
2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2.1 INTRODUCTION

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15123, this Chapter of the EIR provides a brief description of the ~~project~~ proposed General Plan Update; identification of significant effects and proposed mitigation measures or alternatives that would reduce or avoid those effects; areas of controversy known to the lead agency; and issues to be resolved including the choice among alternatives and whether and how to mitigate the significant effects.

The project being considered by the Town and addressed in this ~~Revised Draft PEIR~~ Final Program EIR is the 2005 comprehensive update of the Town's General Plan. Prior to preparing and circulating the Revised Draft Program EIR upon which this Final Program EIR is based, the ~~The~~ Town of Mammoth Lakes circulated a Draft PEIR Program EIR for the General Plan Update ~~Project~~ in February 2005. The public comment period on the Draft PEIR Program EIR began in February 2005 and ended on May 17, 2005. Over 400 individual comments were received on the previously circulated Draft PEIR from regulatory agencies, jurisdictions, and individuals. Comments were provided on all sections of the document.

Based on the extent and range of comments the Town determined that the project should be revised or redefined and that additional and clarifying technical information was necessary. Based on CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5, which provides guidance on recirculation of an EIR prior to certification, the Town determined that the proposed revisions to the ~~project~~ previous version of the General Plan Update and to the Draft Program EIR required the preparation of a ~~revised~~ Revised Draft Program EIR which ~~is to be~~ was also ~~circulated so as to~~ provide the public with the opportunity to review the new information. The new information ~~is~~ was contained in ~~this version of the document, which is referred to as~~ the Revised Draft PEIR Program EIR, which was circulated for public review and comment from October 31, 2005 and December 14, 2005. ~~See Chapter 1, Introduction, for a discussion regarding major changes between the February 2005 Draft PEIR and this document.~~

A total of 55 agencies, private organizations, and individuals submitted letters containing some 935 separate comments. Each of these comments has been responded to and a compilation of all of the Responses to Comments is presented in Volume II of this Final Program EIR. Reproduction of each of the comment letters is contained in Volume III. On the basis of the whole of the commentary and the responses thereto, the Revised Draft Program EIR has been modified via redline/strikeout to reflect additions and/or corrections and this corrected document is the Final Program EIR in this Volume I.

2.2 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The Town was incorporated in August of 1984. Upon incorporation, the Town prepared an EIR and the Mammoth Lakes General Plan. The timeframe of this plan was 20 years, with updates expected to occur approximately every five to ten years. The existing General Plan was adopted in 1987 and although some of the Town's General Plan Elements have been revised within the past ten years, the existing General Plan has never undergone a comprehensive update since it was adopted. The intent of the General Plan is to provide a comprehensive and integrated document based on current community values and an understanding of existing and projected conditions and needs.

The Planning Area, as defined in this EIR includes the entirety of land within the Town's Municipal Boundary and includes portions of land within unincorporated Mono County, certain lands owned by the City of Los Angeles, and other public and private entities. The Town boundaries (Municipal Boundary) includes approximately 24.4 square miles of land. The Municipal Boundary include two separate and distinct areas of land: (i) the portion of the Town that includes the principal Town structures, functions and activities; and (ii) an entirely separate "island" area (not physically connected with the rest of the Town) that surrounds the Mammoth Yosemite Airport (Airport) and which is located north of U.S. Highway 395 and approximately 10 miles east of the portion of the Town described in (i) above.

Of the total 24.4 square miles within the Municipal Boundary, approximately 4.6 square miles, or approximately 2,500 acres, lies within the UGB. The urbanized portion of the Town as well as the entirety of the Town "island" surrounding the Airport lie within the UGB. Within the UGB, approximately 3.5 square miles of land has been developed, leaving only 1.1 square miles of the total 4.6 square miles vacant non-federal land.

The land outside the UGB but inside the Municipal Boundary consists of national forest, public and national monument lands administered by the USFS and the U.S. Department of the Interior (Bureau of Land Management and National Park Service, respectively.)

2.3 2005 GENERAL PLAN VISION STATEMENT

As expressed in the General Plan's "Vision Statement", the community envisions Mammoth Lakes, today and in the future, as a community that is:

“Surrounded by uniquely spectacular scenery and diverse four-season recreation opportunities, the community of Mammoth Lakes is committed to providing the

very highest quality of life for its residents and the highest quality of experience for its visitors.”

It is the intent of the Town to maintain this identity and quality of life throughout the lifetime of this General Plan by maintaining adherence to the following Guiding Principles:

- I The Mammoth Lakes community places a high value on the sustainability and continuity of our unique relationship with the natural environment. As stewards, we support that relationship with visitors as one way of maintaining our high quality of life.
- II Mammoth Lakes is a great place to live and work because it is a strong, diverse yet cohesive, small-town community that supports families and individuals by providing a stable economy, high quality educational facilities and programs, and a broad range of community services including a participatory Town government.
- III Mammoth Lakes has adequate and appropriate housing that its residents and workers can afford.
- IV Mammoth Lakes is a year-round destination resort community based on diverse outdoor recreation and tourism.
- V Mammoth Lakes has limited its urbanized area to protect its environment and to support its small-town atmosphere.
- VI Mammoth Lakes has maintained high standards for development and design while allowing for a variety of styles that are complementary and appropriate to the Sierra Nevada alpine setting.
- VII Mammoth Lakes has a variety of transportation options that emphasize connectivity, convenience, and alternatives to personal vehicle use with a strong pedestrian emphasis.

2.3.1 Organization of the 2005 General Plan

As shown in Table 2-1 on page 2-4, the 2005 General Plan has been organized into seven “chapters,” each of which examines and addresses several interrelated issues. These chapters represent not only the seven state-mandated elements, but also the seven guiding principles of the Vision Statement. In accordance with California Government Code Section 65302, the General Plan must contain the following seven “elements”: Land Use, Circulation, Housing, Conservation, Open Space, Noise and Safety.

Table 2-1**Organization of the Updated Plan**

| Chapters | Elements | Vision Statement Guiding Principles |
|--|---|--|
| Land Use | Land Use | Overarching Chapter |
| Environmental Sustainability | Conservation Element Land Use Element Open Space Element Noise Element ^a | I The Mammoth Lakes community places a high value on the sustainability and continuity of our unique relationship with the natural environment. As stewards, we support that relationship with visitors as one way of maintaining our high quality of life. |
| Community Health and Safety | Housing Element Conservation Element Open Space Element Safety Element Land Use Element | II Mammoth Lakes is a great place to live and work because it is a strong, diverse yet cohesive, small-town community that supports families and individuals by providing a stable economy, high quality educational facilities and programs, and a broad range of community services including a participatory Town government. |
| Housing | Housing Element ^b Land Use Element | III Mammoth Lakes has adequate and appropriate housing that its residents and workers can afford. |
| Destination Resort | Land Use Element Circulation Element | IV Mammoth Lakes is a year-round destination resort community based on diverse outdoor recreation and tourism. |
| Urban Growth Boundary | Land Use Element Open Space Element Parks and Recreation ^c | V Mammoth Lakes has limited its urbanized area to protect its environment and to support its small-town atmosphere. |
| Aesthetics | Land Use Element Housing Element Noise Element Safety Element | VI Mammoth Lakes has maintained high standards for development and design while allowing for a variety of styles that are complementary and appropriate to the Sierra Nevada alpine setting. |
| Transportation and Circulation | Circulation Element Housing Element Safety Element Land Use Element | VII Mammoth Lakes has a variety of transportation options that emphasize connectivity, convenience, and alternatives to personal vehicle use with a strong pedestrian emphasis. |
| <p>^a Although additional noise policies have been added to the 2005 General Plan and additional noise analyses have been undertaken as part of this project the 1997 Noise Element is not being updated at this time. The Town of Mammoth Lakes anticipates adoption of a revised Noise Element in 2006.</p> <p>^b Local Housing Elements are required to be updated every five years as prescribed through the State Housing Element Law. The current Town of Mammoth Lakes Housing Element covers the five year period from 2003 to 2008 and has been structured to include formatting consistent with the overall General Plan. However, the content is not being revised at this time. The Town of Mammoth Lakes anticipates adoption of an updated Housing Element during 2007.</p> <p>^c Although additional parks and recreation related policies have been added to the 2005 General Plan the 1990 Parks and Recreation Element is not being updated at this time. The Town of Mammoth Lakes anticipates adoption of a revised Parks and Recreation Element in 2006.</p> <p>Source: Town of Mammoth Lakes, 2005</p> | | |

Three of the adopted General Plan elements are not part of the current update. These elements include, the optional Parks and Recreation Element, the Housing Element and the Noise Element.

Each chapter summarizes pertinent planning issues and contains a set of goals and objectives intended to address and resolve key issues. These chapters are further augmented with specific policies and implementation actions. State law mandates that each general plan element have equal stature, whereby no particular element is considered to supersede another element. The equal stature requirement assures the interdependency of the general plan elements.

2.3.2 Land Use

The Land Use Chapter has an important role in determining land use and development decisions. Consisting of both text and maps, this element defines the various land uses and designates their distribution, location and extent throughout the town. It contains standards for residential density as well as building intensity. Residential density is expressed in terms of dwelling units per acre while commercial and industrial building intensity is expressed in square feet.

Land Use designations define residential, commercial, industrial, institutional, public, open space and resort lands. Land use designations were developed based on community desires and in response to the specific characteristics of the General Plan Area. These designations are shown on the Land Use Map.

The proposed Updated Plan consists of a series of objectives, policies, and implementation measures, as well as land use designations that would allow for development with a balance between resort development, environmental sustainability and workforce housing. The following sections describe the land use designations and definitions that would be applied under the project.

2.3.3 Residential

2.3.3.1 Low Density Residential 1 (LDR-1)

The LDR-1 category provides for single family detached residential development at a maximum density of two units per gross acre. This density range is typical of residential subdivisions in Old Mammoth. Development standards, including larger minimum lot sizes, increased setbacks, and decreased lot coverage provide for large residential sites, preserve

vegetation, scenic values and privacy, respect the varied topography, and protect streams and riparian areas.

2.3.3.2 Low Density Residential 2 (LDR-2)

The LDR-2 category applies to single-family residential development of four dwelling units per gross acre. This density is typical of residential subdivisions in Mammoth Slopes, Mammoth Knolls and Majestic Pines. Development standards that include setbacks, height, and lot coverage are designed to provide for building separation, useable yards, snow storage, retention of native trees and other vegetation, and limited shading of adjoining parcels by structures.

2.3.3.3 High Density Residential 1 (HDR-1)

The HDR-1 designation is intended primarily to provide areas for development of multi-family housing at a maximum density of ten dwelling units per acre. These densities would accommodate townhouses, condominiums, and apartments. Density may be increased pursuant to state law or up to double for housing projects where all units are deed restricted for workforce housing pursuant to the provisions of the Housing Element in the General Plan. This designation includes standards that ensure compatibility with adjacent properties; provide adequate recreation space, snow storage, and building separation; and generally provide for well-designed livable developments. Setbacks and lot coverage also provide for preservation of existing trees. This designation applies to portions of Old Mammoth, the Sierra Valley Sites, and the Shady Rest Tract. The HDR-1 designation preserves areas of town for resident housing by prohibiting hotels, motels, timeshares, or other transient occupancies. The Shady Rest Tract is specifically designated for workforce housing.

2.3.3.4 High Density Residential 2 (HDR-2)

The HDR-2 designation permits transient occupancy and is intended for multi-family style developments including townhouses, condominiums, and apartments. A maximum density of ten dwelling units per acre is permitted. These developments have standards that ensure compatibility with adjacent properties; provide adequate recreation space, snow storage, and building separation; and generally provide for well-designed resort visitor developments. Setbacks and lot coverage also provide for preservation of existing trees.

2.3.4 Commercial

2.3.4.1 Commercial 1 (C-1)¹

The C-1 designation is intended primarily to provide small-scale development along Main Street and to provide areas for visitor lodging and commercial services for residents and visitors, as well as accessory affordable and small-scale workforce apartment development. Intensive large-scale development is not appropriate in this designation because of terrain and access issues. This designation is located along Main Street between North Village and Mono Street and is intended to create a transition zone between the intensive retail commercial at the eastern end of Main Street and the resort commercial of North Village. Density of 20 units per acre is permitted; this may be increased up to double for development that provides additional community benefits. Development standards and policies associated with maximum density shall be developed as an implementation measure of the General Plan. All commercial development is encouraged, if not required to provide workforce housing on site. Building setbacks and lot coverage provide for light, trees and landscaping, and snow storage. Where residential uses or mixed residential/commercial uses are developed, development standards shall be appropriate to the specific area.

2.3.4.2 Commercial 2 (C-2)

This designation is designed and intended to provide areas for commercial services and sales of goods. Development policies promote pedestrian use, reduce vehicular conflicts, and improve the visual appearance of street frontages. Ground-floor street frontage on arterial streets shall be limited to commercial uses to foster the development of a pedestrian-oriented commercial district along Old Mammoth Road and the eastern section of Main Street from Old Mammoth Road to Mono Street. Multi-unit housing is encouraged as an accessory use. Density of 20 units² per acre is permitted; this may be increased up to double for development which provides additional community benefits. Development standards and policies associated with maximum density shall be developed as an implementation measure of the General Plan. Development standards support a pedestrian-oriented retail experience while maintaining views and some native trees.

¹ *Commercial Density was revised from the General Plan Draft circulated in April 2005, Council and Planning Commission direction to not revised densities of the Commercial Designations through the General Plan. Language has been revised to reflect existing density, with the only exception being that doubling of density is not solely linked to understructure parking but for additional community benefits.*

² *Studio and one-bedrooms equal to ½ dwelling unit of density.*

2.3.5 Open Space (OS)

The OS designation is applied to lands that have significant recreational or environmental values. The OS designation permits development of facilities that support the environmental and recreational objectives of the community. This designation may include environmentally sensitive areas such as wetlands, floodplains, and streams. It may include recreation facilities such as parks, athletic fields, ski areas, golf courses, and community gathering spaces. This designation includes the patented mining claims located on Sherwin Ridge, the proposed future second nine holes of the Snowcreek golf course, Camp High Sierra, and Town properties along Mammoth Creek.

2.3.6 Institutional Public (IP)

The IP designation allows for public facilities and institutional uses. This designation is applied to lands that are anticipated to be used for schools, hospitals, governmental offices and facilities, museums, and related uses. As these uses are among the largest employers within the Town, affordable housing, as defined by the Town, would be permitted on IP lands located south of Meridian Boulevard and east of Old Mammoth Road. For housing development within areas designated IP, the HDR1 uses and development standards are applicable at a maximum density of up to four units per gross acre. Policies encouraging adequate pedestrian and transit facilities are included to promote alternatives to private vehicle access to places of employment, study, shopping, and recreation.

2.3.7 Resort (R)

The R designation is intended to provide mixed uses consistent with a mountain resort community. Visitor lodging, amenities, and services are the primary emphasis. Affordable workforce housing is allowed within the major resort developments. Amenities within resort developments include recreation, meeting spaces, and commercial services that support the resort atmosphere. This designation is generally applied to large parcels capable of providing a complete resort experience as found in Sierra Star, Snowcreek, and Juniper Ridge. New developments are physically connected internally and to all visitor oriented destinations with an integrated system of streets, sidewalks, and recreational paths. The density range for the R designation is a maximum of six units per acre for residential development other than visitor lodging, and up to a maximum of eight dwelling units per acre for visitor lodging. Residential density may be increased pursuant to state law. Most resort development projects are required to provide support commercial within their development area. Resort projects must also demonstrate consistency with the overall community goals and must demonstrate sufficient amenities to make the projects attractive in their own right. Lot coverage is limited to a maximum of 50 percent overall to provide space for outdoor recreation amenities.

2.3.8 Industrial (I)

The I designation is designed and intended to accommodate industrial uses needed to support a resort community. Uses allowed by right are generally those that are conducted entirely within an enclosed structure and may include light manufacturing, storage, and maintenance uses. Other permitted uses include heavy equipment storage and maintenance, batch plants, automobile repair and service, and similar uses. Policies require that industrial uses take measures to ensure screening, separation, and overall compatibility with adjacent properties.

2.3.9 North Village Specific Plan

The North Village Specific Plan (North Village SP) area provides for the highest intensity uses consistent with a mountain resort community and includes a mix of visitor oriented commercial and visitor lodging. North Village is intended to be the primary visitor attraction in the community due to its access via gondola to MMSA and its commercial village. Total residential and commercial development density in the North Village SP is calculated in terms of rooms. For the purpose of assessment development within this land use designation, commercial development is converted from residential density at a rate of 450 square feet of commercial per room. The maximum density under the North Village SP is 3,020 rooms and 135,000 square feet of commercial (equivalent to 300 rooms). Limited density transfers are permitted within the SP area. Density is not uniform, but rather is allocated by districts as specified in the North Village SP. Within the Plaza Resort district, commercial development is required to support the lodging development and to assure a successful village atmosphere. Residential development under the SP is limited to visitor lodging development and workforce housing to assure a successful village atmosphere. Affordable workforce housing is encouraged to be provided onsite. Total density within the North Village SP area may be increased pursuant to density bonus and density transfer policies or provision of a high level of community amenities and services. The maximum density with increases is 3,800 rooms and 220,000 square feet of commercial. All increased density must be in projects located within 500 yards of the gondola terminal.

2.3.10 Airport (A)

The A designation is applied to the Mammoth Yosemite Airport. Facilities and services associated with aviation including hangars, fueling, and fixed base operator services are permitted. Supporting uses including automobile rental, transient lodging, retail uses, and a RV park may be permitted. The Airport zone is designated for 250 visitor accommodation units and approximately 50,000 square feet of commercial development.

2.3.11 National Forest (NF)

The NF designation is applied to lands administered by the Inyo National Forest that are outside the adopted UGB. National Forest Land is not subject to the land use jurisdiction of the Town; however, building codes and other specific Town regulations apply on National Forest land within the Municipal Boundary.

2.3.12 Population Density and Intensity

California planning law requires that a General Plan include a statement of population intensity. Table 2-2 on page 2-10 shows the 2004 resident population estimates included 7,569 permanent residents. However, population intensity is more than just permanent residents and includes transient residents and visitors. Therefore, the General Plan uses the phrase people at one time (PAOT) to describe population intensity. The average peak population of 34,265 is the total number of PAOT, which represents the average winter Saturday. For the purposes of projecting PAOT, the Town applied a person/unit occupancy, based upon the 2000 census average of 2.4 people per household, for all units occupied by permanent residents and a person/unit occupancy of 4.0 was applied to all remaining visitor, second home, and seasonal resident units. This number was verified by the Town of Mammoth Lakes annual visitor survey and is similar to the unit occupancy factor of 4.1 which was used during the 1987 General Plan.

2.3.13 Key Land Use Policies

Key policies of the Land Use Chapter are the following:

- Density Transfers, may be permitted between the Resort, Specific Plan, and HDR-2 designations, subject to the development of a density transfer ordinance. Transfers may only occur if vehicle miles traveled is decreased, PAOT does not increase, and benefits are provided to the community by protecting environmentally sensitive sites, providing additional public services and amenities, or providing additional workforce housing.
- Open space in and adjacent to town is preserved and maintained for outdoor recreation opportunities.
- The development of commercial nodes that are interconnected, specialized and distinct in character is encouraged. These nodes include North Village, Snowcreek, Sierra Star, Main Street, Old Mammoth Road and Eagle Lodge.

Table 2-2**Existing Population (2004)**

| Units / Population | Permanent Resident | Seasonal | Second Home | Visitor | Total |
|---------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|--------------------|----------------|--------------|
| Units | 3,115 | 566 | 1,942 | 4,166 | 9,871 |
| Population | 7,569 | 2,264 | 7,768 | 16,664 | 34,265 |
| Total Population | 34,265 ^a | | | | |

^a Population assumes seasonal, visitor, lodging and second home equal four people per dwelling. Permanent resident equal 2.4 per dwelling. 38.5 percent of residential units are permanent, 7 percent are seasonal, 24 percent are second home, and 29.5 percent are visitor. This does not equal 100 percent due to vacancies.

Source: Town of Mammoth Lakes, 2005

2.4 AREAS OF CONTROVERSY AND ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED

According to CEQA Guidelines §15123(b)(2) and §15123(b)(3), the Executive Summary of an EIR shall identify potential areas of controversy and issues to be resolved by the decision-makers. Generally, these include issue areas where concerns have been raised, primarily through the Notice of Preparation process, indicating a level of controversy, as well as those areas where a significant unavoidable impact has been identified.

Due to the permanent change in visual character of newly developed areas of the Town, it is concluded that impacts to the Town's visual character and quality are significant and unavoidable. In addition, due to the increase in night lighting that would occur from development associated with the Updated Plan, the project would result in a significant impact with regard to night lighting and a reduction in the quality of star-gazing for residents and visitors that would result.

The Updated Plan would result in an increase in development compared with existing conditions, which would result in an increase in air pollutant emissions. While federal air quality standards would be met, the State 24-hour PM₁₀ and 1-hour O₃ standard would continue to be exceeded. The O₃ impact is primarily the result of pollution generated in the San Joaquin Valley, transported by air currents and winds over the Sierra Nevada Mountains into the Planning Area during limited periods of the year and is not a condition substantially generated by Town activities. Mitigation measure 4.2-1 would decrease the long-term impacts to air quality from wood burning and road dust, but attainment of the State standards for PM₁₀ and 1-hour standard for O₃ are not expected. Therefore, the impact from the project as well as in conjunction with related projects would be significant and unavoidable. Based on this, sensitive receptors could be exposed to substantial pollutant concentrations associated with implementation of the Updated Plan.

With regard to biological resources, the Updated Plan has potential for indirect impact upon resources beyond the UGB and even the Planning Area. Such potential is associated with incidental contact or intrusion impacts produced by growing resident and visitor recreational activities in areas surrounding the UGB, particularly during non-winter months. While excessive use of these areas is not indicated at present, the project does provide for a considerable growth increment. While the peak people at one time data (PAOT) is dominated by wintertime visitation, increases in non-winter months must also be expected. In the absence of data clearly establishing otherwise, it is conservatively concluded that such increased wilderness and open lands usage as may be indirectly caused by the Updated Plan could have significant impact upon one or more of the special status wildlife or plants species. In addition, the project would contribute to a cumulatively significant impact due to an increase in population that would occur from the related projects in combination with the project.

~~With regard to wildland fires, given~~ Given that the Town does not have control over the entire area, the project as well as cumulative impact with regard to wildland fires is considered to be potentially significant and unavoidable.

With regard to noise, implementation of the measures provided in the Updated Plan along with measures provided in the Noise Element would ensure that existing and proposed sensitive uses would not exceed applicable noise standards. However, a significant unavoidable impact would occur because of the increment in the noise generated by traffic from implementation of the Updated Plan, which would exceed current ambient levels by up to 6 dBA.³ Therefore, the permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the UGB above existing levels that would result from development associated with the Updated Plan would be significant and unavoidable.

With regard to cumulative noise impacts, each of the related projects would have to comply with the applicable noise ordinance. No increase in traffic related noise levels within the Town are anticipated from the related projects. However, traffic from development associated with the Updated Plan combined with related project traffic could incrementally increase noise levels along ~~Interstate~~ U.S. Highway 395 within the Planning Area and result in a cumulatively significant noise impact.

Development associated with the Updated Plan would result in an increase of population and a corresponding demand for services. Library and hospital/health care services are not within the Town's jurisdiction. The existing library facility is at capacity and inadequate to address the proposed population growth. Although ~~construction of a new library could begin as~~

³ *Community responses to changes in noise levels fluctuate, but a change in noise level from 3 to 5 dBA may be noticed by some individuals who are extremely sensitive to changes in noise, while a 5 dBA increase is readily noticeable.*

~~early as spring of 2006~~ is currently under construction, the library is a County facility and ultimate control over the development of additional libraries is under the County's control. Similarly, health care services are provided by Southern Mono Health Care District. The Updated Plan is an approximately 20-year plan and the Southern Mono Health Care District does not have funded improvements for the expansion of facilities over a 20-year timeframe. Therefore, growth that would occur under the Updated Plan would result in a significant impact with regard to health services.

With regard to recreation, the increase in population would result in a corresponding demand for recreational facilities as well as an increased demand on existing facilities. Based on the performance objective for parks of 5 acres per 1000 permanent and seasonal residents, the Updated Plan would require an additional 22 acres of park and recreation facilities at buildout. The Town would need to construct or expand facilities in order to maintain the stated performance objective. The Town of Mammoth Lakes anticipates adoption of a revised Parks and Recreation Element in 2006. While the current park demand is met and parks are maintained, the demand for parks based on the adopted performance objective would increase as population increases. The Updated Plan contains policies and/or implementation measures and the Town collects development impact fees to reduce potential impacts to parks. However, based on the increased demand, and the uncertainty of the location of additional park lands, impacts to recreation are considered significant and unavoidable. In addition, the Updated Plan would redesignate Mammoth Creek Parks to IP. While the facilities at Mammoth Creek Park would remain with the redesignation, the redesignation would provide the potential loss of that park. If the park were redeveloped, the loss of the park would be significant and unavoidable.

In addition, MCWD provided water assessments during the process of the preparation of the Updated Plan. The water assessments conclude that water supply ~~is~~ may not currently be sufficient to serve the growth. While MCWD is pursuing various courses to reduce demand and increase the water supply for the region, the water supply at this time is uncertain.

Finally, as discussed in Section 6.B of this EIR, while the project is not growth inducing, the Updated Plan has the potential to induce significant growth-inducing impacts in one or more outlying communities and that those communities would not be able to satisfactorily mitigate such effects.

2.5 CLASSIFICATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

Potential environmental impacts for the proposed project have been classified in the EIR in the following three categories:

- Less Than Significant Impact—the project would result in impacts that are below the identified thresholds of significance; or
- Potentially Significant Impact unless Mitigation Incorporated—the project would result in significant adverse impacts that can be feasibly mitigated to less than significant levels.
- Significant Unavoidable Impact—the project would result in significant adverse impacts that cannot be feasibly mitigated to less than significant levels.

2.6 ALTERNATIVES

The CEQA Guidelines require an EIR to “describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project, and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives.” The CEQA Guidelines direct that selection of alternatives be guided by a “rule of reason” that requires the EIR to set forth only those alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice.

Chapter 7.0 of the Revised Draft PEIR contains a thorough discussion and analysis of the three alternatives to the project. Although alternatives need not be analyzed in the same depth as the proposed project, sufficient information must be provided to allow meaningful evaluation, analysis, and comparison with the project. The three alternatives considered in this Revised Draft PEIR are briefly described below.

2.6.1 No Project Alternative

Under the No Project Alternative, the Updated Plan would not be adopted. Therefore, development would occur under the existing (1987) General Plan. With the exception of state-mandated affordable housing density bonuses, the No Project Alternative would retain the existing General Plan in its current form, including all of its land use designations, policies and plans for the future development of Mammoth Lakes.

The land use pattern and distribution of land uses in the No Project Alternative would be similar to the land use pattern under the project. The No Project Alternative has fewer land use designations compared with the project. In other words, the categories of land uses would be more general under the No Project Alternative.

The No Project Alternative would result in a total of 17,396 residential (non-transient and transient) units compared with ~~17,020~~ 16,710 units under the project. The No Project Alternative would result in 376 units more than the project. The No Project Alternative would

result in 85,000 square feet less of commercial/office floor area and 154,233 square feet less of industrial floor area compared with the project. The projected population would be slightly greater in the No Project Alternative compared with the Updated Plan (61,376 people at one time compared with ~~60,680~~ approximately 60,700 people at one time under the Updated Plan).

2.6.2 Workforce/Affordable Housing Alternative

The Workforce/Affordable Housing Alternative emphasizes expanded affordable and workforce housing development. The same land use categories would be used in this Alternative as in the project. However, this alternative would allow for more workforce housing within the IP zone, would allow all developments such as transient projects to be eligible for Density Bonus provisions and would allow for a doubling of density for projects which provide workforce Housing. The land use pattern would be similar to the pattern proposed under the project.

This Alternative would include land uses and policies that support the development and preservation of new and existing housing to fully meet the needs of the Town's workforce and resident population. This Alternative would further allow the greatest density for all housing projects, including visitor accommodations that provide a minimum percentage of affordable/workforce housing. This alternative would increase the density bonuses permitted for all projects from 25 percent to a maximum of 50 percent. Densities for projects that are 100 percent restricted to Town-identified affordability levels may be eligible for density increases of up to 100 percent.

Under this alternative, the anticipated people at one time would be approximately ten percent greater than the projected people at one time that would occur under the project. The peak resident and visitor population expected at buildout under the Workforce/Affordable Housing Alternative is estimated at ~~67,225~~ approximately 67,200 PAOT as compared to ~~the 60,680~~ approximately 60,700 PAOT under the project.

2.6.3 Reduced Development Alternative

The Reduced Development Alternative emphasizes reduced overall development and increased provision of open space in order to limit traffic, enhance air quality, and to protect the natural resources while still providing housing for resident and workforce population. In comparison with the project, the areas designated for Resort and Institutional Public uses would be less. More specifically, the area in the eastern portion of the UGB would be designated OS in this Alternative compared to IS under the project. In addition, the bell shaped property in the central portion of the UGB would be designated OS under this Alternative compared to a designation of Resort under the project. The Reduced Development Alternative would also change permitted uses at the Airport from visitor accommodations to Industrial uses.

In terms of intensity of development, while the area designated for residential land use would be similar to that under the project, the total number of units would be substantially less than the Updated Plan since the permitted densities in commercial areas would be less. This Alternative would reduce density for most undeveloped residential/visitor accommodation properties in the town while emphasizing the provision of affordable/workforce housing through the purchase of existing condominiums rather than through new construction.

Under this Alternative the anticipated population would be approximately 15 percent less than the project. The peak resident and visitor population expected at buildout under the Reduced Development Alternative is estimated at ~~51,210~~ approximately 51,200 PAOT as compared to ~~the 60,680~~ approximately 60,700 PAOT under the project.

2.7 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Table 2-3 on page 2-17 presents a summary of the environmental impacts associated with the proposed project, the mitigation measures that would reduce or avoid those effects, and the level of significance of the impacts following implementation of the mitigation measures.

Table 2-3

Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation

| Environmental Impacts | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|---|--|---|
| | | |
| <p>AESTHETICS</p> <p>Issue 4.1-1: Development associated with the project would not adversely affect scenic vistas within the Town.</p> | <p>No mitigation measures are required.</p> | <p>With implementation measures contained in the Updated Plan, impacts to scenic vistas would be less than significant.</p> |
| <p>Issue 4.1-2: Development associated with the project would impact scenic resources.</p> | <p>4.1-1 The Town shall extend the existing easement along Mammoth Creek to the remaining undeveloped parcels to protect scenic resources along this corridor. The Town shall enforce the existing setback requirements along Mammoth Creek as they apply to the remaining undeveloped parcels to protect this important biological and scenic corridor. As necessary to protect the resource, the Town shall secure easements as the remaining parcels develop to ensure that the corridor is permanently protected.</p> <p>4.1-2: The Town shall amend the Design Review Guidelines to include standards to assure that public and private facilities in the vicinity of the Main Street (SR203) and the Old Mammoth Road intersection shall be designed to present an attractive face to the road. The standards shall address such issues as building height and massing, tree preservation, and lighting to ensure that public and private development in proximity to SR203, which is eligible for designation as a scenic highway, do not detract from scenic resources.</p> <p><u>4.1-3: The Town through its environmental and design review process shall ensure that development</u></p> | <p>With the incorporation of mitigation measures, impacts to scenic resources resulting from development associated with the project would be reduced to a less than significant level.</p> |

Table 2-3 (Continued)

Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation

| Environmental Impacts | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|--|---|---|
| | <p><u>at the Mammoth Yosemite Airport that is visible from Highway 395 is consistent with State scenic highway regulations for Highway 395.</u></p> | |
| <p>Issue 4.1-3: Development associated with the project would degrade the existing visual character or quality within the Town.</p> | <p>No mitigation measures beyond the policies and/or implementation measures identified in the Updated Plan are feasible to reduce the potential impacts from development on visual quality and character.</p> | <p>Due to the permanent change in visual character of newly developed areas of the Town, impacts to the Town’s visual character and quality are significant and unavoidable.</p> |
| <p>Issue 4.1-4: Development associated with the project would create a new source of substantial light, which would adversely affect nighttime views in the Town.</p> | <p><u>4.1-4The Town shall review the existing Lighting Ordinance and revise the ordinance, where feasible, to protect views of the night sky and to ensure that the intent of the Lighting Ordinance is met. The Lighting Ordinance shall be amended to consider the feasibility of restrictions on lighting that include, but are not limited to: unshielded bulbs wattage restrictions, complete shielding on fixtures, shielding of all lights on buildings over approximately 35 feet tall, cumulative wattage limits, and holiday lighting timing limits.</u></p> | <p><u>Even with the policies and measures regarding lighting in the Updated Plan as well as the Town’s lighting regulations and Mitigation Measure 4.1-4, Due</u> due to the increase in development compared with existing conditions, light impacts associated with development that would occur under the Updated Plan would be significant and unavoidable.</p> |
| <p>AIR QUALITY</p> <p>Issue 4.2-1: Development associated with implementation of the Updated Plan could conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan.</p> | <p>4.2-1The Town shall evaluate PM₁₀ levels on an annual basis using the AQMP model. The <u>Until a revised source contribution study is completed, the</u> The <u>The</u> Town shall limit the total Town VMT to the <u>level specified in Municipal Code Section 8.30.110, currently 106,600.</u> that, when modeled, shows PM₁₀ levels are less than the federal standard of 150 µg/m³. Offset credits should be included from elimination or reduction in emissions from other sources (e.g., wood stoves, fire places, the use of</p> | <p>Implementation of the policy measures in the Updated Plan and the mitigation measure would ensure that the Updated Plan would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the AQMP. Impacts would be less than significant.</p> |

Table 2-3 (Continued)

Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation

| Environmental Impacts | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|--|--|--|
| | <p>any traction material, more suitable than cinders, that resists being milled into sub-10 micron diameter particles, etc.). The Town shall require a VMT analysis for specific projects in those cases where the project would result in 500 daily vehicle trips for incorporation into the AQMP model. VMT analyses shall be required to demonstrate compliance with the federal standard of 150 µg/m³ and be conducted early in the environmental review process so that mitigation may be included in the project design.</p> | |
| <p>Issue 4.2-2: Development associated with implementation of the Updated Plan could violate an air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.</p> | <p>4.2-2_The Town shall evaluate PM₁₀ levels on an annual basis using the AQMP model. <u>The Town shall conduct surveys, as needed, to establish an accurate inventory of wood burning and pellet burning appliances, to validate assumptions regarding annual and daily wood and pellet usage patterns, to determine compliance rates with “No Burn” days, and to monitor effectiveness of VMT-reducing implementation measures. The Town shall condition or restrict future development as necessary to manage Town wide VMT at levels that ensure compliance with federal PM10 NAAQS. The Town shall limit the total Town VMT to a level that, when modeled, shows PM₁₀ levels are less than the federal standard of 150 µg/m³. The Town shall limit the total Town VMT to a level that, when modeled, shows PM10 levels are less than the federal standard of 150</u></p> | <p>With the incorporation of the implementation measures in the Updated Plan and the mitigation measure, maintenance of the <u>24-hour</u> federal standards can be expected. -The State 24--hour PM₁₀ and 1 hour O₃ standards would continue to be exceeded. However, the O₃ impact is primarily the result of pollution transport from the San Joaquin Valley and is not a condition substantially generated by Town activities, policies, or the Updated Plan. In fact, exceedances of the O₃ standard would likely occur without any contribution of emissions of O₃ precursors (nitrogen oxides and hydrocarbons) from Town activity. Mitigation measures would decrease the long-term impacts to air quality from wood burning and road dust, but attainment of the State standard for PM₁₀ and 1-hour standard for O₃ are not expected, and the impact remains significant and unavoidable.</p> |

Table 2-3 (Continued)

Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation

| Environmental Impacts | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|--|--|--|
| | <p>µg/m³. Offset credits should be included from elimination or reduction in emissions from other sources (e.g., wood stoves, fire places, the use of any traction material, more suitable than cinders, that resists being milled into sub 10 micron diameter particles, etc.). The Town shall require a VMT analysis for specific projects in those cases where the project would result in 500 daily vehicle trips for incorporation into the AQMP model. VMT analyses shall be required to demonstrate compliance with the federal standard of 150 µg/m³ and be conducted early in the environmental review process so that mitigation may be included in the project design.</p> | |
| <p>Issue 4.2-3: Development associated with implementation of the Updated Plan would result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of a criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions, which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors).</p> | <p>See Mitigation Measures 4.2-1 and 4.2-2, which would ensure that the Updated Plan would meet the federal standards. However, it is unlikely that the Basin will attain the state PM₁₀ and O₃ standards. No additional feasible mitigation measures were identified.</p> | <p>Implementation of the measures in the Updated Plan and Mitigation Measure 4.2-1 and 4.2-2 would be expected to ensure that the Updated Plan would meet Basin attains and maintains compliance with the federal PM₁₀ standard. Nonetheless, it is predicted that the Mammoth Lakes portion of the GBVAB will continue to exceed State 24-hour PM₁₀ and 1-hour O₃ standards. the Mammoth Lakes portion of the GBVAB is designated as nonattainment for O₃ (State standard only) and a nonattainment area for PM₁₀ (State and federal standards). In addition, the State 24 hour PM₁₀ and 1 hour O₃ standard continue to be exceeded. Therefore, the increase in pollutant emissions associated with implementation of the Updated Plan would be cumulatively</p> |

Table 2-3 (Continued)

Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation

| Environmental Impacts | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|---|---|---|
| | | <p>significant and unavoidable. However As mentioned above, the O₃ impact is primarily the result of pollution transport from the San Joaquin Valley and is not a condition substantially generated by Town activities, policies, or the Updated Plan. In fact, exceedances of the O₃ standard would likely occur without any contribution of emissions of O₃ precursors (nitrogen oxides and hydrocarbons) from Town activity.</p> |
| <p>Issue 4.2-4: Development associated with implementation of the Updated Plan could expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.</p> | <p>See Mitigation Measure 4.2-1, which would ensure that the Updated Plan would meet the federal standards.</p> | <p>Implementation of the measures in the Updated Plan and Mitigation Measure 4.2-1 and 4.2-2 would be expected to ensure that the Updated Plan would not expose sensitive receptors to PM₁₀ concentrations that would exceed the federal standard. Nonetheless, the State 24-hour PM₁₀ and 1-hour O₃ standard <u>will</u> continue to be exceeded. Therefore, sensitive receptors could be exposed to substantial pollutant concentrations associated with implementation of the Updated Plan. However, the <u>The</u> O₃ impact is primarily the result of pollution transport from the San Joaquin Valley and is not a condition substantially generated by Town activities, policies, or the Updated Plan. <u>Impacts are considered significant and unavoidable.</u> In fact, exceedances of the O₃ standard would likely occur without any contribution of emissions of O₃ precursors (nitrogen oxides and hydrocarbons) from Town activity.</p> |
| <p>Issue 4.2-5: <u>Development associated with implementation of the Updated Plan will not create</u></p> | <p>No mitigation measures are required.</p> | <p><u>The Updated Plan does not propose any specific development projects, no specific sources of</u></p> |

Table 2-3 (Continued)

Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation

| Environmental Impacts | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|---|--|---|
| <p>objectional odors. The Updated Plan does not propose any specific development projects, no specific sources of objectionable odors can be identified. However, any specific development projects would be required to comply with standards established in the local general plan or applicable standards of other agencies.</p> | | <p>objectionable odors can be identified. However, any specific development projects would be required to comply with standards established in the local general plan or applicable standards of other agencies. Thus, impacts impacts related to the creation of objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people would be less than significant.</p> |
| <p>BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</p> <p>Issue 4.3-1: As a result of development in accordance with the Updated Plan, animal species having a special status could be affected by a loss or fragmentation of habitat and plant species with a special status could be affected by a loss of numbers or habitat. In addition to the limited potential for direct impact on biological resources within the Urban Growth Boundary, the Updated Plan has potential for indirect impact upon resources beyond the UGB and even the Planning Area. Such potential is associated with incidental contact or intrusion impacts produced by growing resident and visitor recreational activities in areas surrounding the UGB, particularly during non-winter months.</p> | <p>4.3-1 The Town shall require developers of residential properties to include a disclosure statement that Mammoth Lakes is an area of habitat for mountain lions which indicates a potential risk, particularly to children and small pets. No feasible mitigation measures have been identified.</p> | <p>Impacts related to candidate, sensitive, or special status species would be less than significant due to development within the Urban Growth Boundary, and potentially significant and unavoidable from contact intrusion due to Plan induced increases in recreational visitation to wilderness and open lands areas. With the implementation measures contained in the Updated Plan, development under the Plan within the Urban Growth Boundary would result in less than significant impacts to candidate, sensitive, or special status species. Mitigation of potential indirect impacts upon special status wildlife or plant species outside of the Urban Growth Boundary and, for the most part, beyond the Municipal Boundaries cannot be feasibly implemented in the context of the Updated Plan. The Town has no jurisdiction to implement mitigation beyond its boundaries, and policies or actions which restrict access to the areas in question conflict directly with other equally important policies to enhance recreational opportunities. Thus, no feasible mitigation measures are recommended to address this potentially significant impact. As such, potentially significant and unavoidable impacts from contact</p> |

Table 2-3 (Continued)

Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation

| Environmental Impacts | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|--|---|---|
| | | <u>intrusion due to Plan induced increases in recreational visitation to wilderness and open lands areas would occur.</u> |
| <p>Issue 4.3-2: Implementation of the Updated Plan would result in the direct removal of native vegetation on development sites, and further impacts could occur on local habitat and invasive species management efforts through the potential introduction of noxious weeds and pests into areas where surface disturbance results from new development or where straw bales are used to control erosion at construction sites. Also, project implementation could have a number of indirect adverse impacts on riparian habitat, increased withdrawals of groundwater and surface water supplies, increased pollution of stormwater and runoff flows, and other related effects.</p> | <p>No mitigation measures are required.</p> | <p>The Updated Plan includes policies and implementation measures that establish a framework for addressing impacts to riparian habitats or other sensitive natural community at the project level and as such, impacts would be less than significant.</p> |

Table 2-3 (Continued)

Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation

| Environmental Impacts | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|---|--|--|
| <p>Issue 4.3-3: Development under the project could directly and indirectly impact wetlands and other jurisdictional waters of the U.S. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers regulates the fill of wetlands and other jurisdictional waters of the U.S. under Section 404 of the CWA. In addition, the Town has adopted Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) requirements for setbacks within the floodplain, which would apply to the Mammoth Creek corridor.</p> | <p>No mitigation measures are required.</p> | <p>The Updated Plan includes policies and implementation measures that establish a framework for addressing impacts to federally protected wetlands. Therefore, impacts to wetlands would be reduced to a less than significant level.</p> |
| <p>Issue 4.3-4: Development in accordance with the Updated Plan could potentially create barriers to wildlife movement and dispersal. However, the potential for development to impact wildlife migration corridors and wildlife movement would be limited since future development would be concentrated within the UGB.</p> | <p>4.3-1: The Town shall require developers of residential properties to include a disclosure statement that Mammoth Lakes is an area of habitat for mountain lions which indicates a potential risk, particularly to children and small pets.</p> | <p>With the mitigation measures and policies and implementation measures contained within the Updated Plan, impacts to the movement of native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors and nursery sites would be less than significant.</p> |
| <p>Issue 4.3-5: The Town has adopted Municipal Codes to provide protection to natural resources within Town limits, including Municipal Code 17.16.050, which requires preservation of trees and other vegetation. In addition, the Updated Plan provides policies and implementation measures to protect native and large specimen trees and other vegetation.</p> | <p>No mitigation measures are required.</p> | <p>Policies and implementation measures contained within the Updated Plan that establish a framework for addressing impacts to biological resources, including trees, do not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.</p> |
| <p>Issue 4.3-6: There are no Habitat Conservation Plans nor Natural Community Conservation Plans in place within the Planning Area. However, other approved plans are in place that protect biological resources within the Planning Area.</p> | <p>No mitigation measures are required.</p> | <p>The Updated Plan would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. Therefore, impacts with regard</p> |

Table 2-3 (Continued)

Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation

| Environmental Impacts | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|---|--------------------------------------|--|
| | | to other such plans would be less than significant. Incorporation of the policies and implementation measures contained in the Updated Plan would reduce impacts to biological resources to a less than significant level. |
| <p>GEOLOGY, SEISMICITY, SOILS, AND MINERAL RESOURCES</p> <p>Issue 4.4-1: Implementation of the Updated Plan would not result in the exposure of people or structures to potential effects due to seismic activity and associated ground failure, landslides, or volcanic activity. In addition, the project would not expose people to carbon dioxide from natural sources.</p> | No mitigation measures are required. | With the policies and implementation measures contained in the Updated Plan, impacts regarding seismic activity and associated ground failure, landslides, and volcanic activity, as well as carbon dioxide from natural sources would be less than significant. |
| <p>Issue 4.4-2: The implementation of the Updated Plan would not result in impacts with regard to soil erosion or the loss of topsoil.</p> | No mitigation measures are required. | With the policies and implementation measures contained in the Updated Plan, impacts with regard to soil erosion and loss of topsoil would be less than significant. |
| <p>Issue 4.4-3: In general, slopes in the Mammoth Lakes Planning Area are composed of stable materials; there are no mapped areas of unstable slopes and no known landslides have occurred.</p> | No mitigation measures are required. | With implementation measures contained in the Updated Plan, impacts related to unstable soils would be less than significant. |
| <p>Issue 4.4-4: Soils in the survey area are sensitive to disturbances by development; however, no expansive soils have been mapped or encountered in the Project Area.</p> | No mitigation measures are required. | With implementation measures contained in the Updated Plan, impacts with regard to expansive soils would be less than significant. |

Table 2-3 (Continued)

Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation

| Environmental Impacts | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|---|--|---|
| <p>Issue 4.4-5: The Basin Plan for the Lahontan Region of the State Water Resources Control Board prohibits individual septic systems in the Mammoth Basin above an elevation of 7,650 feet and within the entire drainage area of the Town. Therefore, septic tanks would not be used for wastewater disposal. No alternative wastewater disposal systems are proposed. The Town has existing infrastructure for the treatment of wastewater.</p> | <p>No mitigation measures are required.</p> | <p>The project would not result in an impact with regard to wastewater treatment and the use of septic systems or alternative wastewater disposal systems.</p> |
| <p>Issue 4.4-6: The activities associated with mineral development under the Updated Plan have the potential to impact the environment through hauling activities, transport emissions, noise and other means. Any projects associated with mineral development would be required to undergo environmental review and permitting. In addition, a geothermal lease that is located within the northeastern portion of the Municipal Boundary extends to the northern boundary of the Planning Area. Implementation of the Updated Plan could potentially impede geothermal exploration in that area due to concerns for land use compatibility impacts.</p> | <p>4.4-1: The Town shall continue to work with the MPLP to ensure that geothermal exploration in the Planning Area does not conflict with land uses in the Town and at the same time to ensure continued exploration and development of geothermal resources in the planning area in a manner that is compatible with Town land uses.</p> <p>4.4-2: The Town shall continue to investigate the feasibility and opportunities for direct use of geothermal energy to meet Town heating requirements and other project objectives.</p> | <p>With the incorporation of the <u>implementation</u> measures contained in the Updated Plan and mitigation resources, impacts to a known mineral resource or a locally important mineral resource would be less than significant.</p> |

Table 2-3 (Continued)

Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation

| Environmental Impacts | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|--|---|--|
| <p>PUBLIC SAFETY AND HAZARDS</p> <p>Issue 4.5-1: The Updated Plan would allow for the development of non-residential uses, which would create the potential for increases in the use and transport of hazardous materials and increases in the generation of hazardous waste.</p> | <p>No mitigation measures are required.</p> | <p>Oversight by the appropriate regulatory agencies and compliance with the applicable regulations would maintain risks at less than significant levels. In addition, implementation measures in the Updated Plan would ensure that impacts regarding the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials are reduced to a less than significant level.</p> |
| <p>Issue 4.5-2: New commercial and industrial development or the expansion of commercial and industrial uses would result in an increase in the use and transport of hazardous materials within the Town, which, in turn, would increase the potential for accidental releases of hazardous materials. These accidental releases could cause contamination of soils, surface water and groundwater.</p> | <p>No mitigation measures are required.</p> | <p>Oversight by the appropriate regulatory agencies and compliance with the applicable regulations would maintain risks at acceptable levels. In addition, implementation measures in the Updated Plan would ensure that impacts regarding reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials are reduced to a less than significant level.</p> |
| <p>Issue 4.5-3: While the Updated Plan could result in the location of a use that emits or handles hazardous materials, substances, or waste within 0.25 mile of an existing or proposed school, any such proposed use would be required to undergo environmental analysis to ensure that the impacts would be less than significant.</p> | <p>No mitigation measures are required.</p> | <p>With the policies and implementation measures contained in the Updated Plan, impacts to schools related to hazardous materials would be less than significant.</p> |

Table 2-3 (Continued)

Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation

| Environmental Impacts | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|---|--|--|
| <p>Issue 4.5-4: Additional development in the vicinity of the Mammoth Yosemite Airport increases the potential for safety hazards. However, mitigation measures in the Mammoth Yosemite Airport Supplement to Subsequent EIR requires future development to comply with the adopted land use policies of the Airport Land Use Commission, and all development related to the Airport must be in compliance with the adopted Airport Land Use Plan.</p> | <p>No mitigation measures are required.</p> | <p>With the policies and implementation measures contained in the Updated Plan, compliance with the mitigation measures in the SSEIR, compliance with federal regulations and the Airport Land Use Plan, impacts regarding safety for people working or residing in the area of the Mammoth Yosemite Airport would be less than significant.</p> |
| <p>Issue 4.5-5: The Town has an adopted Emergency Operations Plan (EOP) that meets the state’s Standardized Emergency Management System requirements for state law. Development under the Updated Plan would not impair implementation or physically interfere with the EOP, because no circulation changes are being proposed which conflict with the procedures set forth in the plan.</p> | <p>No mitigation measures are required.</p> | <p>With implementation measures contained in the Updated Plan and compliance with Emergency Operations Plan, impacts with regard to an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan would be less than significant.</p> |
| <p>Issue 4.5-6: The Mammoth Lakes Planning Area has been rated as having a very high fire potential. Additional development in the Planning Area would increase the number and variety of potential ignition sources for wildland fires; however, this impact is somewhat reduced by the fact that additional development is to be located in the UGB and most of the wildland areas are located outside the UGB. Still, the potential impact associated with this exposure is considered significant.</p> | <p>No feasible mitigation measures have been identified.</p> | <p>Assuming agencies with jurisdiction over surrounding areas susceptible to wildland fires (i.e., USFS, Inyo National Forest, etc) effectively manage fuel sources, the risk of exposure to wildland fires would be reduced but not eliminated. However, given that the Town does not have control over the entire area and additional feasible mitigation measures have not been identified to reduce the risk, the wildland fire impact would be potentially significant and unavoidable.</p> |

Table 2-3 (Continued)

Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation

| Environmental Impacts | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|---|---|---|
| <p>Issue 4.5-7: Structural fires could result in significant safety risks to people and potential loss of property. However, all future development under the Updated Plan would be subject to site plan review by the MLFPD and the Uniform Fire Code. Areas where avalanche potential has been identified have been overlaid with a Snow Deposition Design (SDD) Zone, and no critical or permanently occupied facilities within the Planning Area would be located within a high avalanche hazard area.</p> | <p>No mitigation measures are required.</p> | <p>With implementation measures contained in the Updated Plan, impacts regarding natural conditions, including structural fires and avalanches, would be less than significant.</p> |
| <p>HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY</p> <p>Issue 4.6-1: The Updated Plan would not result in a violation of any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements.</p> | <p>No mitigation measures are required.</p> | <p>With implementation measures contained in the Updated Plan, impacts with regard to water quality standards or waste discharge requirements would be less than significant.</p> |
| <p>Issue 4.6-2: All projects constructed under the Updated Plan must comply with applicable federal, state and/or local requirements to reduce erosion and siltation, including the NPDES Program. All development must also comply with applicable Municipal Code Sections regarding drainage.</p> | <p>No mitigation measures are required.</p> | <p>With implementation measures contained in the Updated Plan and compliance with federal, state and local design and construction requirements, impacts to drainage patterns would be less than significant.</p> |
| <p>Issue 4.6-3: Development under the Updated Plan located within an identified flood hazard area would be subject to the design requirements and regulations set forth by the Town, Mono County and/or FEMA. All development must comply with Municipal Code Sections regarding runoff.</p> | <p>No mitigation measures are required.</p> | <p>With implementation measures contained in the Updated Plan and compliance with federal, state and local design and construction requirements, impacts to the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on or off site would be less than significant.</p> |

Table 2-3 (Continued)

Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation

| Environmental Impacts | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|---|---|--|
| <p>Issue 4.6-4: The 2005 update to the SDMP provides hydraulic modeling of the drainage system and prioritizes the implementation of storm drainage facility improvements designed to accommodate development allowed in the existing Plan. Since the general distribution and types of land uses are similar under the Updated Plan, the improvements would generally address drainage under the Updated Plan. In addition, all construction projects under the Plan would be subject to compliance with all applicable federal, state and local water quality and waste discharge requirements, including the NPDES Program.</p> | <p>No mitigation measures are required.</p> | <p>With implementation measures contained in the Updated Plan and compliance with federal, state and local design and construction requirements, impacts with regard to storm drain capacities and polluted runoff would be less than significant.</p> |
| <p>Issue 4.6-5: Development associated with the Updated Plan would not result in a substantial degradation of water quality due to compliance with all applicable federal, state and local regulations, as well as implementation of the applicable implementation measures.</p> | <p>No mitigation measures are required.</p> | <p>With implementation measures contained in the Updated Plan and compliance with federal, state and local design and construction requirements, impacts with regard to water quality would be less than significant.</p> |
| <p>Issue 4.6-6: The Town has established a conservation easement and building setbacks along Mammoth Creek for the purpose of resource and floodplain management. Although some existing land uses are located within the mapped flood area for Mammoth Creek, no future development areas would be located within the 100-year flood zone.</p> | <p>No mitigation measures are required.</p> | <p>With implementation measures contained in the Updated Plan and compliance with all applicable federal, state and local design requirements, including FEMA design requirements, impacts with regard to flooding would be less than significant.</p> |
| <p>Issue 4.6-7: The Updated Plan identifies several potential flood hazard areas in the Town, including Murphy Gulch and the Mammoth Creek drainage. However, under the Updated Plan, all future development within an identified flood hazard area</p> | <p>No mitigation measures are required.</p> | <p>With implementation measures contained in the Updated Plan and compliance with all applicable federal, state and local design requirements, including FEMA design requirements, impacts with regard to flooding as a result of the placement of</p> |

Table 2-3 (Continued)

Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation

| Environmental Impacts | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|---|---|---|
| <p>would be subject to the design requirements and regulations set forth by the Town, Mono County and/or FEMA.</p> | | <p>structures within a designated flood hazard area would be less than significant.</p> |
| <p>Issue 4.6-8: No future dams or levees are anticipated in the Updated Plan. However, if any future dams and levees were necessary, they would be designed to conform to all applicable safety and design standards of all applicable federal, state and local requirements.</p> | <p>No mitigation measures are required.</p> | <p>With implementation measures contained in the Updated Plan and compliance with all applicable federal, state and local design requirements, including FEMA design requirements, impacts with regard to flooding from failure of a levee or dam would be less than significant.</p> |
| <p>Issue 4.6-9: A Storm Drain Master Plan update provides hydraulic modeling of the drainage system and prioritizes the implementation of storm drainage facility improvements designed to accommodate development under the Updated Plan. Also, all new storm drain facility upgrades or expansion of existing facilities would be subject to compliance with all applicable federal, state and local construction requirements, including the NPDES Program.</p> | <p>No mitigation measures are required.</p> | <p>Implementation of the Updated Plan would not result in construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, and, therefore, impacts with regard to construction of new or expanded storm water drainage facilities would be less than significant.</p> |
| <p>Issue 4.6-10: Implementation of the Updated Plan would not result in a higher probability of inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. Any new development placed in a potential seiche inundation zone would undergo a site-specific analysis to ensure appropriate drainage is in place or would be constructed so that people or structures are not exposed to significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding.</p> | <p>No mitigation measures are required.</p> | <p>Implementation of the Updated Plan would not result in people or structures being inundated by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow, and as such, impacts would be less than significant.</p> |

Table 2-3 (Continued)

Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation

| Environmental Impacts | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|--|---|---|
| <p>LAND USE AND PLANNING</p> <p>Issue 4.7-1: Policies and implementation measures in the Updated Plan serve to create a community that is integrated, cohesive, interconnected and that provides for alternative modes of transportation. The intensification of development adjacent to existing land uses may create incompatibilities. However, the zoning code contains development standards to protect and buffer sensitive land uses from adjacent development. Land use compatibility would be reviewed at the time of site specific development and appropriate measures would be required.</p> | <p>No mitigation measures are required.</p> | <p>With policies and implementation measures contained in the Updated Plan, impacts regarding the physical division of a community or land use incompatibilities would be less than significant.</p> |
| <p>Issue 4.7-2: The project is consistent with the plans and policies outlined in the Mono County General Plan including the county’s goals, objectives, and policies for the Mammoth vicinity and the Mono County land use designations and densities.</p> | <p>No mitigation measures are required.</p> | <p>The project would not conflict with applicable land use plans, policies, or regulations and, therefore, this impact would be less than significant.</p> |
| <p>NOISE</p> <p>Issue 4.8-1: The Updated Plan does not propose any specific development projects and no specific sources of noise can be identified. However, any specific development projects would be required to comply with standards established in the Updated Plan or the Town’s noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies. Oversight by the appropriate agencies and compliance with the applicable regulations would maintain noise levels within acceptable levels.</p> | <p>No mitigation measures are required.</p> | <p>Impacts related to the exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies would be less than significant.</p> |

Table 2-3 (Continued)

Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation

| Environmental Impacts | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|--|---|---|
| <p>Issue 4.8-2: The Updated Plan does not propose any specific development projects and no specific sources of groundborne vibration or groundborne noise can be identified. However, any specific development projects would be required to comply with standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance (i.e., Section 8.16.090), or applicable standards of other agencies. Oversight by the appropriate agencies and compliance with the applicable regulations would result in a less than significant impact with regard to groundborne vibration and groundborne noise.</p> | <p>No mitigation measures are required.</p> | <p>Impacts related to the exposure of persons to excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise would be less than significant.</p> |
| <p>Issue 4.8-3: Development associated with implementation of the Updated Plan could result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project. Implementation of the measures provided in the Updated Plan along with measures provided in the Noise Element would ensure that existing and proposed sensitive uses would not exceed applicable noise standards, there may nonetheless be a significant unavoidable impact because the noise generated by traffic from implementation of the Updated Plan would exceed current ambient levels by up to 6 dBA. Forest Trail east of Minaret would increase from 48 dB L_{dn} to 54 dB L_{dn}. An L_{dn} of 54 dB is well within the generally acceptable outside noise level provided in the Noise Element of 60 dB L_{dn}, but an increase of 6 dBA would be readily noticeable and, thus, considered a substantial change in noise levels.</p> | <p>No additional feasible mitigation measures have been identified.</p> | <p>With the existing regulations and the implementation measures in the Updated Plan and the Noise Element, the Updated Plan would to the extent feasible reduce permanent increases in ambient noise levels in the UGB. However, while noise levels would be within acceptable levels, the increase in ambient noise levels in the UGB above existing levels that would result from development associated with the Updated Plan would be significant and unavoidable.</p> |

Table 2-3 (Continued)

Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation

| Environmental Impacts | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|---|---|--|
| <p>Issue 4.8-4: Development associated with implementation of the Updated Plan could result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project. The Updated Plan would result in an increase in construction activities as well as an increase in outdoor events and recreational activities. However, all projects would be required to comply with existing regulations as well as policies in the Updated Plan and in the Noise Element.</p> | <p>No mitigation measures are required.</p> | <p>Compliance with applicable regulations and policies and implementation measures with regard to temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels would result in a less than significant impact.</p> |
| <p>Issue 4.8-5: The Updated Plan would comply with applicable regulatory requirements (e.g. Title 24 (Building) CCR T25-28), which would preclude locating sensitive receptors within the Mammoth Yosemite Airport’s 65 CNEL contour. There are no noise sensitive land uses and no people living within the CNEL 65 noise exposure area. Therefore, implementation of the Updated Plan would not result in the exposure of sensitive receptors in the UGB to excessive noise levels.</p> | <p>No mitigation measures are required.</p> | <p>Impacts related to the exposure of persons residing or working in UGB to excessive noise levels from an airport would be less than significant.</p> |
| <p>POPULATION, HOUSING, AND EMPLOYMENT</p> <p>Issue 4.9-1: While the Updated Plan would accommodate a relatively substantial increment of population growth, it would neither directly nor indirectly induce that growth or cause it to occur. Rather, the project will shape the location, form, and behavior of the growth increment, should external demand be sufficient.</p> | <p>No mitigation measures are required.</p> | <p>The Updated Plan would result in a less than significant impact with regard to the inducement of a direct or indirect substantial population growth.</p> |

Table 2-3 (Continued)

Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation

| Environmental Impacts | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|--|---|---|
| <p>Issue 4.9-2: The project would not displace substantial numbers of existing housing units or residents necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.</p> | <p>No mitigation measures are required.</p> | <p>The Updated Plan would result in a less than significant impact with regard to the displacement of substantial numbers of existing housing or residents.</p> |
| <p>PUBLIC SERVICES</p> <p>Issue 4.10-1: Development associated with implementation of the Updated Plan would result in an increase in the quantity of emergency calls received by the MLFPD due to population increases. An increase in calls would likely require the employment of additional full-time personnel. Also, it is anticipated that as the area develops around Fire Station two, relocation of the training tower would become necessary. The imposition of the development impact fee (Code Section 15.16.082) would ensure that potential impacts to fire protection services would be reduced.</p> | <p>No mitigation measures are required.</p> | <p>With implementation measures contained in the Updated Plan, along with project-specific environmental review and payment of the development impact fees, impacts to fire protection services and facilities would be less than significant.</p> |
| <p>Issue 4.10-2: Permanent and transient population growth resulting from implementation of the Updated Plan would result in a greater volume of emergency calls to the police department, which could strain existing police protection services and create demand for expanded services and facilities. The imposition of the development impact fee (Code Section 15.16.082) would ensure that potential impacts to police protection services would be reduced.</p> | <p>No mitigation measures are required.</p> | <p>With implementation measures contained in the Updated Plan, along with project-specific environmental review and payment of the development impact fees, impacts to police protection and law enforcement services and facilities would be less than significant</p> |

Table 2-3 (Continued)

Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation

| Environmental Impacts | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|---|--|---|
| <p>Issue 4.10-3: Increases in the number of students resulting from implementation of the Updated Plan could be served by reconstructing or adding on to existing facilities and would not require the construction of any new facilities. The MUSD has several options available for collecting the necessary funds for reconstruction and expansion efforts, including general obligation bonds, and developer fees.</p> | <p>No mitigation measures are required.</p> | <p>Given the implementation measures contained in the Updated Plan, along with the payment of appropriate development fees, impacts to schools would be less than significant.</p> |
| <p>Issue 4.10-4:</p> <p>Libraries: Development associated with the Updated Plan would result in an increase of population and a corresponding demand for library services. Construction of a new library would be adequate to service the increased population under the project. However, the Town does not have ultimate control over the construction of a County library that would be needed to mitigate impacts to less than significant.</p> <p>Roadway Maintenance/Snow Removal: Implementation of the Updated Plan would result in an increased need for roadway maintenance, as well as an increase in snow removal operations and costs due to development of new roads and pedestrian areas and reduced snow storage space. The imposition of the development impact fee (Code Section 15.16.082) would ensure that potential impact to public service providers charged with maintaining the roadways and removing snow would be reduced.</p> | <p>Libraries: No mitigation measures are feasible, as mitigation is primarily within the control of another jurisdiction.</p> <p>Roadway Maintenance/Snow Removal: No mitigation measures are necessary.</p> | <p>Libraries: The Updated Plan would result in a significant and unavoidable impact to library services because the required mitigation is within the control of another jurisdiction.</p> <p>Roadway Maintenance/Snow Removal: With implementation measures contained in the Updated Plan, along with project-specific environmental review and payment of the development impact fee, impacts to roadway maintenance and snow removal would be less than significant.</p> |

Table 2-3 (Continued)

Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation

| Environmental Impacts | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|--|---|---|
| <p>Hospitals: Permanent and transient population increases in the Town as a result of the project would increase the demand for hospital and health services. In addition to general healthcare services, the anticipated population would increase the need for laboratory services, food services, administrative offices, warehouse, maintenance, and staff work space. Since the Town does not have ultimate control over the provision of health care services that would be needed to mitigate impacts to hospital and health services to less than significant.</p> | <p>Hospitals: No mitigation measures are feasible, as mitigation is primarily within the control of another jurisdiction.</p> | <p>Hospitals: Implementation measures contained in the Updated Plan would assist in reducing potential impacts to hospital and health services to a less than significant level. However, the Updated Plan is an approximately 20-year plan and the Southern Mono Health Care District does not have funded improvements for the expansion of facilities over a 20-year timeframe. Since the Town does not have ultimate control over the provision of health care services, impacts to hospital and health services is significant and unavoidable.</p> |
| <p>PUBLIC UTILITIES</p> <p>Issue 4.11-1: With the project, the current available water supply under a single dry year would result in a surplus of 622 acre-feet deficiency of 1,488 acre-feet. However, at two dry years a surplus of 73 acre feet is shown and at three dry years a deficiency of 31 acre feet per year is shown. According to the MCWD, a surplus of only 73 acre feet at the two dry year period presents a minimal margin for error in these projections. In the third and fourth years in a multiple dry year scenario, deficiencies of 390 and 406 acre-feet are predicted, respectively. Therefore, the Updated Plan would result in a significant impact with regard to water supply.</p> | <p>4.11-1 The Town shall not approve new development applications that would result in a water demand in excess of available supplies as determined by the MCWD, based on the multiple drought year scenario presented above. The Town shall work with MCWD to ensure that land use approvals are phased in tandem with so that the development of necessary water supply sources is established prior to development approvals. This shall be made a policy of the Updated General Plan.</p> | <p>With incorporation of the mitigation measure and implementation measures contained in the Updated Plan, impacts to water supplies would be less than significant.</p> |
| <p>Issue 4.11-2: With the projected wastewater flow demands for the project estimated to be an average of 2.6 mgd with peak daily flows of 4.3 and the design capacity of the wastewater treatment plant at 4.9 mgd, the District’s treatment process would</p> | <p>No mitigation measures are required.</p> | <p>With policies and implementation measures contained in the Updated Plan, impacts with regard to wastewater treatment would be less than significant.</p> |

Table 2-3 (Continued)

Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation

| Environmental Impacts | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|---|--------------------------------------|--|
| continue to meet the effluent limitations and treatment policies set forth by the Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board. | | |
| Issue 4.11-3: The population increase and structural development associated with the project would increase the quantity of wastewater generated and associated requirements for collection, treatment and disposal. However, the estimated maximum quantity of wastewater requiring treatment would not exceed the capacity of the treatment facility. | No mitigation measures are required. | No new construction of water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion would be required, and, therefore, impacts to those facilities would be less than significant. |
| Issue 4.11-4: Estimates derived from the MCWD 2000 Urban Water Management Plan indicate that the maximum quantity of wastewater requiring treatment would not exceed the capacity of the treatment facility with implementation of the Updated Plan. | No mitigation measures are required. | The Updated Plan would not result in inadequate capacity for wastewater treatment. Therefore, impacts related to wastewater treatment capacity would be less than significant. |
| Issue 4.11-5: The Benton Crossing Landfill can accommodate the Town’s waste generation and disposal needs for the next 20 years, based on site life and loading rate calculations provided by the Mono County Department of Public Works (MCDPW). The MCDPW has indicated that based on their projections, there is sufficient capacity for the projected buildout under the Updated Plan. The Town also has an option for five years at the Pumice Valley Landfill. Therefore, the project would not result in the construction of a new landfill or expansion of existing facilities under the Updated | No mitigation measures are required. | As the Updated Plan incorporates implementation measures for various recycling programs affecting all types of waste and waste sources, impacts with regard to the disposal of solid waste would be less than significant. |

Table 2-3 (Continued)

Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation

| Environmental Impacts | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|--|---|--|
| Plan. | | |
| <p>Issue 4.11-6: With the Town’s existing waste collection and recycling program and the measures in the Updated Plan regarding waste reduction, the project would comply with applicable federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.</p> | <p>No mitigation measures are required.</p> | <p>With the policies and implementation measures contained in the Updated Plan, impacts related to solid waste would be less than significant.</p> |
| <p>Issue 4.11-7: Electricity and Geothermal Energy: Southern California Edison has stated that it is currently able to supply enough electricity to accommodate the needs of the region and anticipates being able to continue its service with implementation of the Updated Plan. Also, there are currently no direct uses of geothermal energy in the Town or for structures and uses in the Town. Propane: The propane infrastructure is designed for expansion to accommodate the population growth anticipated under implementation of the Updated Plan. Communications: Implementation of the Updated Plan would not significantly impact existing communication services. Any needed construction or modification would be funded out of user service and connection fees or through developer contributions.</p> | <p>No mitigation measures are required.</p> | <p>With policies and implementation measures contained in the Updated Plan, impacts to electrical and geothermal energy, propane services and facilities, and communications would be less than significant.</p> |

Table 2-3 (Continued)

Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation

| Environmental Impacts | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|--|---|---|
| <p>RECREATION</p> <p>Issue 4.12-1: The project proposes to redesignate Mammoth Creek Park as IP, which would not impact the existing provision of parkland in compliance with the performance standard of 5 acres per 1,000 permanent and seasonal residents. However, while the facilities at Mammoth Creek Park would remain with the redesignation, the redesignation would provide the potential loss of that park. If the park were redeveloped, the loss of the park would be significant and unavoidable. At buildout the Updated Plan would require an additional 22 acres of park and recreation facilities to maintain existing performance objectives of parkland per population. The Town collects Development Impact Fees prior to building permit to fund park lands. The Town of Mammoth Lakes anticipates adoption of a revised Parks and Recreation Element in 20062008. Because it is uncertain at this time where these additional acres would be provided, this impact to existing recreation uses is considered significant and unavoidable. Development fees and fees under the Quimby Act would help fund new parks.</p> | <p>No mitigation measures beyond the policies and/or implementation measures identified in the Updated Plan and the Development Impact Fees are feasible to reduce the potential impact on existing parks and recreation.</p> | <p>As it is uncertain at this time where additional park acres would be provided upon implementation of the Updated Plan, the impacts to recreation would be significant and unavoidable.</p> |
| <p>Issue 4.12-2: Implementation of the Updated Plan would increase demands for, as well as demands upon, recreational facilities and areas, necessitating construction of additional facilities in order to maintain adequate service levels and to prevent overuse and the resultant physical deterioration of existing facilities.</p> | <p>No mitigation measures beyond the policies and/or implementation measures identified in the Update Plan are feasible.</p> | <p>Due to the projected increase in demand based on the performance objective, impacts to existing parks and recreation due to increased use of existing parks and facilities would be significant and unavoidable.</p> |

Table 2-3 (Continued)

Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation

| Environmental Impacts | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|---|---|---|
| <p>TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION</p> <p>Issue 4.13-1: New development within the Town that could result from implementation of the Plan, along with regional traffic growth, would <u>not result in traffic volumes that would exceed roadway capacities in the Town result in an increase in traffic volumes</u> for the planning horizon year of 2024.</p> | <p>4.13-21— The Town shall amend the Master Facility Plan to include the mitigation measures necessary to reduce impacts to the level of service on the street system. The Town shall review the Development Impact Fees to ensure that sufficient funds will be available to make the necessary improvements. No mitigation measures are required.</p> | <p>With incorporation of Mitigation Measure 4.13-1, along with implementation measures contained in the Updated Plan, impacts related to existing traffic load and capacity of the street system would be less than significant.</p> |
| <p>Issue 4.13-2: Based on the Town’s established LOS D threshold, future 2024 traffic modeling indicates that <u>nine</u>10 of the 2224 study intersections would exceed the LOS D threshold with the buildout of the Updated Plan.</p> | <p>4.13-1 The Town shall amend the Master Facility Plan to include the mitigation measures necessary to reduce impacts to the level of service on the street system. The Town shall review the Development Impact Fees to ensure that sufficient funds will be available to make the necessary improvements.</p> <p>4.13-324.13-2 <u>Lakeview Road/Lake Mary Road:</u> This intersection shall be improved to include separate southbound left and right-turn lanes and a westbound<u>eastbound</u> acceleration lane along Lake Mary Road (to accommodate two-stage left turns from Lakeview Drive to Lake Mary Road)</p> <p>4.13-3 <u>Main Street/Center Street:</u> This intersection shall be improved to include a traffic signal or roundabout. A traffic signal would be warranted and would operate at LOS C under build out of the Updated Plan at this location. Alternatively, a dual lane roundabout with single lane northbound and southbound approaches, a 75-foot island diameter, a 32 foot circulating width, and a 139 foot inscribed circle diameter would</p> | <p>With incorporation of the traffic improvement mitigation measures and the policies and implementation measures contained in the Updated Plan, traffic impacts would be less than significant.</p> |

Table 2-3 (Continued)

Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation

| Environmental Impacts | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|-----------------------|---|--|
| | <p>operate at LOS B. In addition to addressing the LOS deficiency, provision of a signal or a roundabout would greatly improve Main Street pedestrian crossing conditions.</p> <p>4.13-54 <u>Minaret Road/Main Street Intersection:</u> This intersection shall be improved to include protected left-turn phasing on all approaches, and eastbound right turn overlap signal phasing at the existing signal.</p> <p>4.13-6 — <u>Main Street/Forest Trail Intersection:</u> There are three primary potential mitigation measures for this LOS deficiency: construct a roundabout, construct a traffic signal, or prohibit left turns out of the southbound minor street approach. While prohibiting left turns at this intersection would inconvenience drivers, constructing a roundabout or traffic signal would actually encourage drivers to use Forest Trail as a cut through route, as the delay of the southbound approach would be greatly reduced. Prohibiting southbound left turns, on the other hand, would only slightly inconvenience drivers by requiring them to drive to the Center Street intersection to turn around (which could potentially be aided through the provision of a roundabout at Center Street). However, this inconvenience may work to lessen the exiting Forest Trail cut through problem, thereby having a beneficial impact to Town wide circulation. The prohibition of southbound left turn movements at the intersection would result in a worse approach LOS of D upon build out of the</p> | |

Table 2-3 (Continued)

Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation

| Environmental Impacts | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|-----------------------|--|--|
| | <p>Updated Plan.</p> <p>4.13-7 <u>Main Street/Meridian Boulevard:</u> Because Main Street is a divided roadway at its intersection with Meridian Boulevard with a substantial median, the intersection of Main Street and Meridian Boulevard operates as two separate intersections. The northbound approach at the Main Street Eastbound/Meridian Boulevard intersection and the northbound approach at the Main Street Westbound/Meridian Boulevard intersection exceed LOS thresholds in 2024 under the Updated Plan. In the case that a traffic signal is built at both intersections, they shall be coordinated to ensure that queues at the northern intersection would not form back into the southern intersection. Traffic signals would operate at a LOS B. Alternatively, one roundabout could be constructed that combined the two intersections. A dual lane roundabout with single lane northbound and southbound approaches, an 85-foot island diameter, a 32-foot circulating width, and a 149-foot inscribed circle diameter would operate at LOS A upon build out of the Updated Plan.</p> <p>4.13-85 <u>Majestic Pines/Meridian Boulevard Intersection:</u> This intersection shall be improved by either a traffic signal, which would cause the intersection to operate at LOS BC or better; or Meridian Boulevard shall be reduced to one lane in each direction in addition to constructing a single-lane roundabout with a 60-foot island diameter and a 20-foot circulating width. This roundabout would</p> | |

Table 2-3 (Continued)

Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation

| Environmental Impacts | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|-----------------------|--|--|
| | <p>operate at LOS A. The installation of a traffic signal would not require any widening of the roadway.</p> <p>4.13-96 <u>Minaret Road/Forest Trail Intersection</u>: This intersection shall be improved by the construction of a roundabout, which would operate a LOS B upon build out of the Updated Plan.</p> <p>4.13-497 <u>Minaret Road/Old Mammoth Road Intersection</u>: Due to the high volume of traffic that is expected on all four approaches upon build out of any of Updated Plan, a roundabout or traffic signal is recommended. If a traffic signal were installed, the following improvements would be required for the Updated Plan, which would result in an intersection LOS D.</p> <p>÷</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Construct a traffic signal with protected left-turn phasing. - Construct a separate northbound left-turn lane and a northbound through/right shared lane (remove left/through and right-turn lanes). - Construct separate southbound left, through, and right-turn lanes (remove left/through/right shared). <p>Alternatively, if a roundabout with a 75-foot island diameter, 20-foot circulating width, and 16-foot entry width were constructed, at <u>the intersection</u> would operate at LOS C.</p> <p>4.13-448 <u>Meridian Boulevard/Azimuth Drive</u>: This intersection is forecast to exceed LOS</p> | |

Table 2-3 (Continued)

Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation

| Environmental Impacts | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|---|--|---|
| | <p>thresholds on the northbound and southbound approaches upon build out of the Updated Plan. This impact shall be mitigated by constructing a traffic signal, or roundabout. If a roundabout with a 60-foot island diameter, 20-foot circulating width, and 15-foot entry lanes were constructed, the intersection would operate at a LOS B or better under all 2024 scenarios. The intersection would operate at LOS D if a traffic signal with split phasing on all approaches were built in addition to a separate northbound left-turn lane</p> <p><u>4.13-9 Meridian Boulevard/Sierra Park Road: With growth in nearby land uses, this intersection is forecast to exceed LOS thresholds on the westbound approach with the existing all-way stop control. This impact shall be mitigated by constructing a traffic signal, which would operate at LOS C.</u></p> <p><u>4.13-10 Main Street/ Mountain Boulevard: This intersection is forecast to provide LOS F conditions on the northbound and southbound approaches, with more than four vehicle-hours of delay on each. This impact shall be mitigated by constructing a traffic signal, which would operate at LOS D.</u></p> | |
| <p>Issue 4.13-3: The Updated Plan does not propose or require any modifications to the Mammoth Yosemite Airport Master Plan or the Airport Land Use Plan for the Mammoth Yosemite Airport. Thus, air traffic patterns would not be affected by development associated with implementation of the</p> | <p>No mitigation measures are required.</p> | <p>With policy and implementation measures contained in the Updated Plan, impacts regarding aviation facilities and associated air traffic patterns would be less than significant.</p> |

Table 2-3 (Continued)

Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation

| Environmental Impacts | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|--|--------------------------------------|---|
| Updated Plan | | |
| Issue 4.13-4: The Updated Plan does not specify design features for roads. Subsequent CEQA review would be conducted at such time as specific road improvements are proposed. | No mitigation measures are required. | Impacts regarding design features or incompatible uses would be less than significant. |
| Issue 4.13-5: The Updated Plan includes policies and implementation measures to ensure that the Town of Mammoth Lakes Emergency Operations Plan for Mammoth Lakes which was adopted in 2001 and revised in 2004, would be maintained and that appropriate evacuation routes would be incorporated into the Emergency Preparedness and Response Plan. In addition, all development projects would be subject to project-specific environmental and design review, which includes review of the provision of adequate emergency access. | No mitigation measures are required. | With the various policies and measures regarding emergency access and the Town's Emergency Operations Plan (2001), development associated with implementation of the Updated Plan would result in a less than significant impact with regard to emergency access. |
| Issue 4.13-6: Compliance with the Town Municipal Code parking requirements and implementation of the Updated Plan policies and mitigation measures would ensure that that each development adequately mitigates its impact on parking availability. | No mitigation measures are required. | Impacts regarding parking would be less than significant. |
| Issue 4.13-7: Implementation of the Updated Plan would create a significant demand for new labor, which would in turn add to the need for public transit options. The Updated Plan contains numerous policies and implementation measures to enhance alternative transportation facilities and | No mitigation measures are required. | With policies and implementation measures contained in the Updated Plan, impacts and/or conflicts to adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation would be less than significant. |

Table 2-3 (Continued)

Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation

| Environmental Impacts | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|--|--|---|
| programs (pedestrian, bicycle, bus). | | |
| <p>CULTURAL RESOURCES</p> <p>Issue 4.14-1: There are no known historic resources within the UGB; however, new development or redevelopment under the Updated Plan could result in the demolition or alteration of physical characteristics of an unknown historical resource that has historical significance that justifies its inclusion in, or eligibility for inclusion in, the California Register of Historical Resource. Therefore, the Updated Plan could result in the discovery of historical resources and potential impacts to historic resources.</p> | <p>4.14-1: A qualified historic archaeologist approved by the Town shall perform the following tasks prior to development approvals on any part of the Town:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Subsequent to a preliminary Town review, if evidence suggests the potential for historic resources, a field survey <u>conducted using methodology that meets or exceeds state and federal guidelines</u> for historical resources within portions of the project area not previously surveyed for cultural resources shall be conducted. • Subsequent to a preliminary Town review, if evidence suggests the potential for historic resources, the Town Archives shall be contacted for information on historical property records. <u>A qualified cultural resources professional shall be contracted to review the records search data collected by PCR Services Corporation on behalf of the Town of Mammoth Lakes as part of the Draft General Plan Update process.</u> • Subsequent to a preliminary Town review, if evidence suggests the potential for sacred land resources, the Native American Heritage Commission shall be contacted for information regarding sacred lands. • Inventory all historical resources within the project area, including archaeological and historic resources older than 50 years, | <p>With incorporation of the mitigation measures, impacts to historic resources would be less than significant.</p> |

Table 2-3 (Continued)

Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation

| Environmental Impacts | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|-----------------------|--|--|
| | <p>using appropriate State record forms and following guidelines in the California Office of Historic Preservation’s handbook “Instructions for Recording Historical Resources”. The archaeologist will then submit two (2) copies of the completed forms to the Town for the assignment of trinomials.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluate the significance and integrity of all historical resources within the project area, using criteria established in the CEQA Guidelines for important archaeological resources and/or 36 CFR 60.4 for eligibility for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. • Propose mitigation measures and recommend conditions of approval to eliminate adverse project effects on significant, important, and unique historical resources, following appropriate CEQA and/or National Historic Preservation Act’s Section 106 guidelines. • Prepare a technical resources management report, documenting the inventory, evaluation, and proposed mitigation of resources within the project area, following guidelines for Archaeological Resource Management Reports prepared by the California Office of Historic Preservation, Preservation Planning Bulletin 4(a), December 1989. Submit one copy of the completed report, with original illustrations, to the Town for permanent | |

Table 2-3 (Continued)

Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation

| Environmental Impacts | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|-----------------------|---|--|
| | <p>archiving.</p> <p>4.14-2: If cultural materials or archaeological remains are encountered during the course of grading or construction, the developer shall cease any ground disturbing activities near the find. A qualified archeologist will be retained to evaluate significance of the resources and recommend appropriate treatment measures. Treatment measures may include avoidance, preservation, removal, data recovery, protection, or other measures developed in consultation with the Town and the developer. In addition, the Town shall:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enact interim measures to protect undesignated sites from demolition or significant modification without an opportunity for the Town to establish its historic value. • Require, where appropriate, the incorporation of historic sites and buildings within new developments, using their special qualities as a theme or focal point. • Encourage the use of the State Historic Building Code on buildings of historic significance that can allow modification without imposing some of the potentially detrimental provisions of the current building codes. • Educate the public about the area’s archaeological heritage. <p>4.14-3: Prior to the approval of any projects that propose to demolish or significantly alter a potentially significant historic resource as defined</p> | |

Table 2-3 (Continued)

Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation

| Environmental Impacts | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|--|---|---|
| | <p>pursuant to applicable state and federal laws, the applicant shall complete an historic survey report <u>using methodology that meets or exceeds state and federal guidelines</u> to determine potential historic significance. The determination of resource significance shall be made in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5. Where appropriate for a standing historic structure that will not be preserved in place, conservation can include documentation to Historic American Building Survey (HABS) standards and/or relocation</p> | |
| <p>Issue 4.14-2: New development or redevelopment under the Updated Plan could impact an archaeological site(s) during grading and excavation activities. Due to the primarily developed and disturbed condition of the lands within the UGB, where development would occur, the potential number and distribution of such sites or resources is anticipated to be limited. Nevertheless, future development within the Town could result in the discovery of cultural sites and potential impacts to prehistoric and historic resources.</p> | <p>4.14-4: A qualified archaeologist shall perform the following tasks prior to development activities on any part of the Town:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Subsequent to a preliminary CityTown review, if evidence suggests the potential for prehistoric resources, a field survey for prehistoric resources within portions of the project area not previously surveyed for cultural resources shall be conducted. • Subsequent to a preliminary CityTown review, if evidence suggests the potential for sacred land resources, the Native American Heritage Commission for information regarding sacred lands shall be consulted. • Inventory all prehistoric resources using appropriate State record forms and submit two (2) copies of the completed forms to the Town. • Evaluate the significance and integrity of | <p>With incorporation of the mitigation measures, impacts to an archaeological resource would be less than significant.</p> |

Table 2-3 (Continued)

Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation

| Environmental Impacts | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|-----------------------|--|--|
| | <p>all prehistoric resources within the project area, using criteria established in the CEQA Guidelines for important archaeological resources.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If human remains are encountered on the project site, the Mono County Coroner’s Office shall be contacted within 24 hours of the find, and all work should be halted until a clearance is given by that office and any other involved agencies. If the Coroner determines that the remains may be Native American, contact the Native American Heritage Commission for notification to the most likely descendants of the descendent and follow the required protocols specified in Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. • All resources and data collected within the project area should be permanently curated at an appropriate repository within the Town or County. <p>4.14-5: If cultural materials or archaeological remains are encountered during the course of grading or construction, the developer shall cease any ground disturbing activities near the find. A qualified archeologist approved by the Town will be retained to evaluate significance of the resources and recommend appropriate treatment measures. Treatment measures may include avoidance, preservation, removal, data recovery, protection, or other measures developed in consultation with the Town and the developer. With the assistance of the</p> | |

Table 2-3 (Continued)

Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation

| Environmental Impacts | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|-----------------------|--|--|
| | <p>archaeologist, the Town shall:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider establishing provisions to require incorporation of archaeological sites within new developments, using their special qualities as a theme or focal point. • Educate the public about the area’s archaeological heritage. • Propose mitigation measures and recommend conditional of approval to eliminate adverse project effects on significant, important, and unique prehistoric resources, following appropriate CEQA guidelines. • Prepare a technical resources management report, documenting the inventory, evaluation, and proposed mitigation of resources within the project area. Submit one copy of the completed report, with original illustrations, to the Town for permanent archiving. <p>4.14-6: If during grading and excavation an archaeological resource is found, construction shall be temporarily diverted, redirected or halted as appropriate. Any discovery of such resources shall be treated in accordance with federal, state, and local regulations, including those outlined in the CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 (e) and as appropriate, the Native American Historical, Cultural and Sacred Sites Act. For archaeological remains, conservation of a resource for which preservation in place is not feasible, relocation and</p> | |

Table 2-3 (Continued)

Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation

| Environmental Impacts | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|---|--|--|
| | if that is not feasible, documentation shall be required. | |
| <p>Issue 4.14-3: There are no known unique paleontological resources or sites, and no known unique geologic features in the developable portions of the community. The soils within the UGB are glacial till and relatively recent volcanic materials; no paleontological resources would be expected. Therefore, the Updated Plan would not result in an impact to paleontological resources.</p> | <p>No mitigation measures are required.</p> | <p>With policy and implementation measures contained in the Updated Plan, impacts to paleontological resources would be less than significant.</p> |
| <p>Issue 4.14-4: New development or redevelopment under the Updated Plan could result in the discovery of human remains during grading and excavation activities. However, due to the primarily developed and disturbed condition of the lands within the UGB where development would occur, the potential location of such sites or resources would be minimal. Nevertheless, future development within the Town could result in the discovery of human remains and potential impacts to these resources.</p> | <p>4.14-7: Should the existence of, or the probable likelihood, of Native American or other human remains be found during development of a site, the landowner shall contact the County Coroner and no further excavation or disturbance of the site or nearby area shall be permitted until the County Coroner determines that no investigation of the cause of death is required. If the remains are determined to be Native American, the Coroner shall, as required by Public Resources Code Section 5097.98, notify the Native American Heritage Commission, which shall contact the most likely descendants and those descendants shall have 24 hours to inspect and make a recommendation to the landowner as to the appropriate means for removal and nondestruction of the remains and artifacts found with the remains. If an agreement cannot be reached between the landowner and the descendants, the Native American Heritage Commission shall mediate the disagreement, and if resolution is not reached, the landowner shall reinter</p> | <p>With incorporation of the mitigation measure, impacts to human remains would be less than significant.</p> |

Table 2-3 (Continued)**Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation**

| Environmental Impacts | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|------------------------------|---|---|
| | the remains and items associated with Native American burials with appropriate dignity on the property in a location not subject to further subsurface disturbance. The applicant may develop a prospective agreement for treating or disposing of, with appropriate dignity, the human remains and any items associated with Native American burials with the appropriate Native Americans as identified by the Native American Heritage Commission. | |