6.0 LONG-TERM IMPLICATIONS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT

6.0 LONG-TERM IMPLICATION OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT

6.1 THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SHORT-TERM USES OF MAN'S ENVIRONMENT AND THE MAINTENANCE AND ENHANCEMENT OF LONG-TERM PRODUCTIVITY

If the proposed 1999 Specific Plan Amendment is approved and constructed, a variety of short-term and long-term impacts would occur on a local level. During project grading and construction, portions of surrounding lands may be temporarily impacted by dust and noise. Short-term erosion may occur during grading. There may also be a minor increase in dust and vehicle emissions caused by grading and construction activities. However, these disruptions would be temporary, and can be mitigated to a large degree through mitigation cited in this report and the standards for construction as cited in the Town's Municipal Code (refer to Section 5.0, *Description of Environmental Setting, Impacts and Mitigation Measures*).

Ultimate development of the project would create long-term environmental consequences that are associated with any transition in land use. The long-term effects of the proposed project and subsequent development may impact the physical, aesthetic, and human environments. Long-term physical consequences of development include: increased traffic volumes, additional noise created by traffic generated from the project, incremental increased demands for public services and utilities, and increased energy and natural resource consumption. Long-term biological, cultural, and aesthetic consequences associated with grading, construction and landscaping would also include the replacement of on-site vegetation with other plant varieties. Incremental degradation of local and regional air quality would also be a long-term impact.

6.2 IRREVERSIBLE ENVIRONMENTAL CHANGES THAT WOULD BE INVOLVED IN THE PROPOSED ACTION SHOULD IT BE IMPLEMENTED

Implementation of the proposed project would cause irreversible environmental changes including the following:

- ❖ Commitment of land, which would be physically altered.
- ❖ Vegetation removal for grading and construction activities. Replacement landscaping is included with the project.

- Alteration of the human environment as a consequence of the development process. The project represents an enhanced commitment to commercial uses which intensifies land uses on the project site.

- Utilization of various new raw materials, such as lumber, sand and gravel for construction. Some of these resources are already being depleted worldwide. The energy consumed in development and maintaining the site may be considered a permanent investment.

- Incremental increases in vehicular activity in the surrounding circulation system, resulting in associated increases in air emissions and noise levels.

6.3 GROWTH INDUCING IMPACTS

Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), Section 15126.2, the following discussion identifies ways in which the proposed 1999 Specific Plan Amendment project could foster economic or population growth, or the construction of additional housing, either directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment. Growth-inducing impacts include projects which would remove obstacles to population growth and projects which may encourage and facilitate other activities that could significantly affect the environment, either individually or cumulatively. Potential growth-inducing impacts are also assessed based on a project's consistency with adopted plans that have addressed growth management from a local and regional standpoint.

Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines contains the Initial Study Environmental Checklist form used during the preparation of the project Initial Study as contained in Appendix 15.1, *Initial Study*, of this EIR. The Initial Study includes questions relating to population and housing. The issues presented in the Initial Study Checklist have been utilized as thresholds for significance in this Section. Accordingly, a project may create a significant environmental impact if one or more of the following occurs:

- 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);

- Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere; and/or

- Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

Potential growth-inducing impacts from the proposed 1999 Specific Plan Amendment project are analyzed below as they relate to population, housing and employment factors. Additionally, it should be noted that Section 5.2, *Population and Housing,* provides a detailed discussion of population, housing and employment within the Town of Mammoth Lakes.

EMPLOYMENT

The Town's 1995 labor force was estimated at 3,520 persons which accounted for approximately 52 percent of the County's total labor force. As of August 1999, the Town's labor force was an estimated 3,210 persons, accounting for approximately 56 percent of the County's total. Almost all jobs in Mammoth Lakes depend directly or indirectly on tourism and recreation. According to the 1992 General Plan Housing Element, amusement and recreation services provided 1,530 jobs, retail trade provided 1,730 jobs, restaurants and bars provided 1,183 jobs, and hotels provided 606 jobs.[1]

Implementation of the 1999 Specific Plan Amendment would create new employment within the Town. The Plan would involve the development of 135,000 square feet of commercial uses and 3,020 accommodation rooms. These uses have the potential to generate an estimated 1,532 full-time equivalent employees (FTEE). However, the project's actual employment generation could be as high as 3,448 employees since an FTEE is comprised of a combination of full-time, seasonal and/or part-time employees. Based on the types of uses proposed, it is anticipated that the majority of the jobs would be within the services industry (i.e., hotels and other lodging) and within the retail trade industry (i.e., food stores, eating and drinking establishments, and other retail trade). The increase in the Town's employment would foster economic growth, therefore, is considered a beneficial project impact.

POPULATION- PERMANENT

The Town is located in Mono County. The County's 1990 population was estimated at 9,956 persons. By 2000, the County's population had increased to 10,914 persons, representing an increase of approximately nine percent.

The Town was home to an estimated 4,785 persons in 1990 and experienced a population growth for each year between 1990 and 2000, with the exception of 1996, when the population slightly decreased (-0.9%). The average annual change in population between 1990 and 2000 was a 1.1% increase. Based on the California Department of Finance estimates, the Town's population as of January 1, 2000 was an estimated 5,355 persons, which represented approximately 49% of Mono County's

[1] *Town of Mammoth Lakes General Plan Housing Element,* July 1, 1992, page 3.

total population of 10,914 persons. According to the 1986 General Plan, the resident population has been projected to increase to 8,000 persons by the year 2005.

The Town would experience growth in their permanent population as a result of the proposed employment generating (i.e., commercial and hotel) uses. The jobs created by the proposed uses would be occupied by persons moving to the Town. Additionally, the labor force would be partially made up of employees with families requiring long-term, family-oriented living accommodations and partially made up of single employees in households consisting of multiple single workers. Based on the California Department of Finance's January 1, 2000 factor of 2.485 persons per household, project implementation would increase the Town's population by approximately 1,718 persons. This population increase would be slightly offset due to removal of the existing uses. Accordingly, implementation of the proposed 1999 Specific Plan Amendment has the potential to increase the Town's existing population of approximately 5,355 persons (California Department of Finance, January 1, 2000) to approximately 6,950 persons, representing an increase of approximately 30 percent.

POPULATION - VISITOR

In addition to the permanent year-round population, the Town experiences both annual and seasonal fluctuations in its population. The seasonal population is comprised of both winter and non-winter visitation and activities, although, these temporary changes in population peak during winter. The Town's weekend populations are currently approaching 30,000 and are expected to ultimately reach 52,000.[2]

The proposed 1999 Specific Plan Amendment would involve the development of approximately 3,020 accommodation rooms which could all be available for public rental at any given time. Persons staying at these rooms would include both skiers and visitors. Based on these assumptions, the Town's seasonal population could potentially increase by approximately 4,472 persons as a result of the proposed accommodation rooms.

Due to the resort nature of the Town, the actual population of the Town is always greater than the permanent population. The maximum number of people at one time (PAOT) in the Town would include the permanent population plus the seasonal population. Based on the project's permanent and seasonal population projections of 1,595 persons and 4,472 persons, respectively, project implementation has the potential to increase the Town's weekend population to approximately 36,067 persons.

[2] North Village Specific Plan, June 22, 1994, Page 12.

HOUSING

The total housing stock for the Town in 1990 was an estimated 7,102 units. A slight increase in the Town's housing stock occurred consecutively during the years between 1990 and 1999, with an average annual increase of approximately 1% over the decade and a peak increase of 3.3% between the years 1990 and 1991. Based on the California Department of Finance estimates, the Town's housing stock as of January 1, 2000 was an estimated 7,824 units. The Town's housing stock was made up of 32% single-family units (detached and attached), 66% multiple-family units, and the remaining two percent mobile homes.

The population increase associated with project implementation would create a greater demand for housing, thereby, directly and indirectly, resulting in the construction of additional housing.

As noted previously, the projected increase in population associated with the 1999 Specific Plan Amendment is based on the assumption that the jobs created by the proposed commercial and hotel uses would be filled by persons moving to the Town, hence, requiring new housing within the Town. Housing would be required for both employees with and without families.

In consideration of the Town's 73 percent vacancy rate, it would appear that there is sufficient housing to absorb the reduction in housing and the demand generated by project implementation. However, the Town's relatively high vacancy rates are misleading since a majority of the units are short-term seasonal dwelling units; a reflection of the resort nature of the Town. The Town's housing shortage is further aggravated by existing overcrowded conditions due to high rents and low paying jobs, as well as the limited housing opportunities which exist in the communities closest to the Town.

Further, the recreation-based service economy which exists in the Town, and which would be expanded through implementation of the proposed 1999 Specific Plan Amendment, depends largely upon a labor pool of individuals working at low paying jobs. Due to the nature of the jobs which would be created, it is assumed that the majority of the new employees would require affordable housing. In an effort to satisfy the affordable housing requirements of future employment, the Town has drafted an Employee Housing Mitigation Policy (EHMP).

ECONOMIC GROWTH

A project that would directly create more jobs than directly create more housing or population increased would have a favorable affect on employment and revenue in the Town. CEQA Section 15126.2 states that an EIR should discuss ways in which the

proposed project could foster economic growth in the environment. The proposed project could foster economic growth with its hotel, commercial, and recreational uses, as well as the resultant demand for housing. The project could result in additional revenue generated by tourists attracted to the Resort. These tourists, particularly those associated with the ski industry, would also contribute to the local economy of the Town as patrons of the existing recreational and commercial uses.

CONCLUSION

In as much as the proposed 1999 Specific Plan Amendment development would facilitate both economic and population growth, and result in the construction of additional housing, both directly and indirectly, project implementation would be considered growth inducing. However, potential growth-inducing impacts are also assessed based on a project's consistency with adopted plans that have addressed growth management from a local and regional standpoint.

While the additional employment and resultant population growth and housing construction induced by the project may in and of itself be considered growth inducing, this growth was anticipated in both local and regional plans as is evidenced below:

- The proposed Plan would result in fewer FTEE and a reduction in the projected population increase of the 1994 Specific Plan.

- The difference in seasonal population between the 1994 Specific Plan and the 1999 Specific Plan Amendment is not considered significant in as much as the Town's General Plan anticipated the project's development and resultant seasonal population increases. Further, project implementation is consistent with the General Plan's policies with respect to the projected growth in seasonal population.

- The proposed 1999 Specific Plan Amendment would result in a slightly lesser demand for housing than the 1994 Specific Plan;

- The Town's General Plan designates the site as Specific Plan area, hence, anticipating development and resultant population increases. Further, the anticipated population growth is accommodated by the Town's existing zoning regulations.

- The proposed 1999 Specific Plan Amendment would not increase the overall permitted square footage of commercial uses beyond those previously approved for the site and as analyzed in the certified 1991 EIR and 1994 EIR Addendum.

Based on these findings, it is concluded that implementation of the proposed 1999 Specific Plan Amendment would not result in significant growth inducing impacts. Further, as the project would not exceed growth projections anticipated by local and/or regional growth documents, it can be considered consistent with the intent of these documents to not allow additional growth than what is currently anticipated.

7.0 ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

7.0 ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

In accordance with California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15126.6, the following Section describes a range of reasonable alternatives to the proposed project which could feasibly attain the basic objectives of the proposed project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project, and evaluate the comparative merits of each alternative. This analysis focuses on alternatives capable of eliminating significant adverse environmental effects or reducing them to less than significant levels, even if these alternatives would impede, to some degree, the attainment of the project objectives. Potential environmental impacts associated with three separate alternatives are compared to impacts from the proposed project below. These alternatives include:

1) No Project Alternative;
2) Reduced Density Alternative; and
3) Alternative Site Alternative.

Throughout the following analysis, impacts of alternatives are examined for each of the issue areas examined in Section 5.0 of this EIR. In this manner, each alternative can be compared to the proposed 1999 Specific Plan Amendment on an issue-by-issue basis. The alternative's ability to meet the primary project objectives are also identified (refer to Section 3.4, *Project Objectives*).

An EIR must identify an "environmentally superior" alternative and where the No Project Alternative is identified as environmentally superior, the EIR is then required to identify as environmentally superior an alternative from among the others evaluated. The Environmentally Superior Alternative is identified and discussed in Section 7.4. Each alternative's impacts are compared to those of the proposed project. However, only those impacts found significant and unavoidable are relevant in making the final determination of whether an alternative is environmentally superior or inferior to the proposed project. The proposed 1999 Specific Plan Amendment development would create a significant and unavoidable impact in the following area:

Air Quality

The increased traffic associated with the 1999 Specific Plan Amendment would exceed District State and Federal PM10 significant standards thereby creating a significant and unavoidable air quality impact. On a cumulative level, the project would contribute to a current violation of the State and Federal PM10 standard. This contribution would be significant and unavoidable.

7.1 NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE

DESCRIPTION OF ALTERNATIVE

The No Project Alternative consists of buildout of the 1994 Specific Plan as currently approved. As explained in Section 3.2, *Background and History*, an EIR was prepared for the 1991 Specific Plan in February 1991 by EIP Associates. The 1991 EIR was certified by the Mammoth Lakes Town Council on April 17, 1991. A total of 90 mitigation measures were applied to the project. A summary of the impacts and mitigation measures adopted by the Town Council in 1991 for the development of uses proposed under the 1991 Specific Plan is available for review at the Town offices.

In 1994, Zoning Code Amendment 94-1 and General Plan Amendment 94-1 further refined the design of the Pedestrian Core area and the realignment of Canyon Boulevard to meet with Millers Sliding/Lake Mary Road as a Collector Street. The design refinement did not alter the concept of the 1991 Specific Plan approved in 1991. An Addendum to the certified 1991 EIR was completed in 1994 for the 1994 Specific Plan.

The existing Specific Plan area is comprised of 41 separate parcels under several separate ownerships, totaling 64.1 acres. The existing 1994 Specific Plan creates a set of land use designations and development standards to facilitate the development of North Village as a concentrated, pedestrian-oriented activity center with limited demand for automobile use. The North Village development is oriented toward year-round uses and visitor activity to strengthen the existing winter visitor market and to improve Mammoth's attractiveness to spring, summer and fall resort visitors.

Based upon the 1991 Specific Plan and 1994 Specific Plan, buildout may result in approximately 3,020 accommodation rooms, in addition to affordable housing, and 135,000 square feet of commercial uses. Three land use districts are provided with the highest intensity district permitting a maximum of 80 rooms per acre and the lowest intensity district permitting a maximum of 48 rooms per acre, with an overall project density of approximately 54 rooms per acre. The design emphasizes the creation of diverse shopping, accommodation, recreational, residential and cultural opportunities which appeal to all ages and family interests.

The Pedestrian Core area is intended as a mixed-use village with commercial uses on the ground level and accommodation units on the upper floors. Restaurants, shops, meeting facilities and recreation uses are oriented around two pedestrian plazas, one on the westside of Minaret Road and one on the east side of Minaret Road. A gondola leading up to the Canyon lodge base facility of Mammoth Mountain Ski Area (MMSA) originates from the west-side plaza. Parking is provided in underground parking

garages, available to guests and patrons of the plaza accommodation and commercial uses.

Surrounding the Pedestrian Core are supporting accommodation and residential uses. Commercial uses within the outlying areas are limited to only those necessary to support the on-site lodging or residential uses. In this way, the core remains the focus of North Village shopping and cultural activities. Each development is self-contained, providing on-site parking and desired amenities.

The circulation system emphasizes pedestrian use, but provides for vehicular routes into and through the North Village area. The gondola feature provides alternate access to MMSA limiting the need for vehicular trips to that destination. The street pattern allows for visitation and drop-off areas at key destinations, such as the gondola building and parking garages. Minaret Road passes through the center of the project allowing for continued travel along Highway 203 and access into parking garages, transit stops and drop-off areas. The secondary access into the project is from Millers Siding which connects to Canyon Boulevard to form a through route from Lake Mary Road to the Slopes subdivision. Canyon Boulevard, east of Hillside Drive, is abandoned to allow for development of the pedestrian plaza. Access to parking garages, the gondola building, passenger and transit drop-offs are available from Millers Siding/Canyon Boulevard. Perimeter streets, such as Forest Trail and Hillside Drive, afford very limited access to the project. Berner Street is rerouted to intersect with Forest Trail rather than Minaret Road and provides access to parking garages on the east side of the development.

IMPACT COMPARISON TO PROPOSED PROJECT

The proposed 1999 Specific Plan Amendment is compared to impacts from the 1994 Specific Plan, as approved, throughout Section 5.0 of this EIR. Impacts of the approved Specific Plan as documented in the 1994 EIR Addendum are provided below for each of the issue areas analyzed in this EIR.

Land Use and Relevant Planning

Summary of Previous Documentation. The 1991 EIR provided a brief consistency analysis of the Specific Plan with the primary General Plan goals. The 1991 EIR impact analysis did not identify inconsistencies with the General Plan and the 1994 EIR Addendum did not provide an additional consistency analysis or recommend additional mitigation measures. The 1991 EIR for the 1991 Specific Plan identified several potentially significant impacts related to land use. Impacts identified as potentially significant included 1) changes in the existing physical land use patterns and demand both in the project area and throughout the commercial areas of the Town; and 2) development of a more intense use than the 1991 Specific Plan and 1994

Specific Plan Addendum zoning and land uses. Mitigation measures were adopted for these potentially significant impact to reduce impacts to less than significant levels. No additional impacts were identified in the 1994 EIR addendum.

Comparison to 1999 Specific Plan Amendment. The 1991 EIR identified a significant and unavoidable land use compatibility impact related to privacy issues and location of the gondola easement over residential uses. The proposed 1999 Specific Plan Amendment would not create additional unavoidable significant impacts beyond those anticipated in the previous environmental documentation.

Although the proposed 1999 Specific Plan Amendment would amend the permitted land uses within the on-site land use ~~districts~~ designations and redistribute the location of various uses, when compared to the 1994 Specific Plan, implementation of the proposed Amendment would not physically divide an established community. Similar to the 1994 Specific Plan, significant cumulative land use impacts have not been identified for the proposed 1999 Specific Plan Amendment.

Population and Housing

Summary of Previous Documentation. As noted in the 1991 EIR, population increases were anticipated as a result of the employment created by the proposed hotel and commercial development. Based on the development of 2,000 hotel units, 400 resort condominiums, approximately 191,000 square feet of commercial/retail, and 60,000 square feet of restaurant, the projected population increase identified in the 1991 EIR was an estimated 2,828 persons (assuming the generation of 1,612 full-time employees and a 0.57 jobs to population ratio). This increase in population was not identified as a significant impact in the 1991 EIR although the demand for additional housing associated with this increase in population was considered a significant impact.

The 1991 EIR addressed the development of 2,000 hotel units and 400 resort condominiums. It was anticipated that the 1991 Specific Plan would generate a peak population of 2,300 people on-site.[1] The factors utilized to arrive at this estimate were not identified in the EIR. Impacts to the Town's seasonal population were not specifically addressed. According to the 1994 EIR Addendum, the revised project description resulted in no changes to the impacts, mitigation measures or cumulative impacts with respect to seasonal population. The 1991 EIR did not specifically address the displacement of existing housing units; however, the housing demand of 1,230 units created by the employment associated with the proposed hotel and commercial development (1991 Specific Plan) was identified as a significant impact in the 1991 EIR. It was assumed that "all units anticipated in the Specific Plan were hotel or resort

[1] North Village Specific Plan EIR, 1991, Page 4.4-13.

condominium units, except for an undisclosed number of employee housing units in the Specific Plan area." Population increases from the proposed Specific Plan were anticipated from the jobs that would be created from the hotel and commercial development. Based on the creation of an estimated 1,612 jobs, the 1991 EIR projected a population increase of 2,828 persons and a resultant demand for 1,230 housing units. Further, it was determined that approximately 800 of the 1,230 housing units would be designated as affordable housing.

The 1991 EIR noted that "since there is a present unmet need for affordable housing in Mammoth Lakes, any additional demands created by the North Village Specific Plan is considered a significant impact upon the Town's ability to meet the needs for affordable housing." It further noted that "based on the types of jobs created, it is likely that about two-thirds of the North Village employees will be in the low-income category, therefore an additional 800 affordable housing units will be needed." According to the 1994 EIR Addendum, the revised project description resulted in no changes to the impacts, mitigation measures or cumulative impacts with respect to population, housing or employment. The 1991 EIR did not specifically address the displacement of people due to the removal of existing housing units.

Comparison to 1999 Specific Plan Amendment. Implementation of the proposed ~~1999~~ 1994 Specific Plan Amendment has the potential to increase the Town's existing population of approximately 5,355 persons (California Department of Finance, January 1, 2000) to approximately 6,950 persons, representing an increase of approximately 30 percent.

Permanent Population. Based on updated factors and methodologies, and in consideration of the existing uses, the 1994 Specific Plan would generate 1,502 FTEE. The proposed 1999 Specific Plan Amendment would generate an estimated 1,532 FTEE.

Seasonal Population. The 1994 Specific Plan projected a seasonal population increase of approximately 2,300 persons, however, did not specify the factors utilized in arriving at this estimate. Therefore, in order to provide a more realistic comparative analysis, the seasonal population for the 1994 Specific Plan was re-computed. Based on a 2,800 accommodation room estimate and more current occupancy rates, the seasonal population increase associated with the 1994 Specific Plan would be 4,146 persons. When compared to the 1994 Specific Plan, the proposed 1999 Specific Plan Amendment's seasonal population increase of 4,472 persons would result in a greater increase in the seasonal population (326 additional persons). The eight percent (8%) difference in seasonal population between the 1994 Specific Plan and the 1999 Specific Plan Amendment is not considered significant in as much as the Town's General Plan anticipated the project's development and resultant seasonal population increases.

Housing - Free Market. The 1994 Specific Plan was projected to generate 1,612 FTEE.[2] This estimate was based on the best available information in 1994. When compared to the 1994 Specific Plan, the proposed 1999 Specific Plan Amendment would result in the displacement of a similar number of housing units due to a similar development footprint. Therefore, in consideration of removal of the existing commercial and residential uses, and based on updated factors and methodologies, the 1994 Specific Plan would create an overall housing demand of 1,706 EHU and 850 HUE, including a free market housing demand of 708 EHU and 353 HUE (refer to Table 5.2-7). In contrast, the proposed 1999 Specific Plan Amendment would create a free market housing demand of 671 EHU and 334 EHU. The proposed project would create a demand for 37 EHU and 19 HUE fewer free market units than the 1994 Specific Plan.

Housing - Affordable. Based upon updated methodologies and factors, the 1994 Specific Plan would create a demand for approximately 1,061 affordable EHU and 530 affordable HUE. In consideration of the residential and commercial uses which would be removed, the 1994 Specific Plan would result in an overall demand for approximately affordable 998 EHU and 497 affordable HUE. When compared to the 1994 Specific Plan, the proposed 1999 Specific Plan Amendment would create a demand for 53 EHU and 26 HUE fewer affordable units than the 1994 Specific Plan.

Implementation of the 1999 Specific Plan Amendment may induce substantial growth in the Town's permanent year-round population as a result of the employment associated with hotel and commercial uses. The population growth was anticipated in the Town's General Plan and accommodated by zoning regulations. Based on these findings, it is concluded that implementation of the proposed 1999 Specific Plan Amendment would not result in significant impacts with regards to increases in the Town's permanent population when compared to the approved 1994 Specific Plan. Since the proposed 1999 Specific Plan Amendment would not increase the overall permitted square footage of commercial uses beyond those previously approved for the site and is consistent with the General Plan's projected growth in tourism, implementation of the proposed project would not result in significant impacts with regards to increases in the Town's seasonal population (same conclusion as the 1994 Specific Plan).

The proposed 1999 Specific Plan Amendment may displace approximately 27 persons associated with removal of the existing housing units. The existing shortage of housing, coupled with the loss of existing housing due to project development, would require replacement housing on-site or in zoning districts not impacted by factors determining housing supply. As the proposed 1999 Specific Plan Amendment involves

[2] North Village Specific Plan Environmental Impact Report Addendum, May 1994, Table A, Page 14.

the development of replacement housing, this is not considered a significant unavoidable adverse impact beyond levels anticipated in the 1994 EIR Addendum.

Aesthetics/Light and Glare

Summary of Previous Documentation. The 1991 EIR concluded that development of the 1991 Specific Plan would change the physical and visual character of the site thereby resulting in a significant aesthetic impact. This impact would be caused by the increased density of development compared to existing conditions and the subsequent loss of open space and forest. Mitigation measures such as enforcement of a tree preservation plan; contour grading; a forested buffer of 100 feet along Lake Mary Road, the southern extension of Minaret Road and along the western and eastern edges of the Specific Plan area; and the use of native plants in landscaping design was recommended to reduce potential impacts in this regard to a less than significant level.

The 1991 EIR identified the location of the gondola and route as a significant and unavoidable visual impact. The 1991 EIR concluded that existing views from off-site residential areas and on-site hotels would be permanently altered by the gondola. Mitigation measures such as limiting the height of the gondola to 90 feet (just below the tree line), the retention of existing trees along the route to serve as a visual buffer, and the use of natural earth-tone colors in building design were recommended to reduce significant impacts. The 1991 EIR, however, states that these impacts would remain significant after mitigation.

The 1991 EIR concluded that distant views for motorists and pedestrians traveling along Minaret Road and Main Street/Lake Mary Road would not be significantly affected by the gondola although views would be affected due to intensification of development and potential 100 foot building heights in the western area of the site. The pedestrian overpass connecting the eastern and western components of the "Plaza area" would extend across Minaret Road, screening forest and mountain views from motorists traveling along the roadway. Mitigation measures such as design review for individual development sites within the Specific Plan area, the use of earth-tone colors and materials, and the minimization of the height and visual massing of the overpass were recommended to reduce these impacts to a less than significant level.

The 1991 EIR states that levels of lighting on-site would increase with implementation of the 1991 Specific Plan. External lighting would be introduced for safety and security and street lights may also be extended into new areas of the site. Internal lighting systems would not be of an intensity that would cause impacts to adjacent residential uses. The most sensitive light receptors would be residential and condominium uses located adjacent to the Specific Plan area. Mitigation measures in the form of design recommendations and light intensity levels were recommended to reduce potentially significant light impacts to less than significant levels. Sources of reflective glare could

emanate from window glass (including the gondola cabins), and from other construction materials. The use of reflective glass and other materials could have significant impacts on adjacent land uses, pedestrians, and motorists traveling along Minaret Road and Lake Mary Road. Mitigation was recommended to minimize the use of reflective material to reduce impacts resulting from glare to a less than significant level. The 1994 EIR Addendum did not identify additional significant impacts or recommend additional mitigation measures beyond those included in the 1991 EIR.

Comparison to 1999 Specific Plan Amendment. The proposed 1999 Specific Plan Amendment would result in less than significant level with implementation of project design measures and implementation of recommended mitigation measures. Impacts are not expected to increase when compared to the 1994 Plan. As analyzed in Section 5.4, *Aesthetics/Light and Glare*, the proposed 1999 Specific Plan Amendment is not anticipated to obstruct a scenic vista or substantially damage a scenic resource provided mitigation measures from the 1991 EIR and 1994 EIR Addendum are implemented (same as 1994 Specific Plan).

Light and glare generated by the 1999 Specific Plan Amendment may create additional impacts beyond those anticipated in the 1991 EIR and 1994 EIR Addendum. Although increased, this impact would be mitigated to a less than significant level with implementation of recommended mitigation measures (the 1994 Specific Plan would also be reduced to less than significant levels with mitigation measures).

Traffic and Circulation

Summary of Previous Documentation. The 1991 EIR identified several significant impacts to traffic and circulation. These impacts include seven segments operating at level of service (LOS) F with the project, and deficiencies at numerous intersections. Mitigation measures including roadway improvements and transportation demand management demand techniques were recommended to reduce the significance of impacts to less than significant levels.

The 1994 EIR Addendum included further refinements to the previously approved circulation system including the realignment of Canyon Boulevard to east with Millers Siding/Lake Mary Road as a Collector Street. Canyon Boulevard, east of Hillside, would be abandoned. Berner Street would be re-routed to intersect with Forest Trail rather than Minaret Road. Additional mitigation measures to address revisions in circulation were recommended in the 1994 EIR Addendum to reduce impacts to less than significant levels.

Comparison to 1999 Specific Plan Amendment. Traffic impacts associated with the proposed 1999 Specific Plan Amendment are analyzed in Section 5.4, *Traffic and Circulation*. As analyzed in that Section, project-related traffic would potentially

impact LOS at several intersections. Operational deficiencies may occur at several intersections both with and without project traffic under cumulative conditions. Impacts associated with round-about and pedestrian safety and parking were also identified to be less than significant with implementation of mitigation measures.

According to the Traffic Report, the proposed 1999 Specific Plan Amendment would generate less traffic than the 1994 Specific Plan. Mitigation measures were recommended for both Specific Plan scenarios with the overall conclusion that impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level with implementation of recommended mitigation measures.

Air Quality

Summary of Previous Documentation. The 1991 EIR identified potentially significant short-term construction impacts from fine particulate matter (PM10) concentrations in fugitive dust. Mitigation measures requiring site watering twice per day and use of drift fencing tackifiers and stockpile covering for inactive construction areas were recommended to reduce impacts to a less than significant level. The 1991 EIR also identified construction vehicles and equipment as creating potentially significant short-term hot spot violations of Federal and State (carbon monoxide) CO standards. Mitigation to reduce unnecessary idling of construction equipment was recommended to reduce impacts to less than significant levels.

The 1991 EIR identified potentially long-term significant air quality impacts from three different sources: 1) localized CO hotspots; 2) contribution to PM10 levels from resuspended road cinders and vehicle tail pipe and tire wear; and 3) impacts of wood burning on PM10 levels. Mitigation measures relating to compliance with APCD requirements and other measures regarding limitations on the number of fireplaces, limiting residential units to one woodburning applicable per dwelling, etc., were recommended to reduce potential long-term air quality impacts to less than significant levels.

The 1991 EIR quantified existing, future cumulative and future cumulative plus project worst-case curbside CO concentrations expected at five intersections where 1991 Specific Plan traffic is expected to have the greatest impact (1991 EIR results reprinted in Appendix 16.4, *Air Quality Data*, of this EIR). As shown in the Appendix, the potential for existing and future violations of the State's 9 ppm 8-hour CO standard exists at two locations. Of the five intersections analyzed, two intersections (Minaret Road/Main Street and Old Mammoth Road/Main Street) showed potential exceedances of the CO standard. Combined traffic impacts from cumulative development plus the Specific Plan at buildout could exceed the 8-hour CO standards for receptors at the roadside. A sensitivity analysis showed that CO levels at the Minaret Road/Main Street intersection dropped rapidly as receptors were moved away from the intersection. At

a receptor distance of 50 feet from the roadside, 8-hour CO concentrations at the intersection of Minaret Road and Main Street were determined to be below the State standard (8.7 ppm). Cumulative development *without* the 1991 Specific Plan did not show the potential for exceedances of the CO standards at any of the intersections reviewed. No exceedances of the 1-hour CO standard were projected as a result of the 1991 Specific Plan or cumulative development.

A 50-foot buffer around the Old Mammoth Road and Main Street intersection was recommended as mitigation in the 1991 EIR and 1994 EIR Addendum to reduce the potential for exposure of individuals to elevated CO concentrations to less than significant levels.

The 1991 EIR states that development of the 1991 Specific Plan would contribute to an increase in the degradation of the general air quality of the Town. Since both population and vehicular traffic would increase as a result of Specific Plan buildout, the release of pollutants would correspondingly increase. The 1991 EIR quantified PM10 emissions from cumulative development and identified cumulative levels of PM10 as significant, both with and without 1991 Specific Plan implementation. The 1991 EIR continues to recommend adherence to the General Plan Transportation Element which calls for transportation systems management measures to reduce peak-hour trip generation. The 1991 EIR concludes that implementation of the recommended measures would reduce cumulative impacts to ambient air quality to less than significant levels. The 1994 EIR Addendum refers to the 1991 EIR for analysis and does not provide an additional evaluation regarding project -specific or cumulative air quality impacts.

Comparison to 1999 Specific Plan Amendment. Short-term air quality impacts associated with particulate emissions (fugitive dust) may occur from demolition, clearing and grading activities within the Specific Plan area. As explained in Section 5.5, *Air Quality*, impacts in this regard would be mitigated to a less than significant level with implementation of standard dust control measures required by the APCD (same as 1994 Specific Plan).

Similar to the approved 1994 Specific Plan, buildout of the proposed 1999 Specific Plan Amendment may result in an overall increase in the local and regional PM10 pollutant load due to direct impacts from vehicle emissions. Although not identified as such in the 1994 EIR Addendum, this impact would remain significant and unavoidable even with implementation of standard mitigation included in Air Quality Management Plan and proposed project design measures.

Noise

Summary of Previous Documentation. The 1991 EIR analyzed potential short-term construction impacts which would occur during development of the 1991 Specific Plan area. Noise levels up to 101 dBA at 50 feet from the noise source were assumed to occur during pile driving activities. The 1991 EIR concluded that implementation of measures such as applying limitations to construction activities and the provision of noise mufflers for engine driven equipment would reduce potentially significant short-term noise impacts to less than significant levels.

The 1991 EIR indicated that noise levels exceeding 60 dBA exists on all major arterials and most streets which would increase significantly as a result of cumulative development with and without implementation of the 1991 Specific Plan. According to the 1991 EIR, noise levels anticipated for year 2005 with implementation of the 1991 Specific Plan would not be noticeably higher than noise levels projected without the project. The methodology utilized within the 1991 EIR noise analysis results in inconclusive findings regarding the significance of potential long-term noise impacts.

Stationary noise impacts identified in the 1991 EIR are limited to the operation of the gondola. The gondola would be operated by electrical power and have a diesel back-up engine for emergencies. Both engines would be located outside the Specific Plan area, thereby reducing noise impacts. The 1991 EIR concluded that gondola operations would result in below ambient noise levels at sensitive receptors, and therefore result in insignificant noise impacts. According to the 1994 EIR Addendum, the 1994 Specific Plan would not result in changes to the impacts, mitigation measures, or cumulative impacts with respect to noise beyond those identified in the 1991 EIR.

Comparison to 1999 Specific Plan Amendment. Similar to the 1994 Specific Plan, grading and construction within the Specific Plan area may result in temporary noise impacts to nearby noise sensitive receptors. Adherence to Town code requirements would reduce general construction noise impacts to a less than significant impact. However, temporary pile driving activities associated with construction of subterranean parking structures and for residences along the construction truck haul route along Canyon Boulevard would occur with the 1999 Specific Plan Amendment. This impact would be considered additional to the impacts anticipated in the 1994 Specific Plan.

Both the 1994 Specific Plan and 1999 Specific Plan Amendment would generate additional vehicular travel on the surrounding roadway network, thereby resulting in noise level increases along local roadways beyond existing conditions. Impacts are mitigated to a less than significant level.

Both the 1994 Specific Plan and proposed 1999 Specific Plan Amendment may result in the generation of on-site noise associated with and loading/unloading activities,

mechanical equipment, parking lots, plaza activities, outdoor music, etc. Stationary noise impacts for both Plans would be reduced to less than significant levels with adherence to requirements in the Mammoth Lakes Noise Ordinance. When combined with cumulative projects, both the approved and proposed Specific Plan would increase the ambient noise levels in the site vicinity. Impacts are mitigated to a less than significant level.

Geology, Soils and Seismicity

Summary of Previous Documentation. The 1991 EIR for the 1991 Specific Plan concluded that an unavoidable significant impact associated with topographical alterations to the Specific Plan area would occur with implementation. No additional unmitigable geologic conditions were identified within the 1991 EIR. A Statement of Overriding Considerations for this finding was adopted by the Town Council. The 1994 EIR Addendum did not identify additional project or cumulative impacts associated with geology, soils, and seismicity, beyond those included in the 1991 EIR.

The 1991 EIR for the 1991 Specific Plan concluded that with incorporation of recommended mitigation measures, potentially significant impacts associated with existing or newly created unstable slopes within the Specific Plan area would be reduced to less than significant levels. The 1991 EIR did not analyze potential hazards associated with ground fracturing and/or differential changes due to subsidence and/or the presence of collapsible soils. The 1994 EIR Addendum did not identify additional project or cumulative impacts associated with geology, soils, and seismicity, beyond those included in the 1991 EIR.

According to the 1991 EIR, potential significant impacts associated with soil erosion would be reduced to less than significant levels with adherence to standard specifications outlined within the comprehensive Erosion and Sediment Control Plan required prior to issuance of grading or building permits. The 1991 EIR also concluded that with the design of manufactured slopes pursuant to applicable Town codes and standards, long-term erosion impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels.

The 1991 EIR indicated that the Specific Plan area is not subject to known impacts associated with earthquake-induced landsliding, liquefaction, or seiche inundation hazards. In addition, the 1991 EIR concluded that with the incorporation of recommended mitigation measures outlined within required geotechnical studies for individual developments on a project-by-project basis, seismic ground shaking within the Specific Plan area would be reduced to less than significant levels.

According to the 1991 EIR, due to the Specific Plan's central location within the Town of Mammoth Lakes, the Specific Plan area is subject to the same flowage phenomena, tephra eruption, and gas migration hazards as the rest of the developed portion of

Mammoth Lakes. The 1991 EIR concluded that with adherence to the Town's General Plan Safety Element, impacts associated with volcanism would be reduced to less than significant levels.

The 1991 EIR addressed potential impacts associated with increased surface runoff velocities from the Specific Plan area and would constitute a significant adverse impact on downstream flooding. The 1991 Specific Plan incorporated a drainage plan to control excess flow which would occur from development of the Specific Plan area. Improvements proposed as part of the drainage plan included an additional 54-inch storm drain pipe installed parallel to the existing storm drain, modifications to portions of an existing 42-inch pipe, and a storm drain installed in Minaret Road. The 1991 EIR concluded that implementation of recommended mitigation measures and drainage improvements would reduce potentially significant surface runoff impacts to less than significant levels.

According to the 1991 EIR, the quality of surface runoff could significantly be degraded as a result of development and short-term erosion associated with construction activities. The 1991 EIR concluded that with implementation of recommended mitigation measures impacts to water quality would be reduced to less than significant levels. According to the 1991 EIR, runoff from developed area would result in an incremental increase of contaminants in the surface runoff due to the increase in urban development, however would not result in a significant impact on water quality. The 1991 Specific Plan includes storm drain improvements which would reduce the potential for pollutants to enter surface waters. The 1991 EIR concluded that the quality of groundwater would not be affected by project construction activities, and would result in less than significant impact to groundwater quantity and quality.

According to the 1994 EIR Addendum, the 1994 Specific Plan resulted in no changes to the impacts, mitigation measures, or cumulative impacts with respect to hydrology and drainage beyond those identified in the 1991 EIR.

Comparison to 1999 Specific Plan Amendment. Both the approved 1994 Specific Plan and 1999 Specific Plan Amendment may alter the existing topography within the Specific Plan area converting an under-developed setting to an urbanized developed condition. The 1991 EIR concluded that an unavoidable and significant topographical impact would occur with implementation of the 1991 Specific Plan. Implementation of the proposed 1999 Specific Plan Amendment would not result in topographical impacts beyond those previously analyzed in the previous environmental documentation for the 1991 Specific Plan. Slope stability impacts associated with modification of topography during grading phases would be reduced to a less than significant level with implementation of recommended mitigation measures for both the 1994 Specific Plan and 1999 Specific Plan Amendment.

Since the same area would be developed with both Specific Plans, impacts associated with seismic activity, volcanic hazards, and short- and long-term erosion control would be similar for both the 1994 Specific Plan and the 1999 Specific Plan Amendment. Related mitigation measures would apply to both development scenarios.

Biological Resources

Summary of Previous Documentation. According to the 1991 EIR, any loss of a plant species of concern would be considered significant. Field surveys done in late June, 1990, a time of flowering for all species of concern, failed to find any of the six species of concern. As a result it is expected that there would be no significant adverse effects on any species of concern.

According to the 1991 EIR, the recreational and commercial developments proposed for this site would result in the alteration of most of the scattered native vegetation and wildlife resources presently on the property. Cover may actually be increased in some areas as a result of landscape planting, however, this increase may not increase habitat values since the replacement vegetation would be "urban" and represents a loss of plant species diversity. This would be considered a potentially significant impact of the 1991 Specific Plan which would be reduced to a less than significant level after mitigation.

The 1991 EIR further notes that the 1991 Specific Plan would result in a change in vegetation from conifer forest to urban development within portions of undisturbed vegetation. As in the case of changes in vegetation cover, this change in vegetation would likely result in a lowering of habitat values. The change must be considered less than significant due to fragmented nature of the habitat. Additionally, development of the Specific Plan would result in the loss of 25 acres of fragmented native wildlife habitat which was considered to be a less than significant impact.

However, the 1991 EIR considered, for purposes of that EIR, that loss of vegetation cover and loss of large, specimen trees would be considered significant impacts (EIP Associates). The 1991 EIR stated "loss of cover is considered significant since it results in lowered wildlife habitat values and can lead to soil erosion, blowing dust, and other environmental problems. Implementation of mitigation measures in the 1991 EIR were found to reduce impacts to a less than significant level. According to the 1994 EIR Addendum, the revised project resulted in no changes to the impacts, mitigation measures, or cumulative impacts with respect to Biological Resources. The 1991 EIR did not specifically address impacts to wildlife corridors or the issue of tree preservation.

Comparison to 1999 Specific Plan Amendment. None of the species of concern identified through the California Native Diversity Data Base search were observed in

the Specific Plan area nor are they expected to occur. As such, neither the 1994 Specific Plan or 1999 Specific Plan Amendment would create significant impacts to sensitive species in this regard. As analyzed in Section 5.9, *Biological Resources*, the proposed Specific Plan would not create significant impacts to wildlife corridors and would be subject to Town ordinances and requirements regarding tree preservation. Since both the 1994 Specific Plan and 1999 Specific Plan Amendment would provide development in the same areas, impacts to biological resources would be similar for both development scenarios.

Public Services and Utilities

Summary of Previous Documentation. With the exception of impacts to school services, the 1991 EIR concluded that impacts to public services and r utilities would be mitigated to a less than significant level. Regarding schools, the 1991 EIR anticipated that the 1991 Specific Plan would produce approximately 373 students, resulting in an overcrowded situation for School District facilities. The cumulative impact of the proposed projects within the Town, including North Village, will result in the need for a new elementary school. This impact was considered significant and unavoidable.

According to the 1994 EIR Addendum, the 1994 Specific Plan resulted in no changes to the impacts, mitigation measures or cumulative impacts with respect to public services beyond those identified in the 1991 EIR.

Comparison to 1999 Specific Plan Amendment. As analyzed in Section 5.10, *Public Services and Utilities*, impacts to public services and utilities would be mitigated to a less than significant level. Due to the changes in CEQA significance thresholds since preparation of the 1991 EIR, the previously identified significant impacts to school services would no longer occur. As such, impacts to public services and utilities for both the 1994 Specific Plan and 1999 Specific Plan Amendment would be similar.

ABILITY TO MEET PROJECT OBJECTIVES

The objectives of the Specific Plan Amendment are discussed in Section 3.4, Project Objectives. As stated in Section 3.4, primary project objectives include facilitating the development (or renovation) of "North Village" as a concentrated, pedestrian oriented activity center with restricted vehicular access. The North Village development would be oriented toward year-round uses and visitor activity, to strengthen the existing winter visitor market and to improve Mammoth's attractiveness to spring, summer, and fall resort visitors. Unification of development throughout the Specific Plan area through the establishment of architectural and landscaping guidelines, would strengthen North Village's image as a resort activity node in Mammoth Lakes.

The No Project Alternative would permit development of the North Village area as currently approved by the Town in 1994. While the proposed types of land uses would be similar between the 1994 and proposed 1999 Specific Plan Amendment, the orientation and distribution of uses would be different with the 1999 Specific Plan Amendment (refer to Section 3.0 *Project Description*). Despite the differences in development standards and distribution, the No Project Alternative would fulfill the primary project objectives.

7.2 REDUCED DENSITY

DESCRIPTION OF ALTERNATIVE

The Reduced Density Alternative would involve a 30 percent reduction in the overall density (square footage) of the 1999 Specific Plan Amendment. The reduction would occur proportionally for all permitted land use types. The overall distribution of uses would remain the same as the proposed 1999 Specific Plan Amendment as well as the gondola and the proposed roundabout at the Forest Trail/Minaret Road intersection.

The overall result of this alternative would be a lower magnitude in project impact for each environmental concern. The relative significance of the project impacts would be similar to impacts resulting from the project as proposed on the developed areas, but would be substantially less impact on the remaining portion of the area to be left undeveloped.

IMPACT COMPARISON TO PROPOSED PROJECT

Land Use and Relevant Planning

Impacts under this Alternative would be generally reduced due to the 30 percent density reduction. No significant impacts have been identified for the 1999 Specific Plan Amendment thus no significant impacts would occur under this Alternative.

Population and Housing

A 30 percent decrease in accommodation lodging would result in a decrease to 2,114 lodging units. The increase in population and employment levels associated with the project would also be proportionately reduced.

Aesthetics/Light and Glare

Although this Alternative would reduce overall development by 30 percent, it is presumed that development would still be concentrated around the Pedestrian Core

area. Impacts to scenic resources would therefore be similar to the proposed 1999 Specific Plan Amendment (the proposed Amendment would not create significant unavoidable impacts to aesthetics). Light and glare would be proportionately reduced due to the reduction in density with this Alternative. However, mitigation as recommended in Section 5.3, *Aesthetics/Light and Glare*, would still apply to this Alternative. Overall conclusions of significance would be the same with both development scenarios.

Traffic and Circulation

As with the proposed project, the reduced project alternative would increase the level of demand for transportation and circulation beyond existing conditions. Due to the 30 percent reduction in land use throughout the Specific Plan area, this Alternative would generate a proportionately decreased number of daily trips. Despite this reduction, it can be assumed that the trip distribution would remain the same for both development scenarios.

Air Quality

Air quality impacts associated with this Alternative would be proportionately reduced when compared to the proposed project due to the decrease in daily trips. However, the significant and unavoidable impacts analyzed in Section 5.5., *Air Quality*, would still occur with this Alternative due to the non-attainment status for PM10 in the region.

Noise

Contingent upon the amount of architectural changes that would occur as a result of the reduced project Alternative, construction traffic may decrease. If a shorter construction period and a reduction in vehicle trips occur, there would be a decrease in the project's contribution to ambient noise levels when compared to the proposed project. Impacts and mitigation associated with the 1999 Specific Plan Amendment would be similar under this Alternative.

Geology, Soils, and Seismicity

As the same area would be developed under both development scenarios, impacts associated with geology, soils and seismicity would be similar with this Alternative as with the proposed 1999 Specific Plan Amendment. The potential risk would be similar to other developments in the area and would not be considered a significant impact.

Hydrology and Drainage

The increased discharge to the existing drainage capacity as a result of the construction of the 1999 Specific Plan Amendment would be reduced. Stormwater runoff would be reduced due to less impervious surfaces and impact on groundwater and surface water quality would be minimal. However, mitigation measures recommended as part of Section 5.8, *Hydrology and Drainage*, would still apply to this Alternative.

Biological Resources

As the Reduced Density Alternative would involve a 30 percent reduction in development when compared to the proposed 1999 Specific Plan Amendment, a reduction in the amount of vegetation and trees to be disturbed by the proposed project may be reduced. However, the overall conclusion for related impacts would be the same with both development scenarios: impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level with implementation of recommended mitigation measures.

Public Services and Utilities

As with the proposed 1999 Specific Plan Amendment, this Alternative would not create significant unavoidable impacts to public services and utilities. Mitigation measures recommended in Section 5.10, *Public Services and Utilities*, would still apply to this Alternative. No significant impacts would remain with implementation of the mitigation measures required under the proposed project.

ABILITY TO MEET PROJECT OBJECTIVES

The objectives of the proposed 1999 Specific Plan Amendment are discussed in Section 3.4, Project Objectives. As stated in Section 3.4, primary project objectives include facilitating the development (or renovation) of "North Village" as a concentrated, pedestrian oriented activity center with restricted vehicular access. The North Village development would be oriented toward year-round uses and visitor activity, to strengthen the existing winter visitor market and to improve Mammoth's attractiveness to spring, summer, and fall resort visitors. Unification of development throughout the Specific Plan area through the establishment of architectural and landscaping guidelines, would strengthen North Village's image as a resort activity node in Mammoth Lakes. The Reduced Density Alternative would fulfill the primary objectives of the project, although to a less degree due to the reduction in size.

7.3 ALTERNATIVE SITE

DESCRIPTION OF ALTERNATIVE

This Alternative would involve construction of the same land uses proposed as part of the 1999 North Village Specific Plan Amendment on the Lodestar at Mammoth Master Plan site. The Lodestar at Mammoth site is located near the geographical center of the Town, generally bordered to the north by main Street, to the south by Meridian Boulevard and Minaret Road, to the west by Lake Mary Road and the back side of the Mammoth Mountain Ski Resort, and to the east by Joaquin Road.

In May 1991, a Master Plan for development was prepared for the site which states all land use development standards, and conditions of approval that would apply to all development within the area of the Lodestar Master Plan. General information includes permitted and conditional uses, building height, setbacks, parking, grading, street standards, etc. In February 1991, a Final EIR was prepared for the Master Plan. This EIR addressed a proposal for construction of a 210-acre master planned destination resort which would include 40 single-family homes, 735 multi-family condominiums, 100 lodges and apartments (employee housing), 515,600 square feet of full-service hotels, an 80,000 square feet commercial village, and a 110-acre 18-hole golf course. The Final EIR included responses to 17 comments received on the Draft EIR. The Final EIR was certified on April 17, 1991 by the Town of Mammoth Lakes. Unavoidable adverse impacts were identified for biotic resources, archaeological resources, schools and fiscal impacts.

IMPACT COMPARISON TO PROPOSED PROJECT

Land Use and Relevant Planning

The conclusions rendered for the 1999 Specific Plan Amendment land use impacts would be similar under this alternative.

Population, Housing and Employment

Although the proposed conceptual development plan would be constructed at an Alternative Site, the same number of population and employees would be generated by the development as anticipated at the North Village Site. The same is true of housing needs.

Aesthetics/Light and Glare

Primary views to the Lodestar at Mammoth site are along portions of Main Street, Meridian Boulevard, Minaret Road, and from the east-facing ski slopes served by Chairlift #15. The majority of views to the site's interior are screened by the site's forested edge. The forest canopy extends to a height of approximately 120 feet. The certified EIR for the Lodestar at Mammoth project identified the removal of substantial numbers of trees with the development of the project, as then proposed, would result in a significant unavoidable impact (impact would remain significant after mitigation).

Significant and unavoidable aesthetics/light and glare impacts have not been identified for the currently proposed 1999 Specific Plan Amendment project at the North Village site.[3] If the proposed land uses were developed at the Lodestar site, it can be anticipated that the aforementioned significant and unavoidable aesthetic impact concluded in the Lodestar EIR would carry over to the subject development. As such, the Alternative Site Alternative would create additional impacts to aesthetics when compared to the proposed 1999 Specific Plan Amendment site. Impacts associated with light and glare may be similar under both development scenarios but would be contingent upon the actual placement of structures within the Lodestar alternative site.

Traffic and Circulation

The same number of average daily trips would be generated by this Alternative when compared to the 1999 Specific Plan Amendment project, although the trips would be distributed on a different local network of roadways in comparison. The Lodestar at Mammoth EIR concludes that implementation of mitigation measures (specifically improvements to the roadway network) would reduce impacts in this regard to a less than significant level. The addition of North Village traffic along local roadways may create impacts in this regard.

Air Quality

Since the same amount of land uses would be constructed at both the Alternative site and project site, the same amount of construction emissions and long-term regional pollutant emissions would be generated by both development scenarios. These pollutant emissions would create significant and unavoidable impacts for both the Alternative site and project site. The potential location of CO hotspots would be determined following distribution of Specific Plan traffic on the local roadways system.

---

[3] The previous 1991 North Village Specific Plan identified the location of the gondola as a significant unavoidable impact. The proposed Amendment would not create additional impacts beyond those already anticipated by approved development.

Noise

Although the same number of average daily trips would be generated by this Alternative when compared to the 1999 Specific Plan Amendment project, noise impacts would be dependent on the distribution of traffic on the local roadways and location of sensitive receptors in relationship to impacted roadways. The Lodestar at Mammoth Final EIR (page 4.8-9) states that "noise levels exceeding 60 dB currently exist at all intersections reviewed and are projected to increase significantly as a result of cumulative development." Although not identified as a significant increase in the Lodestar EIR, the current CEQA thresholds considers a contribution to an existing noise standard exceedance as a potentially significant impact (refer to Section 5.6, *Noise*, for a listing of thresholds). It can therefore be assumed that trips generated by the 1999 Specific Plan Amendment at the Lodestar Alternative Site would create potentially significant impacts along local roadways.

Geology, Soils and Seismicity

Both the Lodestar and North Village sites are located within the seismically active region of Mammoth Lakes and are subject to risks associated with volcanic activity. Development of the proposed 1999 Specific Plan Amendment project at the Lodestar site would not change risks associated with these issues. Development at both locations would be required to conduct site specific geologic studies for review and approval to the Town.

Hydrology and Drainage

The Lodestar at Mammoth Final EIR states that significant impacts would not occur following implementation of recommended mitigation measures. Although drainage facilities would be necessary to accommodate the proposed project at this Alternative location, significant impacts are not anticipated to occur.

Biological Resources

Development of the Lodestar Master Plan on that site would create significant and unavoidable impacts associated with the loss of vegetation graded for urban development and a change in vegetation type. Neither of these two impacts would affect sensitive resources. It is anticipated that development of the proposed 1999 Specific Plan Amendment would not create significant impacts in this regard beyond issues already anticipated in the Lodestar EIR.

Public Services and Utilities

The Lodestar EIR identified a significant impact to school facilities with implementation of the Master Plan due to the additional demand for such services. Due to the change in CEQA thresholds since preparation of that EIR, this criteria was no longer used to determine significance in the 1999 Specific Plan Amendment EIR (current project would not create significant unavoidable impacts to public services/utilities). Development of the North Village Specific Plan Amendment at the Alternative location would create similar impacts to public services/utilities when compared to the current proposed location in North Village.

ABILITY TO MEET PROJECT OBJECTIVES

The objectives of the proposed Specific Plan Amendment are discussed in Section 3.4, Project Objectives. As stated in Section 3.4, primary project objectives include facilitating the development (or renovation) of "North Village" as a concentrated, pedestrian oriented activity center with restricted vehicular access. The North Village development would be oriented toward year-round uses and visitor activity, to strengthen the existing winter visitor market and to improve Mammoth's attractiveness to spring, summer, and fall resort visitors. Unification of development throughout the Specific Plan area through the establishment of architectural and landscaping guidelines, would strengthen North Village's image as a resort activity node in Mammoth Lakes.

Although the Alternative Site Alternative would result in the same amount/type of development as currently proposed, it would not fulfill the primary project objectives to facilitate the development (or renovation) of "North Village" as a concentrated, pedestrian oriented activity center with restricted vehicular access. The project objectives and conceptual design are specific to the North Village area. As such, this Alternative is not currently being considered as the environmentally superior alternative.

7.4 ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

CEQA Section 15126.6 indicates that if the "No Project" Alternative is the "Environmentally Superior" Alternative, then the EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives. Among the other alternatives assessed in this EIR, the Reduced Density Alternative would result in the least environmental impacts when compared to the current project while still meeting many of the project objectives and not increasing the significance of anticipated impacts. This Alternative would result in reduced noise and air pollutant emissions.

As a result, the Reduced Density Alternative could be considered the Environmentally Superior Alternative.

Of the other two alternatives considered beyond the No Project Alternative, the Reduced Density Alternative would serve to reduce the severity of the project's significant unavoidable impacts, although impacts would remain significant and unavoidable with the Reduced Density Alternative.

8.0 INVENTORY OF MITIGATION MEASURES

8.0 INVENTORY OF MITIGATION MEASURES

The following is a list of mitigation measures recommended within Section 5.0 of this EIR.

LAND USE AND RELEVANT PLANNING

PHYSICAL DIVISION OF ESTABLISHED COMMUNITY

5.1-1 No mitigation measures are required.

CONSISTENCY WITH RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES

5.1-2 No mitigation measures are required.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

5.1-3 No mitigation measures are required.

POPULATION AND HOUSING

POPULATION (EMPLOYMENT)

5.2-1 No mitigation measures are required.

5.2-2 No mitigation measures are required.

HOUSING

Displaced Housing

5.2-3 No mitigation measures are required.

Affordable Housing Demand

5.2-4 No mitigation measures are required.

Market Rate Housing Demand

5.2-5 No mitigation measures are required.

CUMULATIVE

5.2-6 No mitigation measures are required.

AESTHETICS/LIGHT AND GLARE

VISUAL CHARACTER

5.3-1a *(Measure modified from Mitigation Measure 4.11-1(a) in the 1994 EIR Addendum):* To the maximum extent ~~feasible~~ practical, the proposed project shall retain forested areas, and the development shall remain subordinate to the natural character of the site and surrounding landscape.

5.3-1b *(Measure modified from Mitigation Measure 4.11-1(b) in the 1994 EIR Addendum):* Prior to final approval of project development plans, the applicant shall submit a tree preservation and replacement plan pursuant to the Municipal Code, Zoning, requirements related to grading and clearing. The Preservation and Replacement Plan, including the type, size, number and location of replacement trees shall be subject to the approval of the Town of Mammoth Lakes Community Development Director.

5.3-1c *(Measure restated from Mitigation Measure 4.11-1(c) in the 1994 EIR Addendum):* Contour grading shall be used to blend manufactured slopes into the natural terrain. Grading shall be minimized to preserve existing landform and vegetation to the greatest extent possible.

5.3-1d *(Measure restated from Mitigation Measure 4.11-1(e) in the 1994 Addendum EIR):* The landscape design for the site shall maximize the use of existing vegetation, and where new plants are introduced, they shall include, and/or blend with, plants native to the Mammoth Lakes environment. Landscape plans for the site shall be completed by a certified landscape architect.

5.3-1e *(Measure restated from Mitigation Measure 4.11-1(f) in the 1994 EIR Addendum):* To the maximum extent ~~feasible~~ practical, native trees and landscaping shall be concentrated around all structures located on the project site.

5.3-1f *(Measure modified from Mitigation Measure 4.11-1(g) in the 1994 EIR Addendum):* Grading techniques shall be used which minimize the area

of disturbance and shall incorporate such methods as decorative retaining walls rather than slopes to minimize the area of disturbance.

5.3-1g *(Measure restated from Mitigation Measures 4.4-1(a) and 4.11-2(a) in the 1994 EIR Addendum):* The height of the proposed gondola shall be maintained at or near a maximum of 90 feet (just below the tree line), in order to protect views from adjacent residential buildings.

5.3-1h *(Measure restated from Mitigation Measures and 4.4-1(b) and 4.11-2(b) in the 1994 EIR Addendum):* To the maximum extent ~~feasible~~ practical, existing trees located along the gondola easement shall be retained. Replacement trees, in addition to those existing, shall be planted adjacent to the gondola easement (with property owner approval) in order to create a buffer that will protect privacy and minimize visual impacts on affected properties.

5.3-1i *(Measure restated from Mitigation Measure 4.4-1(c) and 4.11-2(c) in the 1994 EIR Addendum):* Natural earth-tone colors and non-glare, non-reflective materials shall be used for the gondola towers and cabins.

5.3-1j *(New Mitigation Measure):* Staging locations shall be indicated on project Building Permit and Grading Plans and shall be subject to review by the Town of Mammoth Lakes Community Development Director in accordance with Municipal Code requirements.

5.3-1k (*New Mitigation Measure*): Upon submittal of Final Development Plans to the Town for the individual development sites, the applicant shall demonstrate that long-range views of the Sherwin Range are incorporated into the project design.

5.3-1l (*New mitigation measure*): Proposed building heights along Berner Street may encroach into the setback areas as proposed, if the development on the east side of Berner Street is limited to 40 feet.

5.3-1m *(Measure modified from Mitigation Measure 4.11-1(d) in the 1994 EIR Addendum)*: A forested buffer shall be maintained for parcels which front along Lake Mary Road, along Minaret Road (south of Main Street) and along the boundaries of the Specific Plan area. The buffers for properties with frontage along Lake Mary Road and Minaret Road south of Main Street shall consist of preservation of trees within the 200 foot and 80 foot right-of-ways, respectively, to the extent vehicular and pedestrian travel is not impeded, coupled with the setback requirements of the development sites. The buffer for properties adjacent to the

Specific Plan boundaries shall be defined as a building setback area of no less than 20 feet to buildings up to 35 feet tall. Portions of buildings which exceed 35 feet adjacent to the Specific Plan boundaries shall require an additional setback of generally 1 foot for every two feet of building height beyond the 20 foot minimum setback. Trees shall be maintained within the buffer area, except for required vehicular and pedestrian access. This will require that buildings be designed and constructed so that the buffer area is maintained. Where existing structures encroach into this buffer area, building demolition may be permitted subject to a revegetation plan which recreates a buffer. Where few trees exist in the buffer area, a 20 foot setback to buildings shall be maintained and additional area(s) of existing trees shall be preserved and protected to create a forested character within the development.

SCENIC VISTAS AND RESOURCES

5.3-2a *(Measure restated from Mitigation Measure 4.11-3(a) in the 1994 EIR Addendum):* Adoption of the North Village Specific Plan shall include all provisions for design review stated in the Plan, with all phases and developments proposed within the Specific Plan area undergoing review by a Town-appointed Design Review Committee and/or Planning Commission.

5.3-2b *(Measure modified from Mitigation Measure 4.11-3(c) in the 1994 EIR Addendum):* The architectural style for the development shall blend with the site's natural setting. Rooflines shall reflect (step down) the slope of the site, and natural "earth tone" colors and materials such as stone and wood shall be emphasized. Conformance shall be assured through the Town's design review procedures.

LIGHT AND GLARE

5.3-3a *(Measure modified from Mitigation Measure 4.12-1(a) in the 1994 EIR Addendum):* The Design Guidelines shall require that all exterior lighting be designed and located so as to avoid intrusive effects on adjacent residential properties and undeveloped areas adjacent to the project site. Low-intensity street lighting and low-intensity exterior lighting shall be used throughout the development to the degree feasible. Lighting fixtures shall use shielding, if necessary, to prevent spill lighting on adjacent off-site uses.

5.3-3b *(Measure modified from Mitigation Measure 4.12-1(b) in the 1994 EIR Addendum):* Lighting used for various components of the development plan be reviewed under North Village Specific Plan design guidelines which shall include review of light intensity levels, fixture height, fixture location, and design.

5.3-3c *(Measure restated from Mitigation Measure 4.12-2 in the 1994 EIR Addendum):* The project shall use minimally reflective glass and all other materials used on exterior buildings and structures (including the gondola cabins and towers) shall be selected with attention to minimizing reflective glare.

5.3-3d *(Measure modified from Mitigation Measure 4.12-1c in the 1994 EIR Addendum):* Vegetative buffers shall be used to reduce light intrusion on residential development and on forested areas located adjacent to the project site.

CUMULATIVE

5.3-4 No mitigation measures are required.

TRAFFIC/CIRCULATION

PROJECT TRAFFIC (refer to Table 5.4-18)

5.4-1a *(Mitigation Measure 4.7-2 in the 1994 EIR Addendum, which recommended that the Minaret Road/Forest Trail intersection be improved by the installation of a traffic signal, the addition of a southbound left turn lane, an eastbound right turn lane with protected phasing, and restripe the westbound approach to include a left turn lane and a shared through-right turn lane is no longer applicable*): A modern roundabout is included as part of the 1999 Specific Plan Amendment to replace the Minaret Road/Forest Trail intersection; hence, no mitigation is recommended since an acceptable LOS (LOS D or better) is achieved with the roundabout.

5.4-1b *(Mitigation Measure 4.7-2 in the 1994 EIR Addendum, which recommended that the Minaret Road/Lake Mary Road-Main Street intersection be improved through the modification of signal phasing to an eight phase signal, the addition of a dedicated northbound right turn lane, restriping the southbound approach to include dual left turn lanes, one through and one shared through/right turn lane, and the addition of a westbound dual left turn lane is no longer applicable*): The proposed

1999 Specific Plan Amendment includes the addition of a second southbound left turn (dual left turn lanes), and the installation of an eight phase traffic signal at the Minaret Road/Lake Mary Road-Main Street intersection; hence, no mitigation is recommended since an acceptable LOS (LOS D or better) is achieved with the additional southbound left turn lane and signalization of the intersection.

5.4-1c (*Measure modified from Mitigation Measure 4.7-2 in the 1994 EIR Addendum, which recommended no modifications to the Forest Trail/Main Street intersection*): Installation of a traffic signal at the intersection of Forest Trail/Main Street Mitigation Measure is consistent with the Town of Mammoth Lakes' Developer Fee (DIF) Program, Project #Tc-05.

5.4-1d (*Measure modified from Mitigation Measure 4.7-2 in the 1994 EIR Addendum, which recommended that the Old Mammoth Road/Main Street intersection be restriped on the northbound approach to include an exclusive left turn lane, and a shared left turn lane, restriping the eastbound approach to include one through lane, a shared through/right turn lane and a dedicated right turn lane*): Fair share payment of the protected right turn phase for eastbound right turning vehicles.

PROJECT PLUS CUMULATIVE TRAFFIC (refer to Table 5.4-19)

5.4-2a (*Mitigation Measure 4.7-1 in the 1994 EIR Addendum, which recommended that Old Mammoth Road from Main Street to Chateau Road be widened from two to four lanes is no longer applicable*): No mitigation is recommended since an acceptable LOS (LOS D or better) is achieved on Old Mammoth Road from Main Street to Chateau Road with the proposed 1999 Specific Plan Amendment.

5.4-2b (*Mitigation Measure 4.7-1 in the 1994 EIR Addendum, which recommended that Old Mammoth Road from Meridian Boulevard to Chateau Road be widened from two to four lanes with a continuous left turn lane*): No mitigation is recommended since an acceptable LOS (LOS D or better) is achieved on Old Mammoth Road from Meridian Boulevard to Chateau Road with the proposed 1999 Specific Plan Amendment.

5.4-2c (*Measure modified from Mitigation Measure 4.7-1 in the 1994 EIR Addendum, which recommended that Meridian Boulevard from Majestic Pines Road to Old Mammoth Road be widened to include a continuous left turn lane*): Restripe roadway to include two travel lanes

and a continuous left turn lane, or other measure designed to achieve an acceptable LOS (LOS D or better) on Meridian Boulevard from Majestic Pines to Old Mammoth Road.

5.4-2d (*Mitigation Measure 4.7-1 in the 1994 EIR Addendum, which recommended that Minaret Road from Forest Trail to Main Street be widened from two to four lanes*): No mitigation is recommended (assuming implementation of the Minaret Road/Forest Trail roundabout included as part of the proposed 1999 Specific Plan Amendment).

5.4-2e (*Mitigation Measure 4.7-1 in the 1994 EIR Addendum, which recommended that Minaret Road from Main Street to Old Mammoth Road be widened from two to four lanes is no longer applicable*): No mitigation is recommended since an acceptable LOS (LOS D or better) is achieved on Minaret Road from Main Street to Old Mammoth Road with the proposed 1999 Specific Plan Amendment.

5.4-2f (*Mitigation Measure 4.7-1 in the 1994 EIR Addendum, which recommended that Main Street from Sierra Boulevard to Minaret Road be widened and restriped to provide a continuous left turn lane and a four lane configuration is no longer applicable*): No mitigation is recommended since an acceptable LOS (LOS D or better) is achieved on Main Street from Sierra Boulevard to Minaret Road with the proposed 1999 Specific Plan Amendment.

5.4-2g (*Mitigation Measure 4.7-1 in the 1994 EIR Addendum, which recommended that Lake Mary Road from Main Street to Lakeview Road be widened from two to four lanes is no longer applicable*): No mitigation is recommended since an acceptable LOS (LOS D or better) is achieved on Lake Mary Road from Main Street to Lakeview Road with the proposed 1999 Specific Plan Amendment.

5.4-2h (*Mitigation Measure 4.7-2 in the 1994 EIR Addendum, which recommended that the Lakeview Boulevard Cut-Off/Lake Mary Road intersection be improved by restriping the eastbound approach to include an exclusive left turn lane and through lane, widen the westbound approach to provide one though lane and one dedicated left turn lane, restripe the southbound approach to provide an exclusive left turn lane and a shared left/right turn lane is no longer applicable*): No mitigation is recommended since an acceptable LOS (LOS D or better) is achieved at the Lakeview Boulevard Cut-Off/Lake Mary Road intersection with the proposed 1999 Specific Plan Amendment.

5.4-2i (*Measure modified from Mitigation Measure 4.7-2 in the 1994 EIR Addendum*): The Millers Siding/Lake Mary Road intersection shall be improved by the installation of a traffic signal, provision of dual southbound left turn lanes, and the provision on the westbound approach for one through lane and one dedicated right turn, or other measure designed to achieve an acceptable LOS (LOS D or better) at the Millers Siding/Lake Mary Road intersection.

5.4-2j (*Mitigation Measure 4.7-2 in the 1994 EIR Addendum, which recommended that the Minaret Road/Lake Mary Road-Main Street intersection be improved by modification of the existing signal phasing to an eight phase traffic signal, provision for a dedicated northbound right turn lane, restriping the southbound approach to include dual left turn lanes, one through lane and one shared through right turn lane, and provision for westbound dual left turn lanes is no longer applicable*): The proposed 1999 Specific Plan Amendment includes the addition of a second southbound left turn (dual left turn lanes), and the installation of an eight phase traffic signal at the Minaret Road/Lake Mary Road-Main Street intersection; hence, no mitigation is recommended since an acceptable LOS (LOS D or better) is achieved with the additional southbound left turn lane and signalization of the intersection.

5.4-2k (*New Mitigation Measure*): Installation of a traffic signal at the Center Street/Main Street intersection is recommended to mitigate the forecast deficient LOS at this intersection with the proposed 1999 Specific Plan Amendment (consistent with the Town of Mammoth Lakes' Developer Impact Mitigation Fee (DIF) Program, Project #TC-05 would remain at LOS F peak hour operation).

5.4-2l (*Mitigation Measure 4.7-2 in the 1994 EIR Addendum, which recommended that the Minaret Road/Meridian Boulevard intersection be improved by widening the northbound and southbound approaches to include an exclusive left turn lane, one through lane, and one shared through/right lane on each approach is no longer applicable*): No mitigation is recommended since an acceptable LOS (LOS D or better) is achieved at the Minaret Road/Meridian Boulevard intersection with the proposed 1999 Specific Plan Amendment.

5.4-2m (*Mitigation Measure 4.7-2 in the 1994 EIR Addendum, which recommended that the Old Mammoth Road/ Meridian Boulevard intersection be improved by widening the northbound approach to provide dual left turn lanes, one through lane and one shared through/right turn lane, and restriping the southbound approach to*

include a shared through/right turn lane is no longer applicable): No mitigation is recommended since an acceptable LOS (LOS D or better) is achieved at the Old Mammoth Road/Meridian Boulevard intersection with the proposed 1999 Specific Plan Amendment.

5.4-2n (*Measure modified from Mitigation Measure 4.7-2 in the 1994 EIR Addendum, which recommended that the Minaret Road/Old Mammoth Road intersection be improved by installation of an eight phase traffic signal, widening the northbound and southbound approaches to provide an exclusive left turn lane, two through lanes, and a dedicated right turn lane for each approach, widening the eastbound approach to provide an exclusive left turn lane, one through lane and one dedicated right turn lane, and widening the westbound approach to provide dual left turn lanes, one through lane and one dedicated right turn lane*): Install an eight phase traffic signal, and widen the northbound approach to include an exclusive northbound left turn lane and a shared through/right turn lane (DIF improvement) to achieve an acceptable LOS (LOS D or better) with the proposed 1999 Specific Plan Amendment.

5.4-2o (*New Mitigation Measure*): Install a traffic signal at the Azimuth Drive/Meridian Boulevard intersection ~~to satisfy~~ when warranted in accordance with Caltrans Signal Warrant ~~assuming the proposed 1999 Specific Plan Amendment~~ analysis methodology or other measure designed to achieve an acceptable LOS (LOS D or better) at the Azimuth Drive/Meridian Boulevard intersection.

5.4-2p (*Mitigation Measure 4.7-2 in the 1994 EIR Addendum, which recommended that the Minaret Road/Chateau Road intersection be improved by installation of a two phase traffic signal, restriping the northbound Minaret approach to provide one through lane and one shared through/right turn lane, widening the southbound Minaret approach to provide one exclusive left turn lane and two through lanes, and restriping the westbound Chateau approach to provide an exclusive left turn lane and a shared left/right turn lane is no longer applicable*): No mitigation is recommended since an acceptable LOS (LOS D or better) is achieved at the Minaret Road/Chateau Road intersection with the proposed 1999 Specific Plan Amendment.

5.4-2q (*Mitigation Measure 4.7-2 in the 1994 EIR Addendum, which recommended that the Old Mammoth Road/Chateau Road intersection be improved by installation of a two phase traffic signal, restriping the southbound Old Mammoth approach to provide one exclusive left turn lane, one through lane, and one shared through/right turn lane, and*

widening the northbound Old Mammoth approach to provide one exclusive left turn lane, one through lane, and one shared through/right turn lane is no longer applicable): No mitigation is recommended since an acceptable LOS (LOS D or better) is achieved at the Old Mammoth Road/Chateau Road intersection with the proposed 1999 Specific Plan Amendment.

5.4-2r (*Measure modified from Mitigation Measure 4.7-2 in the 1994 EIR Addendum*): Sierra Boulevard/Main Street intersection shall be improved by restriping the southbound approach to provide a left turn lane and a right turn lane, and monitoring of the unsignalized intersection periodically to determine if Caltrans Signal Warrants are satisfied to recommend signalization of the Sierra Boulevard/Main Street intersection.

PARKING

5.4-3a (*New Mitigation Measure*): Prior to the approval of a development project, the applicant shall submit a shared parking analysis for review and approval by the Planning Commission to determine the appropriate mix of land uses that would be accommodated by the proposed parking. The study shall consider the type of uses (i.e., office, retail and restaurant) and their variations in peak parking demand as the result of different activity patterns, and attractions to two or more land uses on one visit to the development. The shared parking analysis shall be based on the 1999 Specific Plan Amendment parking rates or the Town's parking rates where applicable. The study methodology shall be based on the *Urban Land Institute Shared Parking Manual*, 1983.

5.4-3b (*New Mitigation Measure*): The 1999 Specific Plan Amendment shall address parking requirements for land uses that do not provide for shared parking.

SAFETY HAZARDS - ROUNDABOUT

5.4-4 (*New Mitigation Measure*): The developer shall incorporate into the design of the roundabout the design, lighting, and landscaping features noted in the *Feasibility Study: Mammoth Roundabout* (Ourston & Doctors, November 1, 1998) with final approval by the Town and Caltrans. At a minimum these shall include:

- To slow traffic on entry, adequate vehicle path deflection shall be provided through approach roads aimed at the central island. These shall veer to the right immediately before the yield lines.

- Additional street lights shall be installed at the roundabout and on its approaches back to a distance of 200 feet from the yield lines. The lighting shall provide at least 1.9 foot candles of horizontal luminance. Street lights shall be evenly spaced in a ring around the outside of the roundabouts and along the approaches to the roundabout.

- The outer margin of the central island shall have low ground cover which provides adequate stopping sight distance for circulating traffic. The central portion of the island shall be available for objects of any height, including trees, walls, and public art.

- Pedestrian crossing shall be divided into two stages: from the near-side wheelchair ramp out to the splitter island, and then from the splitter island to the far-side wheelchair ramp.

SAFETY HAZARDS - PEDESTRIAN ACTIVITY

5.4-5 (*New Mitigation Measure*): The developer shall prepare and provide to the Town Engineer for review and approval, a Traffic Control Officer Monitoring Plan. The Plan shall outline at a minimum, scheduled days of monitoring together with a program to determine additional days of monitoring as may be determined by projected occupancy rates, performance criteria, duration of monitoring, and responsible parties.

TRANSIT

5.4-6 (*New Mitigation Measure*): New development shall participate on a fair share basis in the development and operation of a community-wide winter transit system to achieve the ridership levels assumed in the MTM.

AIR QUALITY

SHORT-TERM

5.5-1a (*Measure modified from Mitigation Measures 4.8-1(a) and 4.8-1(b) in the 1994 EIR Addendum*): In order to reduce fugitive dust emissions, each

development project shall obtain permits, as needed, from the Town and the State APCD and shall implement measures during grading and/or construction of the individual development sites to ensure compliance with permit conditions and applicable Town and APCD requirements.

a. The individual development projects shall comply with State, APCD, Town, and Uniform Building Code dust control regulations, so as to prevent the soil from being eroded by wind, creating dust, or blowing onto a public road or roads or other public or private property.

b. Adequate watering techniques shall be employed on a daily basis to partially mitigate the impact of construction-generated dust particulates.

c. Clean-up on construction-related dirt on approach routes to individual development sites/improvements shall be ensured by the application of water and/or chemical dust retardants that solidify loose soils. These measures shall be implemented for construction vehicle access, as directed by the Town Engineer. Measures shall also include covering, watering or otherwise stabilizing all inactive soil piles (left more than 10 days) and inactive graded areas (left more than 10 days).

d. Any vegetative ground cover to be utilized on the individual development sites/improvements shall be planted as soon as possible to reduce the amount of open space subject to wind erosion. Irrigation shall be installed as soon as possible to maintain the ground cover.

e. All trucks hauling dirt, soil or other loose dirt material shall be covered.

5.5-1b (*Measure modified from Mitigation Measure 4.8-2 in the 1994 EIR Addendum*): To reduce the potential of spot violations of the CO standards and odors from construction equipment exhaust, unnecessary idling of construction equipment shall be avoided.

LONG-TERM PM_{10} MEASURES

5.5-2a (*Measure replaces related Mitigation Measure 4.8-5(a) in 1994 EIR Addendum*): In order to reduce emissions associated with both mobile and stationary sources (i.e., wood burning stoves and fireplaces), all

individual development projects shall adhere to the regulations contained in the *Air Quality Management Plan for the Town of Mammoth Lakes* and Chapter 8.30, *Particulate Emission Regulations*, of the Town's Municipal Code. The commercial use tenants throughout the Specific Plan area shall, at a minimum, include the following, as appropriate:

- Bicycle racks, lockers or secure storage areas for bicycles;
- Transit access, including bus turnouts;
- Site access design shall avoid queuing in driveways; and
- Mulch, groundcover and native vegetation to reduce dust.

5.5-2b (*New Mitigation Measure*): Each project shall contribute on a fair share basis to the Town's street sweeping operations in order to reduce emissions and achieve the required Federal standard.

5.5-2c (*New Mitigation Measure*): New development within the Specific Plan area shall not be permitted to utilize wood burning appliances unless the Federal standard is documented to not be exceeded.

LOCALIZED CARBON MONOXIDE EMISSIONS

5.5-3a (*Measure modified from Mitigation Measure 4.8-3 in the 1994 EIR Addendum*): Development shall be prohibited within 50 feet of the Old Mammoth Road and Main Street intersection unless alternatives to setbacks acceptable to the Town of Mammoth Lakes are incorporated.

5.5-3b (*New Mitigation Measure*): Development shall be prohibited within 50 feet of the Minaret Road and Main Street intersection unless alternatives to setbacks acceptable to the Town of Mammoth Lakes are incorporated.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

5.5-4 Additional mitigation measures beyond those recommended for construction and operation are not necessary.

NOISE

SHORT-TERM CONSTRUCTION NOISE

5.6-1a (*Measure modified from Mitigation Measure 4.9-1a of the 1994 EIR Addendum*): Pursuant to Chapter 8.16.090 of the Town's Noise Ordinance, construction activities shall be limited to the hours of 7:00

a.m. to 8:00 p.m. Monday through Saturday and prohibited on Sunday or holidays, or as otherwise permitted by Chapter 8.16.090.

5.6-1b (*Measure modified from Mitigation Measure 4.9-1b in the 1994 EIR Addendum*): Construction equipment shall be muffled or controlled, if required, to meet Chapter 8.16 requirements for maximum noise generated by construction equipment. Contracts shall specify that engine-driven equipment be fitted with appropriate noise mufflers.

5.6-1c (*New Mitigation Measure*): The construction contractor shall provide temporary sound barriers around pile driving sites to the satisfaction of the Town Engineer should such activities take place in areas within ~~200~~ 400 feet of existing residential units, if required to meet Chapter 8.16 requirements.

LONG-TERM NOISE

5.6-2a (*Measure modified from Mitigation Measure 4.9-2a from the 1994 EIR Addendum*): The proposed project shall be located or architecturally designed to reduce the project noise impacts upon properties adjacent to each master planned area or project property line, such that the exterior noise levels will not exceed Town Noise Ordinance requirements for an urban and multiple family setting. Design features could include setbacks, berms, landscaping, and architectural features, adjacent to both arterial and interior streets.

5.6-2b (*Measure modified from Mitigation Measure 4.9-2b from the 1994 EIR Addendum*): Multi-family buildings shall be located or architecturally designed so the interior noise level will not exceed 45 Ldn. As a minimum, multi-family housing shall comply with Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations.

STATIONARY NOISE

5.6-3a (*New Mitigation Measure*): Prior to Final Development Plan approval for individual development projects within the Specific Plan area, a subsequent noise analysis shall be prepared, to the satisfaction of the Town Engineer, which demonstrates the site placement of stationary noise sources would not exceed criteria established in Section 8.16 of the Town's Noise Ordinance Code at perimeter property lines of master planned areas or projects.

5.6-3b (*New Mitigation Measure*): Prior to Final Development Plan approval for individual development projects within the Specific Plan area, a subsequent noise analysis shall be prepared, to the satisfaction of the Town Engineer, which demonstrates the site placement of PA systems entertainment venues or other stationary noise sources would not exceed criteria established within the State Noise Insulation Standards (California Code of Regulations, Title 24) for adjacent residences.

5.6-3c (*New Mitigation Measure*): Outdoor PA systems shall not be permitted to operate between the hours of 10:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. and shall not exceed the Town's Noise Ordinance standards at perimeter property lines of master planned areas or project property lines. Adherence with this measure is subject to periodic site inspections by the Town of Mammoth Lakes.

5.6-3d (*New Mitigation Measure*): Directional speakers shall be shielded and/or oriented away from off-site residences to the satisfaction of the Town Building Inspector.

5.6-3e (*New Mitigation Measure*): The speaker system proposed for the Pedestrian Plaza shall be limited to the noise standards as contained in Chapter 8.16 of the Mammoth Lakes Municipal Code at perimeter property lines of the master planned areas or project property lines.

CUMULATIVE NOISE

5.6-4 No mitigation measures are required.

GEOLOGY, SOILS AND SEISMICITY

GEOLOGICAL CONDITIONS

Topography

5.7-1 (*Measure restated from Mitigation Measure 4.1-3 in the 1994 EIR Addendum*): Prior to issuance of grading or building permits, geotechnical studies shall be completed and their recommendations shall be incorporated in the project design, as stipulated in the Town's Safety Policy #26.

Slope Instability

5.7-2a (*Measure modified from Mitigation Measure 4.1-1a in the 1994 EIR Addendum*): Soils and foundation analyses shall be approved by Town staff prior to final project design approval, as stipulated in the Town's Safety Policy #18. All measures required by the Town shall be incorporated into final grading and building plans.

5.7-2b (*Measure modified from Mitigation Measure 4.1-1b in the 1994 EIR Addendum*): The project applicant shall provide grading plans and receive approval from the Town Engineer. Said plans shall also show that new slopes within the project area are designed pursuant to slope requirements set forth within the Specific Plan and the standard's of the Town's Municipal Code.

5.7-2c (*Measure modified from Mitigation Measure 4.1-1c in the 1994 EIR Addendum*): All work shall be overseen by a licensed Civil Engineer (CE), Certified Engineering Geologist (CEG), or similar appropriately qualified professional, who shall report to the Town Engineer in order to ensure the standards of the applicable Codes are met.

SOILS

5.7-3 Refer to Mitigation Measure 5.7-1.

GEOTECHNICAL HAZARDS

Erosion Hazards

5.7-4 (*Measure modified from Mitigation Measure 4.1-2 in the 1994 EIR Addendum*): A comprehensive Erosion and Sediment Transport Control Plan shall be prepared by the project applicant and approved by the Town Engineer prior to the issuance of any grading or building permits. The Plan shall be included in the project design, as stipulated in the Town's Safety Policy #18. The Plan shall also meet the requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board and the Town Municipal Code.

5.7-5 Refer to Mitigation Measure 5.7-4 above.

Seismic Hazards

5.7-6 (*Measure restated from Mitigation Measure 4.1-4 in the 1994 EIR Addendum*): The project applicant shall complete the geotechnical studies and incorporate their recommendations in the project design, as stipulated in the Town's Safety Policy #26. All structures shall be designed and built to at least the standards of UBC Seismic Zone 4.

Volcanic Hazards

5.7-7 (*Measure modified from Mitigation Measure 4.1-5b in the 1994 EIR Addendum*): Each project operator shall cooperate with the Town in designing and disseminating information to assist citizens and visitors in responding to emergency situations that are likely to arise (Safety Policy #31). All structures shall be designed and built to at least the standards of UBC Seismic Zone 4.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

5.7-8 No mitigation measures are required. Individual projects will be subject to review and approval by Town Engineer and mitigated on a project-by-project basis through site specific studies and compliance with applicable Town, State, and Federal codes.

HYDROLOGY AND DRAINAGE

DRAINAGE AND RUNOFF

5.8-1a (*New Mitigation Measure*): All drainage collection, retention, and infiltration facilities on the individual development sites shall be constructed and maintained in accordance with the *Mammoth Lakes SDMP* and shall be designed in accordance with the *Master Plan Design Manual,* to the satisfaction of the Town of Mammoth Lakes Town Engineer, prior to the issuance of grading permits.

5.8-1b (*Measure modified from Mitigation Measure 4.2-1a in the 1994 EIR Addendum*): A more complete hydrology analysis for design purposes shall be required to be completed to estimate the amounts of runoff which will be required to be retained on-site for each development. The analysis shall be approved prior to issuance of a grading permit.

5.8-1c (*Measure restated from Mitigation Measure 4.2-1c in the 1994 EIR Addendum*): The following water conservation procedures shall be incorporated into project elements where feasible:

- Landscape with low water-using plants;
- Install efficient irrigation systems that minimize runoff and evaporation and maximize the water that will reach the plant roots, such as drip irrigation, soil moisture sensors, and automatic irrigation systems; and
- Use pervious paving material whenever feasible.

WATER QUALITY

5.8-2a (*New Mitigation Measure*): An Erosion and Sediment Control Plan shall be prepared by the project proponents of individual development projects prior to issuance of grading permits. The Plan shall be reviewed and approved by the Town of Mammoth Lakes and the Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board and be in accordance with the erosion control guidelines as contained in the *Mammoth Lakes SDMP* and be in compliance with the Water Quality Control Plan (for the Lahontan Region [Basin Plan]). General grading activities, including those related to demolition and construction, would be regulated by the Uniform Building Code and Town of Mammoth Lakes Grading Ordinance. The required Erosion and Sediment Control Plan shall outline methods that will be implemented to control erosion and sediment transport from graded or cleared portions of the individual redevelopment/ improvement sites.

5.8-2b (*New Mitigation Measure*): Prior to issuance of grading permits for individual development projects of five acres or greater in size, the project applicant/owner shall file for a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit with the Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board and abide by the conditions of the permit as issued. A copy of the Notice of Intent, Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan, and Monitoring Plan shall be submitted to the Town of Mammoth Lakes Engineering Department prior to commencing grading operations.

5.8-2c (*Measure modified from Mitigation Measure 4.2-3a in the 1994 EIR Addendum*): For individual development projects involving construction of six or more dwelling units or commercial developments that involve soil disturbance on ¼ acre or more, a Waste Discharge Report (related

to soil disturbance) shall be prepared by the individual project applicant(s) and submitted to the Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board not less than 90 days before the intended start of construction activities of a new development to obtain a Waste Discharge Permit or waiver to ensure that proper control measures for the protection of water quality are taken and adhered to during all phases of the development project. A copy of the Waste Discharge Report shall be submitted to the Town of Mammoth Lakes engineering division prior to issuance of a grading permit for the project.

5.8-2d (*New Mitigation Measure*): The Report of Waste Discharge shall contain a description of, and time schedule for implementation, for both the interim erosion control measures to be applied during project construction, and short- and long-term erosion control measures to be employed after the construction phase of the project. The descriptions shall include appropriate engineering drawings, criteria, and design calculations. The report guidelines are as follows:

- Drainage collection, retention, and infiltration facilities shall be constructed and maintained to prevent transport of the runoff from a 20-year, 1-hour design storm from the project site. A 20-year, 1-hour design storm for the Mammoth Lakes area is equal to 1.0 inch (2.5 cm) of rainfall in 1 hour.

- Surplus or waste materials shall not be placed in drainage ways or within the 100-year flood plain of surface waters.

- All loose piles of soil, silt, clay, sand, debris, or earthen materials shall be protected in a reasonable manner to prevent any discharge to waters of the State.

- Dewatering shall be done in a manner so as to prevent the discharge of earthen materials from the site.

- All disturbed areas shall be stabilized by appropriate soil stabilization measures by October 15 of each year.

- All work performed between October 15th and May 1st of each year shall be conducted in such a manner that the project can be winterized within 48 hours.

- Where possible, existing drainage patterns shall not be significantly modified.

- After completion of a construction project, all surplus or waste earthen material shall be removed from the site and deposited at a legal point of disposal.

- Drainage swales disturbed by construction activities shall be stabilized by the addition of crushed rock or riprap, as necessary, or other appropriate stabilization methods.

- All nonconstruction areas shall be protected by fencing or other means to prevent unnecessary disturbances.

- During construction, temporary erosion control facilities (e.g., impermeable dikes, filter fences, hay bales, etc.) shall be used as necessary to prevent discharge of earthen materials from the site during periods of precipitation or runoff.

- Revegetated areas shall be regularly and continually maintained in order to assure adequate growth and root development. Physical erosion control facilities shall be placed on a routine maintenance and inspection program to provide continued erosion control integrity.

- Where construction activities involve the crossing and/or alteration of a stream channel, such activities shall be timed to occur during the period in which streamflow is expected to be lowest for the year.

5.8-3 (*New Mitigation Measure*): Best Management Practices (BMPs) shall be implemented as part of future individual development sites to the satisfaction of the Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board and NPDES Program requirements in order to protect the receiving waters from degradation and correct existing problems. BMPs include structural controls such as retention/detention basins, oil-water separators, which could be implemented in the overall design of the proposed drainage facilities for individual development sites.

GROUNDWATER

5.8-4 No mitigation measures are required.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

5.8-5 No mitigation measures are required.

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

SPECIES OF CONCERN

5.9-1 No mitigation measures are required.

SENSITIVE NATURAL COMMUNITIES

5.9-2a (*Measure modified from Mitigation Measure 4.3-1(a) in the 1994 EIR Addendum*): The project shall preserve existing native vegetation to the maximum extent feasible. Landscaping shall emphasize the use of native plants indigenous to the Jeffrey Pine-Fir Forest plant community. Whenever possible, native plants used on-site shall be selected for their replacement habitat value. Site designs shall be subject to the Design Review procedure of the Town.

5.9-2b (*Measure restated from Mitigation Measure 4.3-1(d) in the 1994 EIR Addendum*): Landscape materials shall be used that allow for the protection and preservation of existing trees. Native plant species, preferably from seed or cuttings from local plants, shall be used where possible. The Landscape Plan shall be approved by the Planning Director prior to issuance of any construction permits.

5.9-2c (*Measure restated from Mitigation Measure 4.3-1(e) in the 1994 EIR Addendum*): Irrigation, fertilization, and other landscape management practices shall be designed to minimize effects on existing trees and other vegetation.

5.9-2d (*Measure modified from Mitigation Measure 4.3-4(a) in the 1994 EIR Addendum*): To the extent possible, native vegetation shall be retained and protected during construction. A Revegetation Plan, prepared by a qualified Landscape Architect and approved by the Town of Mammoth Lakes, shall be completed prior to the commencement of the project which will describe in detail the species of trees and shrubs which will be used, where they will be planted, and in what numbers, and the methods of planting and maintenance which will ensure successful growth. It shall include a monitoring program to follow the progress of new plantings and ensure replacement of unsuccessful plants. Landscaping with native species of trees and shrubs shall be undertaken to enhance wildlife use of cleared areas.

5.9-2e (*Measure modified from Mitigation Measure 4.3-4(b) in the 1994 EIR Addendum*): Under AB3180, once mitigation plans designed to off-set habitat losses are approved and the specific areas where they will be located are identified, the proponent must provide a program to monitor their progress for a period of time (usually three to five years) deemed sufficient by the Planning Director to assure their successful development. Adequate security shall be deposited with the Town to ensure successful implementation of this measure.

5.9-2f (*Measure modified from Mitigation Measure 4.3-5 in the 1994 EIR Addendum*): All construction activities, including movement and storage of vehicles and the storage of building and other materials, shall be confined to areas slated for development. Care shall be taken during construction to avoid damage to vegetation and habitats not directly involved in project construction. Any vegetation inadvertently damaged outside of the area slated for development shall be replaced on a one-to-one basis on- or off-site. Off-site replacement shall require the approval of the Town Planning Director.

5.9-2g (*Measure restated from Mitigation Measure 4.3-6 in the 1994 EIR Addendum*): To prevent erosion and siltation into intermittent creeks, areas cleared of vegetation, fill or other materials shall be stabilized after clearing and grading. Hay bales, silt screens or similar devices shall be used to prevent siltation. To further protect the drainage system and prevent erosion, all grading and construction shall be completed during the summer months, or after October 15 of each year be in a condition to be stabilized within 48 hours should inclement weather threaten.

5.9-2h (*Measure modified from Mitigation Measure 4.3-1(b) in the 1994 EIR Addendum*): A Forest Condition Survey shall be conducted by a professional forester and approved by the Town of Mammoth Lakes, prior to the commencement of each individual development project. All trees greater than 12-inches DBH (Diameter breast height (54 inches above ground)) and significant stands on each project site shall be mapped prior to issuance of grading permits or clearing. A registered forester or arborist shall then determine the age and condition of these trees and whether they should be retained or removed based upon health and visual significance of the trees, except for removal required by approved improvements. Once this determination is made, those trees shall be retained and integrated into the design of each project. A program of specific protection measures shall be prepared by the developer and approved by the Town prior to issuance of any construction permits (e.g., construction fencing, grading controls,

grading design, etc.). Any trees removed unavoidably by each final project approval shall be in accordance with Town policies. Off-site replacement shall require approval by the Town's Planning Director.

5.9-2i (*Measure modified from Mitigation Measure 4.3-1(f) in the 1994 EIR Addendum*): Slash generated from construction or thinning operations shall be ~~piled and burned, chipped, or~~ hauled from the site concurrently with the operation to prevent a breeding site for Ips. Logs shall be removed from the site as soon as possible.

5.9-2j (*Measure restated from Mitigation Measure 4.3-1(c) in the 1994 EIR Addendum*): Construction and site development, such as grading and trenching, shall be prohibited within the dripline of retained trees. Equipment shall not be stored or driven under trees. Grading shall not cover the ground surface within the dripline of existing trees. Grading limits shall be clearly defined and protected.

WILDLIFE CORRIDOR

5.9-3 No mitigation measures are required.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

5.9-4 No mitigation measures are required.

PUBLIC SERVICES AND UTILITIES

PUBLIC SERVICES

Fire Protection

5.10-1a (*Measure modified from Mitigation Measure 4.13-4(b) in 1994 EIR Addendum*): Each project shall contribute a fair share financial contribution for an emergency services facility (fire and police) to be located on the site of Fire Station No. 1 on Main Street.

5.10-1b (*Measure modified from Mitigation Measure 4.13-4(a) in 1994 EIR Addendum*): Access roads to all structures, and areas of use, shall comply with Mammoth Lakes Fire Protection District Ordinance 98-01.

5.10-1c (*Measure modified from Mitigation Measure 4.13-4(d) in 1994 EIR Addendum*): An approved water supply system capable of supplying

required fire flow for fire protection purposes, as determined by the Fire District, shall be provided.

Police Protection

5.10-2 Refer to Mitigation Measure 5.10-1a. No additional mitigation measures are required.

Schools

5.10-3 (*Measure modified from Mitigation Measure 4.13-2(a) in the 1994 EIR Addendum*): In accordance with A.B. 2926, the developer shall pay Developer Fees for commercial uses and foot for residential uses (condominiums).

Snow Removal/Roadway Maintenance

5-10-4a The project proponent shall contribute a fair share financial contribution in accordance with the Town's DIF Mitigation Program established under Resolution 98-06.

5.10-4b (*Measure modified from Mitigation Measure 4.13-1(l) in the 1994 EIR Addendum*): One or more project maintenance district(s) and/or property owner's association(s) shall be established prior to commencement of construction for the maintenance of specialized snow removal activities in the public areas within the Specific Plan area.

Library

5.10-5 Refer to Mitigation Measure 5.10-4a. No additional mitigation measures are required.

RECREATION

5.10-6 Refer to Mitigation Measure 5.10-4a. No additional mitigation measures are required.

UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Wastewater

5.10-7 (*New Mitigation Measure*): The project applicant shall pay the appropriate fees to the MCWD. All new wastewater conveyance facilities shall be located within public rights-of-way or utility easements.

Water

5.10-8 (*New Mitigation Measure*): The project applicant shall pay the appropriate fees to the MCWD. All new water conveyance facilities shall be installed within public rights-of-way or utility easements.

Solid Waste

5.10-9 (*New Mitigation Measure*): Prior to issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall provide an Integrated Solid Waste Management Plan (ISWMP) consistent with the Town's SRRE. The plan shall address, at a minimum, the following measures: construction demolition; recycling; composting; source reduction programs; storage areas for collected recyclable materials, and disposal of hazardous waste materials used on-site.

~~Woods and metals shall be separated during the construction and demolition phases, as required by the Town's SRRE.~~

- ~~Recycling and waste reduction methods shall be incorporated into all developments as required by the Town's SRRE.~~
- ~~Solid waste disposal shall be handled in accordance with policies and procedures adopted by the Mono County Board of Supervisors. Necessary solid waste permits shall be obtained from the Mono County Public Works Department.~~

Cumulative Impacts

5.10-10 No mitigation measures are required.

CULTURAL RESOURCES

ARCHAEOLOGICAL/HISTORICAL RESOURCES

5.11-1a (*Restated from Mitigation Measure 4.10-1(a) in the 1994 EIR Addendum*): North Village Site #1 shall be subject to subsurface testing and a thorough archaeological survey prior to issuance of a permit for grading or construction. If found to be significant, the site shall be avoided or excavated prior to any earth-disturbing activities.

5.11-1b (*Restated from Mitigation Measure 4.10-1(b) in the 1994 EIR Addendum*): North Village Site #2 shall be avoided or excavated prior to any earth disturbing activity. All construction activity at this site and previously unexcavated sites shall be monitored by a qualified archaeologist. If subsurface prehistoric archaeological evidence is found, excavation or other construction activity in the area shall cease and an archaeological consultant shall be retained to evaluate findings in accordance with standard practice and applicable regulations. Data/artifact recovery, if deemed appropriate, shall be conducted during the period when construction activities are on hold.

5.11-1c (*Restated from Mitigation Measure 4.10-1(c) in the 1994 EIR Addendum*): North Village Site #1 may meet the CEQA criteria for important sites, for its ability to address scientifically consequential research questions. The site will be impacted by construction. Although avoidance might be considered the preferred treatment for a buried site, the adoption of any mitigation measures would be premature before the site's significance is determined. In accordance with CEQA, any construction within the site area shall be preceded by data recovery. This will include excavation of up to five 25 by 25 cm shovel test units, surface collection of all surface artifacts, lithic and obsidian hydration analyses and, possibly, soil chemistry and obsidian source analysis. If no substantial subsurface deposit is encountered, this work will also suffice for data recovery. No permits for grading other earth-disturbing activities shall be issued until all appropriate mitigation is completed.

5.11-1d (*Restated from Mitigation Measure 4.10-1(d) in the 1994 EIR Addendum*): North Village Site #2 appears significant. The site is in danger of slow degradation even in the absence of any construction. Its location and high visibility make it susceptible to casual collection and indirect impacts. In accordance with CEQA, any construction within the site area shall be preceded by data recovery. Minimally this would include a sample surface collection, excavation of a least six 1 by 1m

excavation units, analyses, curation of collected materials, and a report. No permits for grading or other earth disturbing activities will be issued until all appropriate mitigation is completed.

5.11-1e (*New Mitigation Measure*): In the event that a material of potential cultural significance is uncovered during grading activities on the project site, all grading in the area of the uncovered material shall cease and the project applicant shall retain a professional archaeologist to evaluate the quality and significance of the material. Grading shall not continue in the area where a material of potential cultural significance is uncovered until resources have been completely removed by the archaeologist and recorded as appropriate.

BURIAL SITES

5.11-2 (*Restated from Mitigation Measure 4.10-2 in the 1994 EIR Addendum*): See Mitigation Measure 5.11; in addition, if human remains are discovered, work shall cease and an appropriate representative of Native American Indian groups and the County Coroner shall both be informed and consulted, as required by Sate law.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

5.11-3 No mitigation measures are required.