



Planning Department
168 North Edwards Street
Post Office Drawer L
Independence, California 93526

Phone: (760) 878-0263
FAX: (760) 872-2712
E-Mail: inyoplanning@inyocounty.us

MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT AND
INITIAL STUDY

PROJECT TITLE: Tentative Parcel Map (TPM) #413/Sorrells; Zone Reclassification (ZR) #2017-01/Sorrells; and, General Plan Amendment (GPA) #2017-01/Sorrells.

PROJECT LOCATION: The project site is comprised of most of the community of Shoshone, at the intersection of California Highways 127 and 178, in the south-eastern portion of Inyo County; Assessor Parcel Numbers 046-120-25 and 046-120-040. See attached maps.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The applicant has applied for a TPM to divide one of the properties (046-120-25), an existing parcel totaling 225.04 acres into four parcels plus a remainder. The proposed parcel sizes are as follows: Parcel #1 – 4.01 acres; Parcel #2 – 0.50 acres; Parcel #3 – 0.61 acres; Parcel #4 – 7.84 acres; and the Remainder – 212.08 acres. The proposed project also includes a Zone Reclassification to update the Zoning for the community of Shoshone on the two existing parcels (6 parcels after the Parcel Map subdivision), bringing the zoning into compliance with the actual and possible future development (Refer to maps and table for an understanding of the zoning both before and after the reclassification). The proposed project also consists of a General Plan amendment causing the general plan designations to match the proposed zoning.

FINDINGS:

A. The proposed project is consistent with goals and objectives of the Inyo County General Plan.

The General Plan amendment portion of this project has two main purposes. To bring current General Plan designations more in line with actual on the ground development, and to limit possible development on areas that have minimal future development need or potential for the current owner by rezoning it to Open Space. Current General Plan designations do not accurately match the existing zoning. This project will bring the zoning and General Plan designations into consistency with the actual development and guide future development. The subdivision portion of this project is in compliance with the proposed zone reclassification and the updated General Plan designations.

B. The proposed project is consistent with the provisions of the Inyo County Zoning Ordinance.

The purpose of the proposed zone reclassification is to have zoning that is both consistent with on the ground development, possible future development and General Plan designations. The subdivision portion of this project will be consistent with the zoning after zone reclassification.

C. Potential adverse environmental impacts will not exceed thresholds of significance, either individually or cumulatively.

Based on the information provided by the applicant and staff's review, TPM 413/Sorrells, ZR 2017-01/Sorrells, and GPA2017-01/Sorrells do not have potential adverse environmental impacts that will exceed thresholds of significance, either individually or cumulatively. The subdivision portion of the project is to subdivide a parcel of land into 4 new parcels plus a remainder; there is no development proposed for the parcels at this time. The zoning reclassification (with associated General Plan amendment) portion of the project will bring the project properties into a zoning and General Plan state that resembles the actual development and limits future development in ways consistent with the general goals of the General Plan. Note that there are 3 areas of potential adverse environmental impacts that have been mitigated to be below a threshold of significance. These are described in sections IV, V, and XVII of the Initial Study and Environmental Checklist form.

D. Based upon the environmental evaluation of the proposed project, the Planning Department finds that the project does not have the potential to create a significant adverse impact on flora or fauna; natural, scenic and historic resources; the local economy; public health, safety, and welfare. This constitutes a Mitigated Negative Finding for the Mandatory Findings required by Section 15065 of the CEQA Guidelines.

Mitigation will be built into the project in the following ways:

- **Biological resources:** A condition of approval for this project shall be that the owner of the property and successors will continue a program already begun to preserve and promote habitat for the Amargosa Vole and the spring habitat on the property.

The 30-day review period for this Negative Declaration expires on **September 1, 2017**. Inyo County is not required to respond to any comments received after this date.

Additional information is available from the Inyo County Planning Department. Please contact Project Planner Tom Schaniel (760-878-0405) if you have any questions regarding this project.



Cathreen Richards
Director, Inyo County Planning Department

7/28/17
Date

INYO COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT

CEQA APPENDIX G: INITIAL STUDY & ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

- 1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- 2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- 4) “Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less Than Significant Impact.” The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section XVII, “Earlier Analyses,” may be cross-referenced).
- 5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are “Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated,” describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- 6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
- 7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.

8) This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.

9) The explanation of each issue should identify:

- a) the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
- b) the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance issues.



Planning Department
168 North Edwards Street
Post Office Drawer L
Independence, California 93526

Phone: (760) 878-0263
FAX: (760) 872-2712
E-Mail: inyoplanning@inyocounty.us

INYO COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT

APPENDIX G: CEQA INITIAL STUDY & ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

- 1. Project title:** Tentative Parcel Map (TPM) #413/Susan Sorrells; Zone Reclassification (ZR) #2017-01/Susan Sorrells; and, General Plan Amendment (GPA) #2017-01/Susan Sorrells.
- 2. Lead agency name and address:** Inyo County Planning Department, 168 N. Edwards St., P.O. Drawer L, Independence, CA 93526
- 3. Contact person and phone number:** Tom Schaniel, Associate Planner, (760) 878-0405
- 4. Project location:** The project site is comprised of most of the community of Shoshone, at the intersection of California Highways 127 and 178, in the south-eastern portion of Inyo County; Assessor Parcel Numbers 046-120-25 and 046-120-040. See attached maps.
- 5. Project sponsor's name and address:** Susan Sorrells, P.O. Box 67, Shoshone, CA 92384
- 6. General Plan designation:** Current General Plan designations are as follows: Residential Medium Density (**RM** – Policy LU-2.3); Residential Very Low Density (**RVL** – Policy LU-2.5); Residential Rural Medium Density (**RRM** – Policy LU-2.7); Retail Commercial (**RC** – Policy LU-3.2); Heavy Commercial/Commercial Service (**HC** – Policy LU-3.3); Resort/Recreational (**REC** – Policy LU-3.4); General Industrial (**GI** – Policy LU-4.2); Open Space and Recreation (**OSR** – Policy LU-5.1); Public Services Facility (**PF** – Policy LU-5.2); and State and Federal Lands (**SFL** – Policy LU-5.6). See attached zoning maps and attached General Plan designations table for proposed General Plan Designations.
- 7. Zoning:** See attached maps and tables for current and proposed zoning.
- 8. Description of project:** The applicant has applied for a TPM to divide one of the properties (046-120-25), an existing parcel totaling 225.04 acres into four parcels plus a remainder. The proposed parcel sizes are as follows: Parcel #1 – 4.01 acres; Parcel #2 – 0.50 acres; Parcel #3 – 0.61 acres; Parcel #4 – 7.84 acres; and the Remainder – 212.08 acres. The proposed project also includes a Zone Reclassification to update the Zoning for the community of Shoshone on the two existing parcels (6 parcels after the Parcel Map subdivision), bringing the zoning into compliance with the actual and possible future development (Refer to maps and table for an understanding of the zoning both before and after the reclassification). The proposed project also consists of a General Plan amendment causing the general plan designations to match the proposed zoning.

The property consists of the community of Shoshone, and includes a motel, restaurant, gas station, store, single family residences, propane dispensing, health clinic, and a museum. Most of the development is close to Highway 127, with the western portion of Parcel 046-120-40 and the eastern portion of Parcel 046-120-25 remaining largely undisturbed.

9. Surrounding land uses and setting: Briefly describe the project’s surroundings:

The property is surrounded primarily by vacant undeveloped land. The land to the south does have a residence and a landing strip, but is otherwise vacant and undeveloped. Further to the south are County and State road maintenance facilities.

Location:	Use:	Gen. Plan Designation	Zoning
Site	Mixture, see project description	Mixture, see above	Mixture, see maps
North	Vacant Land	Open Space and Recreation (OSR) and State and Federal Lands (SFL)	Open Space with a 40-acre minimum (OS-40)
East	Vacant Land	State and Federal Lands (SFL)	Open Space with a 40-acre minimum (OS-40)
South	Vacant Land	Natural Resources (NR)	Open Space with a 40-acre minimum (OS-40)
West	Vacant Land	State and Federal Lands (SFL), Residential Very Low Density (RVL), Public Services Facility (PF)	Open Space with a 40-acre minimum (OS-40); Single Residence or Mobile Home Combined, half acre minimum (RMH-0.5); Public (P)

10. Other public agencies whose approval is required California Department of Fish and Wildlife, Great Basin Air Pollution Control District, Inyo County Environmental Health Department, Inyo County Public Works Department, and the Southern Inyo Fire Protection District.

11. Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1? If so, has consultation begun?

Note: Conducting consultation early in the CEQA process allows tribal governments, lead agencies, and project proponents to discuss the level of environmental review, identify and address potential adverse impacts to tribal cultural resources, and reduce the potential for delay and conflict in the environmental review process. (See Public Resources Code section 21083.3.2.) Information may also be available from the California Native American Heritage Commission’s Sacred Lands File per Public Resources Code section 5097.96 and the California Historical Resources Information System administered by the California Office of Historic Preservation. Please also note that Public Resources Code section 21082.3(c) contains provisions specific to confidentiality.

In compliance with AB 52 and Public Resource Code Section 21080.3.1(b) and with SB 18 and Government Code Section 65352.3, as well as tribes identified as being local to Inyo County, were notified via a certified letter about the project and the opportunity for consultation on this project. The tribes notified were as follows: the Cabazon Band of Mission Indians, the Torres Martinez Desert Cahuilla Indians, the Twenty-Nine Palms Band of Mission Indians, the Big Pine Paiute Tribe, the Bishop Paiute Tribe, the Fort Independence Paiute Tribe, the Lone Pine Paiute Tribe, the Timbisha Shoshone Tribe, the Kern Valley Indian Council and the Walker River Reservation. None of the tribes contacted responded with a request for consultation.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

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

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

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)0238

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

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

I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Tom Schaniel, Associate Planner
Inyo County Planning Department

Date

INYO COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

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

I. AESTHETICS -- Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

The vistas in the area are of the Nopah Range to the east and the Amargosa range to the west, and the general scenic desert of the southern Amargosa Valley. The site is relatively flat, and is already developed along Highway 127 with a mix of multiple commercial and residential uses. The zone reclassification will increase the amount of Open Space zoning. The portions of the project area that allow for development are already nearly fully developed, and area that was zoned for development, but not developed is now largely changing to Open Space zoning, limiting future development to infill development and limiting its impact on scenic vistas.

b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?

No, the highways adjacent to the project are not State scenic highways. Additionally, the project does not anticipate any near term development and will not affect any particularly scenic trees, rock outcroppings or historic buildings.

c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?

No, the project area is already developed, and neither the lot subdivision, nor the zone reclassification nor the general plan amendment are to foster development, but are instead to bring land ownership and zoning in compliance with actual development. No change in the visual character is anticipated.

d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

No, the property is already largely developed. This project does not directly anticipate any development that would be a source of light or glare, and the zone reclassification, by limiting the zoning intensity will decrease the possibilities for future light and glare compared to full build-out under already existing zoning.

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

II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES: In determining

whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including The Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment Project; and forest carbon measurement methodology Provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:

a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?

No, the project does not convert prime farmland, unique farmland, or farmland of Statewide importance to non-agricultural use.

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

No, the proposed subdivision and zone reclassification (with the associated General Plan amendment) is compatible with existing and future agricultural uses on the property; there are no Williamson Act Contracts in Inyo County.

c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?

No, the proposed project does not include forest land or timber land.

d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

No, the proposed project does not include forest land.

e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?

No, the proposed project does not include forest land, and existing potential farm land will increase.

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

III. AIR QUALITY: Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:

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

No, the project is a proposed subdivision of a parcels into four parcels plus a remainder; a zone reclassification (and the associated General Plan amendment) to bring the zoning into conformance with actual development. It will not conflict with an air quality plan.

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

No, the project is a proposed subdivision of a parcel into four parcels plus a remainder plus a zone reclassification (and the associated General Plan amendment) to bring the zoning into conformance with actual development. The project will not cause a violation of an air quality standard. Future infill development could reduce air quality during construction, but these air quality changes would be temporary in nature, not significant, and regulated by Inyo County Code, and the potential for future development will decrease as a result of the zone reclassifications.

c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?

No, the project is a proposed subdivision of a parcel into four parcels plus a remainder; a zone reclassification (and the associated General Plan amendment) to bring the zoning into conformance with actual development that will not cause a net increase in air pollutants. Although there are portions of Inyo County within non-attainment areas for Federal and State PM10 (particulate matter 10 microns or less in diameter) ambient air quality standards, the primary source for this pollution is the Owens dry lake, located approximately 100-miles and two mountain ranges from the project site. As a result of this distance, future infill development (which has less potential than is allowed by current zoning) will not increase PM10 pollutants over existing levels.

d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

No, the project is a proposed subdivision of a parcel into four parcels plus a remainder; a zone reclassification (and the associated General Plan amendment) to bring the zoning into conformance with actual development that will not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. Please also see III c) above.

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

The project site is at near-term foreseeable development build-out. No new development is anticipated, and the possibilities for future development will be more limited under the proposed zone reclassification than under current zoning. Any future development will be infill and will not include uses that will cause objectionable odors.

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

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES: Would the project:

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

No, there are two species that are of potential concern on this property. The first is Ash Meadows Gumplant (Grindelia fraxinipratensis), with a Federal status of Threatened. A certified biologist has reviewed the site and has identified a species with similar visual characteristics to the Ash Meadows Gumplant, but the plant is not the Ash Meadows Gumplant. No Ash Meadows Gumplant has been identified on any of the project properties. The biologists report is on file with Inyo County.

The second species of interest is the Amargosa Vole (Microtus californicus scirpensis) with a Federal and State status of Endangered. The currently developed portions of this land are already fully developed and disturbed (generally along Highway 127), and that development precludes them from becoming vole habitat (voles live in a marsh-like habitat area). Undeveloped portions of the project property have been identified as possible vole habitat. The owner of the property, Ms. Susan Sorrells, has been very involved with CDFW in Amargosa Vole habitat construction and conservation. She has been developing vole habitat in undeveloped portions of the project properties. The habitat construction will be to continue to develop vole habitat in the area that is potential vole habitat (marshy). That preservation and development of vole habitat will be incorporated into a condition of approval for the project.

b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?

No, there is limited riparian habitat located in the proposed subdivision area, and it is all in the areas currently zoned Open Space and that will be zoned Open Space in the proposed zone reclassification. The areas of the subdivision are already developed and do not include riparian habitat. The surrounding area, as well as the bulk of the project property away from Highway 127 is undeveloped and is a desert ecosystem, with limited marsh like areas in Open Space zoning that should remain unaffected by this project.

c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

No, there are no federally protected wetlands in the proposed subdivision area. The surrounding area is undeveloped and is a desert ecosystem.

d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?

No, there are no established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors in the proposed subdivision area, nor is there documented movement of fish or wildlife species. The surrounding area is undeveloped and is a desert ecosystem. As the proposed zone reclassification should actually reduce potential future development from current zoning, possible impacts should be decreased. The subdivision is only affecting already developed areas and will have no impact beyond the current condition.

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

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

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

No, the project is a proposed subdivision of a parcel into four parcels plus a remainder plus a zone reclassification (and the associated General Plan amendment) to bring the zoning into conformance with actual development. It will not conflict with any local policies or ordinances including a tree preservation policy or ordinance.

f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

No, the area of the proposed project is not subject to a formal Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES: Would the project:

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

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

The proposed project is already largely developed and disturbed (in the areas zoned for development, both in the current and proposed zoning) as a commercial and residential property. The project does not anticipate any demolition, removal, or significant remodel of any structures on the property. Future development (which is beyond the scope of this project, but allowed to a limited degree by the proposed zoning) will not cause an adverse change in the significance of a historic resource pursuant to Section 15064.5, because no existing buildings (historical or otherwise) will be affected by this project or potential future development.

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

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

The project properties were identified by the Twenty-Nine Palms Band of Mission Indians as being 1.5 miles from an existing culturally sensitive site, as well as being located within the Chemehuevi Traditional Use Area (TUA). The project will have no direct impact on these or any other potential archaeological and cultural resources, as it is a subdivision of existing developed areas, as well as a general net down-zoning of the project properties as part of the zone reclassification (and the associated General Plan amendment). While the project does not directly propose new development, development is allowed by current zoning already. However, the proposed zone reclassification will actually reduce potential future land available for development from current zoning, so this should provide for a reduced possibility of conflict with any as yet unidentified cultural resource. The owner of the property, Ms. Susan Sorrells, has been involved in the preservation of archaeological and cultural resources in the area and should resources be discovered on the project properties, she is committed to preserving those resources. In large part, most development is limited to already disturbed areas (undisturbed areas are very limited by both current and proposed zoning for significant future development). But, while no development is anticipated directly from this project, future development should be mindful of the potential for archaeological cultural resources. Should any archaeological or cultural resource be discovered on the site, work shall immediately desist and Inyo County staff immediately be notified per Chapter 9.52, Disturbance of Archaeological, Paleontological and Historical Features of the Inyo County Code. Therefore, future development, though beyond the scope of this project, can be conducted so as to not cause an adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The proposed project is on partially disturbed land, with the zone reclassification decreasing the possibility of future development. The project properties have no known paleontological resources, so future development will not directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource.

d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

No known human remains or burial sites are on the property. Refer to the response to V b) for the potential for archaeological resources. While unlikely, human remains are a potential archaeological resource, and will be handle similar to other archaeological resources, as outlined in V b)

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS: Would the project:

a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

No, no delineated Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault zones cross or are in near proximity to the project properties.

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Ground shaking may occur anywhere in the region, but compared to the rest of California, this is a less than average seismically active area. The California Building Code ensures that future structures shall be constructed on the property to required seismic standards in order to withstand such shaking, and so this potential impact is considered less than significant (no more significant than essentially the rest of the State of California)

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

No the proposed project is not within an area of soils know to be subject to liquefaction.

iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
-----------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

No, the proposed project is not in an area subject to landslides.

b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

The proposed project is either on already disturbed land or on land that will only allow a very limited future development, so future development will not result in soil erosion or the loss of topsoil.

c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

No, the project properties are not located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

No, the proposed project is not located in an area with a known expansive soil type.

e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

No, the project area is not located on soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks.

VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS:

Would the project:

a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Future development will have to follow the proposed land use and zone designations that apply to the parcels, which are commercial, residential and open space, and will limit develop more than the current land use and zoning. Additionally, no development is anticipated to directly result from this project. Future development, while beyond the direct scope of this project, would have no significant increase in greenhouse gas emissions.

b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

No, the project is a proposed subdivision and zone reclassification (with the associated General Plan amendment) that will not cause conflicts with a plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing greenhouse gasses.

VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS:

Would the project:

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

No, the project is a proposed subdivision and zone reclassification (with the associated General Plan amendment) and does not anticipate the transport or disposal of hazardous materials for future development. Current zoning includes 6.22 acres of General Industrial or Extractive zoning. This industrial zoning is being eliminated in the proposed zone reclassification. There is some possibility that some materials used in commercial zones would be deemed hazardous, but the use and storage of these materials would be relatively minor if at all, and would be regulated by Inyo County and particularly the Environmental Health Department and would have less potential under the zone reclassification than the current zoning.

b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

No, the project is a proposed subdivision and zone reclassification (with the associated General Plan amendment) that either will not involve hazardous materials at all, or, if used, will be on a small enough scale to inherently limit any impact in the unlikely event of an accident. Additionally, if any hazardous materials are used as part of the agricultural uses of the property, they will be subject to permitting and oversight by the Inyo County Environmental Health Department, and subject to permits and policies to minimize accidental release, both in quantity and impact. Finally, current zoning allows for uses that could potentially include hazardous materials, but those opportunities will be reduce, as industrial zoning is eliminated and commercial zoning is reduced in the proposed zone reclassification.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

No, the project is a proposed subdivision and zone reclassification (with the associated General Plan amendment) that will not emit hazardous emissions, or handle hazardous waste. Any handling of hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances would be subject to regulation by the Inyo County Environmental Health Department, and those opportunities will be reduce, as industrial zoning is eliminated and commercial zoning is reduced in the proposed zoning reclassification.

d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

No, the proposed subdivision is not included on a site included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5.

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

No, the project properties, while located in proximity to a landing strip (immediately to the south), the project will involve no further intensity of development then what is already in place and no further safety hazard would result than the existing development.

f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

No, the project properties are not within the vicinity of a private airstrip.

g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

No, the project is a proposed subdivision and zone reclassification (with the associated General Plan amendment) that will not physically interfere with an adopted emergency plan or emergency evacuation plan.

h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

The project properties are already largely as developed as near term planning anticipates. The project (both subdivision and zone reclassification) will not significantly change the risk of fire from the current conditions. The community of Shoshone is in the Southern Inyo Fire District. No portion of this project anticipates any change in the level of service required. While future infill development could result in more structures, that development is already allowed for and is in fact being reduced by the net down-zoning in the zoning portion of this project. The subdivision portion of the project is for already developed land and anticipates no additional development

IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY: Would the project:

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

No, the project is a proposed subdivision and zone reclassification (with the associated General Plan amendment) that will not affect water quality standards or waste discharge requirements.

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

b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

No, the project is a proposed subdivision and zone reclassification (with the associated General Plan amendment) and is in a remote and sparsely developed area, without large demands on the existing groundwater system. The zone reclassification part of the project actually limits development as compared to current zoning, so, while no development is currently anticipated, possible future development impact is reduced by this project.

c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

No drainage patterns should be altered by this project. The Amargosa River drainage affects the eastern-most portion of this project area, but that area is both currently and in the proposed plan to be Open Space, limiting potential development (and the associated drainage pattern issues) from affecting the Amargosa River drainage.

d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on or off-site?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

No drainage patterns should be altered by this project. The Amargosa River drainage affects the eastern-most portion of this project area, but that area is both currently and in the proposed plan to be Open Space, limiting potential development (and the associated drainage pattern issues) from affecting the Amargosa River drainage.

e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

No, the project is a proposed subdivision and zone reclassification (with the associated General Plan amendment) with no anticipated development and which inherently decreases future development from the currently allowed zoning by reducing the acreage of impactful zones. The project would not create runoff conditions beyond existing or planned storm water drainage system capacity, and in fact future development would be subject to review and permitting by the County Public Works Department and would have to follow current Best Management Practices, limiting any impact from drainage issues..

f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

No, the project is a proposed subdivision and zone reclassification (with the associated General Plan amendment) that has little potential to degrade water quality. Future applications will be required to obtain permits from the County Environmental Health Department for both well development and wastewater disposal, as a result of these requirements, potential impacts are considered less than significant.

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

g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

The project properties are partially (generally the eastern half) in a 100-year flood hazard area. The subdivision portion of the project is proposed to create individual lots of already developed commercial portions of the property. The zoning is being brought into better conformance with the actual uses (current and anticipated as future uses) by transitioning to the Central Business zone. As such, the subdivision portion of the project will not place any housing within a 100 year flood hazard area. The zone reclassification (and the associated General Plan amendment) portion of the project could allow for housing to occur in the 100-year flood hazard area. However, it will allow it at a lesser rate than the current zoning, which has both more area of residential zoning, as well as a multi-family zone that is being eliminated. Any future development of residential units on the property will be required to be in compliance with State and Local codes for building and safety related to being located in a flood hazard area, and future occupants will be required to have State flood insurance.

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

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

No, refer in part to answer g). The property is largely developed with no current plans for future development. The developed area is on the fringe of the flood area, with the undeveloped, Open Space zoned (both proposed and currently) eastern portions of the project properties being the primary area in the flood hazard area. This area is currently undeveloped, and the zoning would limit any future development to a residence, an accessory dwelling unit, possibly some accessory buildings, all in a swath of land over 100 acres. These buildings would have to be designed and constructed in compliance with State and Local codes for building and safety, and both the low density and the code requirements will limit any impediment of these structures to flood flows to a less than significant level.

i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

No, the project properties are not in an area subject to flooding due to the failure of a levee or dam.

j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

No, the project properties are not in an area subject to seiches, tsunamis, or mudflows.

X. LAND USE AND PLANNING: Would the project:

a) Physically divide an established community?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

The project properties essentially consist of the entire community of Shoshone. The subdivision portion of this project only takes portions of developed land and allows them to be on separate parcels (no new development should come from the subdivision, as the lots are already developed). The zone reclassification (and the associated General Plan amendment) portion of the project is intended primarily to make zoning match actual existing development. Secondly, it is to limit some of the existing undeveloped land by changing it to the Open Space zoning, limiting future development of areas that are not currently developed but are zoned that they could be developed. So the project in large part is to preserve a community, limit future expansion and bring the administrative record in line with actual development.

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

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

The subdivision portion of this project is consistent with the proposed zone reclassification and generally consistent with the current zoning. The zone reclassification (and the associated General Plan amendment) portion of the project is to bring the entire project area into a more logical zoning and General Plan designation, both for what is existing and by limiting development of undeveloped portions of the property that have no real need for future development. The project as a whole will help limit possible future environmental impacts when compared to the current zoning.

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

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

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

No, the project is a proposed subdivision and zone reclassification (with the associated General Plan amendment), and is not in an area subject to a natural community or conservation plan.

XI. MINERAL RESOURCES: Would the project:

a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

No, there are no known minerals at the project location.

b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

No, there are no known minerals at the project location.

XII. NOISE: Would the project result in the:

a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

The proposed project will not create additional noise generation at the proposed project location, except possibly at construction of new structures as part of future development, which is already regulated by Inyo County Code. The subdivision portions of this project are already developed and do not anticipate any noise generation. The zone reclassification (and the associated General Plan amendment) portion of the project, will limit the future possibilities of excessive noise levels, by reducing developable land and by reclassifying a current industrial zone to open space.

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

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

No, the proposed project will not create additional noise or vibration generation at the proposed project location.

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

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

No, the project property area is currently mostly developed as Shoshone village. Future ambient noise levels should be comparable to current ambient noise levels. While some infill development is possible, that development is less than is allowed by the current zoning, and should it happen should be in line with current ambient noise levels.

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

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

No, generally the proposed project will not create additional temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels at the proposed project location, except possibly at construction of new structures as part of future development, which is already regulated by Inyo County Code and will be for a limited duration. While some infill development is possible, that development is less than is allowed by the current zoning.

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

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

No, while the project is within two-miles of public/public use airport (immediately to the south), the airport is used minimally, with no support for larger (and louder) air traffic, and the project itself will not increase people's exposure to excessive air traffic noise levels beyond anything that is currently occurring, and will in fact, slightly limit future impacts by reducing possible future development through a net down-zoning of the property.

f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

No, the proposed subdivision will not expose people to new noise generation at the proposed location nor is it in the vicinity of a private airstrip. See comments on 12e for noise from the public use air strip.

XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING -- Would the project:

a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

The subdivision portion of the project will not increase population growth, as the subdivide parcels already have development on them, with no anticipation of future development. While undeveloped portions of the lot could be subject to infill development, that development is currently allowed by the current zoning, and will be reduced by a net downzoning of the project properties.

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

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

No, the proposed project will not displace existing housing or create a situation where replacement housing will be necessary.

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

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

No, the proposed project will not displace people, or create a situation where replacement housing will be necessary.

XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES: Would the project:

a) Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

Fire protection?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

The community of Shoshone is in the Southern Inyo Fire District. No portion of this project anticipates any change in the level of service required. While future infill development could result in more structures, that development is already allowed for and is in fact being reduced by the net down-zoning in the zoning portion of this project. The subdivision portion of the project is for already developed land and anticipates no additional development.

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

Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

The community of Shoshone is served by the Inyo County Sheriff. No portion of this project anticipates any change in the level of service required. While future infill development could result in more residents or workers, that development is already allowed for and is in fact being reduced by the net down-zoning in the zoning portion of this project. The subdivision portion of the project is for already developed land and anticipates no additional development.

Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
----------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

The community of Shoshone is served the Death Valley Unified School District, and an elementary school and high school, serving not only Shoshone but the nearby communities is located at Shoshone. No portion of this project anticipates any change in the level of service required. While future infill development could result in more residents or workers, that development is already allowed for and is in fact being reduced by the net down-zoning in the zoning portion of this project. The subdivision portion of the project is for already developed land and anticipates no additional development.

Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

No, the proposed subdivision will not impact County parks. No portion of this project anticipates any change in the level of service required. While future infill development could result in more residents or workers, that development is already allowed for and is in fact being reduced by the net down-zoning in the zoning portion of this project. The subdivision portion of the project is for already developed land and anticipates no additional development.

Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

No, the project will not create a need for additional public services.

XV. RECREATION: Would the project:

a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

No, the proposed project will not increase the use of existing recreational facilities. No portion of this project anticipates any change in the level of service required. While future infill development could result in more residents or workers, that development is already allowed for and is in fact being reduced by the net down-zoning in the zoning portion of this project. The subdivision portion of the project is for already developed land and anticipates no additional development.

b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

No, the proposed project does not include, nor will it cause a need for an increase in parks or other recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment.

XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC -- Would the project:

a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

No, the proposed project will not cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load or capacity of the street system. The primary road is a state highway, with road development based upon through traffic. The minimal (and already allowed) possibility of future development will have negligible impact on a road that's primary use is the through traffic.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

No, the added traffic for future development (which is not directly a part of this project) would be extremely minimal, and would not exceed a level of service standard set by the County.

c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

No, the proposed project will not result in changes to air traffic patterns or increased traffic that could result in substantial safety risks.

d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

No, the proposed project will not require new roads or changes to the current road system. Any future infill development (not directly part of this project, but allowed by the proposed zone reclassification) would not likely bring about hazards either, as the property along the roadway is already largely developed.

e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

No, emergency access would be unchanged by this project.

f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

No, the project will not have an effect on parking capacity. The subdivision portion of the project relates to already developed areas, with existing parking. The zone reclassification (and the associated General Plan amendment) portion of the project will allow for new development (though less than what is already currently allowed), but this development would be subject to review by the Inyo County Planning Department for adequacy of parking.

g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

No, the proposed project will not significantly increase traffic and therefore will not affect public transit, bicycle or pedestrian facilities. Because of the extremely remote nature of the project location few alternative transportation opportunities exist, but those that do would be unchanged by this project.

XVII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:

a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

The project properties were identified by the Twenty-Nine Palms Band of Mission Indians as being 1.5 miles from an existing culturally sensitive site, as well as being located within the Chemehuevi Traditional Use Area (TUA). The project will have no direct impact on these potential archaeological and cultural resources, as it is a subdivision of existing developed areas, as well as a general net-down zoning of the project properties as part of the zone reclassification (and the associated General Plan amendment). While the project does not directly propose new development, development is allowed by the proposed zoning. However, the proposed zone reclassification will actually reduce potential future land available for development from current zoning, so this should provide for a reduced possibility of conflict with any as yet unidentified cultural resource. The owner of the property, Ms. Susan Sorrells, has

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

been involved in the preservation of archaeological and cultural resources in the area and should resources be discovered on the project properties, she is committed to preserving those resources. In large part, most development is limited to already disturbed areas (undisturbed areas are very limited by both current and proposed zoning for significant future development). But, while no development is anticipated directly from this project, future development should be mindful of the potential for archaeological cultural resources. A condition of approval for this project will be the creation of an inadvertent discovery plan. This plan will include the distribution of a form for any contractor or workman doing site work that explains what to do upon the discovery of an archaeological or cultural resource.

b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.

See XVII a)

XVIII UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS --

Would the project:

a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?

No, the proposed project will not cause changes to wastewater treatment requirements. Future development would be required to have septic systems that would not affect wastewater treatment.

b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

No, the proposed project will not require additional water or wastewater treatment facilities. While it is possible that some level of future development could require expansion of the current water system, that development is currently allowed and is actually being limited by the zone reclassification portion of this project. Wastewater is currently handled by septic systems and any new development will have to install an Inyo County Environmental Health Department permitted septic system .

c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

No, the proposed project will not require new or the expansion of current storm water drainage facilities. Because of the limited development and relatively arid climate little storm infrastructure currently exists. Individual future development projects may be required to contain storm water at the site of development, but this would be part of a grading and drainage plan as part of the Inyo County permitting process for that particular project. Again, this is unchanged by this project, which does not directly anticipate any development and future development potential is being reduced compared to current zoning.

d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?

While the project does not directly anticipate development, even possible future development (which is limited to less than is currently allowed by the current zoning), can be served by the existing entitlements and resources. This is a very small community in a very sparsely populated area, where the resources per person or more than adequate.

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

e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

No, the proposed project area will not require services from a wastewater provider. Future development would be required to have individual septic systems approved by the County's Department of Environmental Health.

f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

The proposed property will not require changes to the current solid waste capacity to accommodate it.

g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

The proposed project and any future development will comply with the related solid waste requirements.

XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE:

a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

No, the project does not have the impact to degrade the quality of the environment, because the project has a subdivision portion, that is only subdividing off portions of developed and disturbed land, and a zone reclassification portion (with the associated General Plan amendment), that is actually including a net-down zoning, removing more impactful uses, and increasing the amount of area designated as open space. The net effect of this project should be positive relative to potential degradation. However, while currently allowed, and not directly anticipated by this project, the project continues to allow for future development of the site in compliance with Inyo County zoning. That potential future development does have some potential for conflict with an endangered species identified on the site and with the possibility of cultural resources, as the site lies 1.5 miles from a culturally sensitive site and within the Chemehuevi Traditional Use Area. Refer to items 4 a) for more information on the potentially impacted biological resource and the associated mitigation, and items 5 b) and 17 a) for more information on the tribal cultural resource and the mitigation procedures should any on site resources be discovered.

b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

No, the proposed project and any future development is small and limited in scope and the area is one of slow to no growth.

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

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

No, the proposed project and any future development will be small in scope and will not cause direct or indirect adverse effects on human beings.