacts are expected in association with the proposed project. Project level CEQA documentation will be prepared as individual projects are proposed for implementation.

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Would the project:

a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?				◆
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?				◆
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				◆

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	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?



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?



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?



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



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?



DISCUSSION OF HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS: The residents of Bishop are at risk of man-made hazards, such as criminal activity, improper disposal of and exposure to hazardous materials and fire. However, Bishop has a comparatively low crime rate and implements a variety of regulatory and discretionary programs to ensure the safe use, transport and disposal of hazardous materials. Old underground fuel tanks and personal use of household hazardous materials, such as pesticides and fertilizer, is the most common occurrence of hazardous materials within the community. Hazardous materials are regulated by the Inyo County Environmental Health Department and the EPA. Because the Mobility Element and accompanying Transportation Report are policy level document, approval of the 2011 Mobility Element would not have significant hazards or hazardous materials impact on the community. However, individual projects will be analyzed in terms of potential impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials in keeping with all applicable CEQA requirements at such time as they are proposed for implementation.

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY --

Would the project:

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste 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)?



Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	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 substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?



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?



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?



f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?



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?



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



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?



DISCUSSION OF HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY: The City uses a stormwater collection system, in conjunction with the natural creek drainage system, to manage run-off. For Bishop, the only area that FEMA has identified as being within the 100-year flood plain are areas along the south fork of Bishop Creek and the Bishop Creek Canal which is located along the northeast and east City limit. Another source of potential flooding is related to dam inundation from a number of dams located west of Bishop in Sierra Nevada Bishop Creek drainage. Flooding would only occur in the unlikely event that the dams failed, and would affect those areas downstream from the dams. Additionally, The Bishop Public Works Department is actively maintaining and improving its water and sewer systems by re-constructing water storage tanks, pump stations, fire hydrants, main distribution lines and sewer plant improvements. Because of mandatory federal and state water quality requirements, the City's maintenance and improvement efforts, and because the proposal is a policy level document, the 2011 Mobility Element would not have a significant hydrological or water quality impact to the community. However, project level CEQA documentation will be prepared at such time as each project is proposed for implementation.

IX. 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?



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

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



DISCUSSION OF LAND USE AND PLANNING: The goals, policies and actions outlined in the proposed 2011 Mobility Element are based upon and consistent with the lands uses described in the City's General Plan Land Use Element. However, the Mobility Element does make several recommendations that could impact area land uses. All of these proposed actions would require subsequent project level review by the City, including CEQA documentation to assess potential impacts. Because the proposed Mobility Element is a policy level document it will have no adverse impact. The Project would result in a positive effect on the unity of the community.

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?



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?



DISCUSSION OF MINERAL RESOURCES: No mineral resources are known to exist in the proposed project area. All of the Mobility Element actions would be subject to individual review prior to approval, including identification of environmental resources and mitigation if required. Therefore, the project will not result in a negative impact to mineral resources.

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 agencies?



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



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



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



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?



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?



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

DISCUSSION OF NOISE: The City of Bishop ambient noise level are relatively low due to the small size of the City, and the limited inventory of undeveloped land and open space. The primary noise sources include traffic along U.S. Hwy.395, aircraft flying in and out of Eastern Sierra Regional Airport, and several small industrial developments located thru out the City. The City reviews noise impacts as part of the CEQA compliance process, supported by General Plan policies. These requirements would apply to individual actions recommended in the Mobility Element at the time they are proposed; approval of the Mobility Element would not in itself have a significant impact with respect to noise impacts nor would it commit the City to actions that would have significant noise impacts.

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)? ◆
- 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? ◆

DISCUSSION OF POPULATION AND HOUSING: The Mobility Element and Transportation Report would not substantially affect population growth or exceed regional or local population projections. Therefore, approval of these documents will have no impact on population and housing; potential impacts of individual projects will be assessed as the projects are proposed for implementation.

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? ◆
- Police protection? ◆
- Schools? ◆
- Parks? ◆
- Other public facilities? ◆

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

DISCUSSION OF PUBLIC SERVICES: The draft Mobility Element contains goals, policies and actions rather than specific projects. When or if specific actions are implemented it would require some form of focused study and compliance with CEQA. With the understanding of each specific project requiring an individual study and CEQA compliance, there does not appear to be a significant impact to public services.

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?



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?



DISCUSSION OF RECREATION: The Mobility Element and Transportation Report will not significantly impact the use of local public parks or necessitate the expansion of recreational facilities, therefore have no impact on recreation. Project level CEQA documentation will be prepared as individual projects are proposed for implementation.

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)?



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



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?



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



e) Result in inadequate emergency access?



f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?



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



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

DISCUSSION OF TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC: The draft Mobility Element contains goals, policies and actions rather than specific projects. Specific projects will have subsequent review for their cumulative impact on the City's circulation system. The proposed Mobility Element sets goals and policies supporting pedestrian and bicycle facilities and public transportation as alternatives to driving. It also contains policies and actions supporting convenient accessible parking and promoting adequate parking for new development. The Mobility Element is a policy level planning document that sets guide lines for improvement and enhancement of the City's circulation system. Therefore, the draft Mobility Element will not result in adverse impacts associated with transportation and traffic. Traffic effects associated with individual projects will be evaluated as part of project level CEQA documentation at the time the projects are proposed for implementation.

XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Would the project:

- a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board? ◆
- 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? ◆
- 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? ◆
- d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed? ◆
- 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? ◆
- f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project=s solid waste disposal needs? ◆
- g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste? ◆

DISCUSSION OF UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS: The proposed draft Mobility Element goals, policies and actions would not result in a need for new systems or supplies or substantial alterations to power, communications, water supplies, water treatment or distribution facilities, solid waste disposal, sewer and sewer treatment, which will continue to be provided by the existing service providers. However, future specific projects will be reviewed for potential impacts to utilities and service systems as part of project level CEQA review. Therefore, the Mobility Element will have no impact on utilities and service systems.

Potentially Significant Impact

Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation

Less Than Significant Impact

No Impact

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?



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)?



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



DISCUSSION OF MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE: The Mobility Element goals, policies and actions do not have environmental impacts that are cumulatively significant. The Mobility Element includes methods of meeting transportation needs, but does not include or imply approval of any specific project. The City will undertake individual and cumulative environmental analyses of specific projects consistent with California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The Mobility Element will assist in such cumulative analyses by outlining transportation development possibilities and providing a preliminary general overview of potential development impacts to resources, services and transportation systems. Therefore, 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.

