

# A DRAFT NEGATIVE DECLARATION



## CITY OF BISHOP DRAFT 2014 HOUSING ELEMENT UPDATE

### LEAD AGENCY:

City of Bishop  
377 West Line Street  
Bishop, CA 93514

In accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act the City of Bishop has conducted an Initial Study to determine whether the draft 2014 Housing Element may have a significant adverse effect on the environment and on the basis of that study hereby finds:

- ◆ The proposed project could not have a significant effect on the environment, and a Negative Declaration will be prepared.

### Project:

*Title: City of Bishop 2014 Housing Element Update*  
*Description: This 2014 Housing Element Update identifies programs, policies and actions that the City of Bishop can implement to achieve the goals and policies established in the General Plan and the regional housing allocation needs identified by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD).*  
*Proponent: The City of Bishop*  
*Address: Post Office Box 1236, 377 West Line Street, Bishop, CA 93515*  
*Contact: Gary Schley, Public Services Officer, 760-873-8458*

### Notice:

This document is provided for review by the general public. This is an information document about environmental effects associated with approval and implementation of the 2014 Housing Element Update. The decision-making body will review this document before considering the project. If you have comments on the adequacy of this document or the finding that this project will not have a significant adverse impact on the environment, please send your comments by mail or email to:

City of Bishop  
P.O. Box 1236  
Bishop, CA 93515  
publicworks@ca-bishop.us  
Contact: Gary Schley (760) 873-8458

Comments will be received for a 30-day period, through March 3, 2014, and public input will be encouraged throughout the public hearing process as well. Final action on this environmental determination will occur after the public hearing process, in conjunction with adoption of the proposed Housing Element.

## **Project Description**

The proposed project is a comprehensive update of the Housing Element of the General Plan for the City of Bishop. The update includes revisions to the prior Housing Element Update, prepared in 2009, in accordance with California law. Article 10.6 of the Government Code, enacted in 1981 and commonly referred to as the Roos Bill, describes the content requirements of local housing elements. The legislation requires local housing elements to include an assessment of housing needs, an inventory of resources and constraints, a statement of goals, policies and objectives and a five year housing program.

The current 2014 Housing Element Update contains no significant changes to the prior 2009 Housing Element. The update focuses on ways in which the City can continue to support goals that were set forth in 2009. Then, as now, the majority of vacant land in the City of Bishop planning area is controlled by the City of Los Angeles Department of Water and Power. Reflecting a priority on water conservation, Los Angeles DWP has adopted very restrictive growth policies that sharply limit the potential for new development in Bishop. However, the City has an ongoing, productive relationship with Los Angeles DWP that has facilitated the achievement of key goals and objectives, including the need for housing that responds to a broad spectrum of income levels. Cooperation between the City of Bishop and the City of Los Angeles will continue to be very important to the success of the City's Housing Element.

## **Project Location**

The City of Bishop is a scenic community located on the eastern slopes of the Sierra Nevada mountains in the northernmost part of Inyo County. The City is situated at the junction of U. S. 6 and U. S. 395, which is a major source of tourist and recreation traffic for Bishop. Bishop is the only incorporated City in Inyo County, and is located approximately 275 miles north of San Bernardino and 35 miles southeast of the Town of Mammoth Lakes.

## **Planning context:**

The Housing Element is one of seven required elements that are included in the City of Bishop General Plan. Residential land uses identified in the Land Use Element provide the primary basis for identification of adequate residential sites in the Housing Element.

The purpose of the Housing Element is to assess local housing problems and to identify measures necessary to mitigate and alleviate these needs and problems for all economic segments of the community. Additionally, the Housing Element sets forth the City's plan to accommodate the regional housing needs identified by the California Housing and Community Development Department (HCD). To this end, the Housing Element Update provides information according to four principal topics:

- ◆ Progress under Previous Housing Elements
- ◆ Housing Needs Assessment
- ◆ Inventory of Resources and Constraints
- ◆ Goals, Policies and Actions

Housing Element were mandated by legislation enacted in 1967. In 1977, "Housing Element Guidelines" were published by the Department of Housing and Community Development. The Guidelines outline the content requirements of housing elements, and give HCD authority for review and comment on local housing elements. The legislation also requires an update of the housing element every five years. The 2009 Housing Element Update complies with Article 10.6 of the Government Code. After adoption of this update by the Bishop City Council, a revised element will be prepared in five years. As with each 5-year update, the next Bishop Housing Element will address the progress made on achieving the goals and objectives stated in the previous Housing Element. The current housing Element update has been widely published in Bishop to notify concerned and interested agencies and citizens about the process and invite comment and participation..

## **Related Studies and Documents:**

The current Housing Element Update is based upon the land use plans and policies set forth in the City of Bishop General Plan Land Use Element prepared in 1992, and more specifically on the housing goals and objectives expressed in the 2009 City of Bishop Housing Element. The update also draws upon information provided in the draft Regional Housing Need Assessment prepared by HCD for the period from January 1, 2013 through June 30, 2019. There are no other studies, projects or documents that are directly related to the 2014 Housing Element Update or to this Initial Study and proposed Negative Declaration.

**ENVIRONMENTAL INITIAL STUDY**

	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
--	---------------------------------------	--	-------------------------------------	------------------

**I. AESTHETICS** -- Would the project:

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

**DISCUSSION OF AESTHETICS:** The 2014 Housing Element update contains recommendations for development of new housing, replacement and rehabilitation of existing units. It also recommends a wide range of policies and programs that would support long term development of additional housing resources. Although the project does not involve a specific proposal and is a policy level document, housing improvements or rehabilitation present a potential new source of light, changes to historical resources and landscape. The nature and extent of these changes will depend largely on specific details associated with each project as developed, and on the City’s success in achieving the goals identified in the Update. Impacts associated with individual projects will be evaluated at the time that proposals are reviewed by the City. At a policy level, however, the potential impact of the Housing Element Update on the environmental resources will be less than significant.

**II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES:** In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:

- |  |  |  |  |   |
|--|--|--|--|---|
| a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? |  |  |  | ◆ |
| b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?   |  |  |  | ◆ |
| c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?  |  |  |  | ◆ |

**DISCUSSION OF AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES:** Although agricultural activities are found throughout the Owens Valley, including areas adjacent to Bishop, The City’s General Plan does not incorporate agriculture into the adopted Land Use Plan. Implementation of the Housing Element would therefore not have the potential to impact existing farming activities, nor would it conflict with City policy concerning conservation of agricultural lands.

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?   |  | ◆ |   |
| b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?  |  |   | ◆ |
| c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? |  |   | ◆ |
| d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?  |  |   | ◆ |
| e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?   |  |   | ◆ |

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

**IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES** -- Would the project:

- |  |  |   |  |
|--|--|---|--|
| a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? |  | ◆ |  |
| b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?   |  | ◆ |  |
| c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?   |  | ◆ |  |

<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
---	--	---	----------------------

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?



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



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



**DISCUSSION OF BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES:** As a planning document, the Housing Element would not in itself result in impacts to biological resources. However, there is the potential that future development projects and actions associated with the proposed Housing Element may result in significant impacts to biological resources. Implementation of the actions outlined in the Housing Element will require subsequent discretionary approvals and environmental review pursuant to CEQA, at which time project-specific impacts related to biological resources can be more specifically defined and site-specific mitigation measures can be identified to reduce those impacts. Because the project is a policy level document and future discretionary projects would be reviewed on a project-specific basis consistent with CEQA and the City's General Plan, the 2014 Housing Element update would not have a significant environmental impact to biological resources.

**V. CULTURAL RESOURCES** -- Would the project:

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



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



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



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



**DISCUSSION OF CULTURAL RESOURCES:** The City of Bishop has a long and rich cultural heritage. The Conservation/Open Space Element of the General Plan indicates that human occupation in the region is thought to date back to 1000 AD, and the Bishop area was one of the principal Paiute settlements due to the overall productivity of local water and soil resources. As a result of this history, the entire planning area is considered to be sensitive for archaeological, paleontological and historic resources. The prevalence of sensitive cultural resources indicates that any land development, including that needed to achieve Housing Element goals, has the potential for significant adverse effects. The General Plan contains site specific guidelines for preservation and recordation of cultural resources in tandem with the processing and review of all development proposals submitted to the City. Given these existing planning requirements, the impact on cultural resources of adopting this update is considered to be less than significant.

**VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS** -- Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.			◆	
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?			◆	
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?				◆
v) Landslides?				◆
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?				◆
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?			◆	
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?			◆	
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?				◆

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

**VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS**

Would the project:

a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?				◆
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?				◆
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				◆

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

d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

◆

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

◆

f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

◆

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

◆

h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

◆

**DISCUSSION OF HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS:** A search of the EPA database indicates that there are no Class I hazardous waste disposal sites in the area, nor are there major waste generators in the City as a whole. None of the types of land uses proposed in the 2014 Housing Element Update is associated with transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials, or unusual fire hazard, or potential disruption to emergency response procedures or plans, and implementation of the proposed goals and objectives would not be expected to result in any hazards to the public. Approval and implementation of the Housing Element Update would not be significant with respect to hazards and hazardous materials.

**VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY --**

Would the project:

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?

◆

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

◆

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

◆

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



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



f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?



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



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



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



**DISCUSSION OF HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY:** The City uses a stormwater collection system, in conjunction with the natural creek drainage system, to manage run-off. For Bishop, the only area that FEMA has identified as being within the 100-year flood plain are areas along the south fork of Bishop Creek and the Bishop Creek Canal which is located along the northeast and east City limit. Another source of potential flooding is related to dam inundation from a number of dams located west of Bishop in the Sierra Nevada Bishop Creek drainage. Flooding would only occur in the unlikely event that the dams failed, and would affect those areas downstream from the dams. Additionally, The Bishop Public Works Department is actively maintaining and improving its water and sewer systems by re-constructing water storage tanks, pump stations, fire hydrants, main distribution lines and sewer plant improvements. Because of mandatory federal and state water quality requirements, the City's maintenance and improvement efforts, and because the proposal is a policy level document, the 2014 Housing Element would not have a significant hydrological or water quality impact to the community.

**IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING** - Would the project:

a) Physically divide an established community?



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



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



**DISCUSSION OF LAND USE AND PLANNING:** The recommendation and goals outlined in the 2014 Housing Element Update are based upon and consistent with the land uses described in the City's General Plan Land Use Element. However, the Housing Element does make several recommendations that could impact area land uses. If implemented these recommendation would require subsequent project level review by the City including CEQA documentation to assess potential impacts. At the current policy level of review, approval and implementation of the Housing Element would not impact land uses or the underlying planning goals and policies of the City of Bishop.

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

**X. MINERAL RESOURCES** - Would the project:

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



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



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

**XI. NOISE** B Would the project result in:

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



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



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



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



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



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



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

**Potentially Significant Impact**

**Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation**

**Less Than Significant Impact**

**No Impact**

**XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING** Would the project:

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



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



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



DISCUSSION OF POPULATION AND HOUSING: The purpose of the Housing Element is to identify local housing problems and to identify measures necessary to mitigate and alleviate these needs and problems for all economic segments of the community. Because the City of Bishop is limited in its ability to accommodate housing demand due to the scarcity of available land, there is no risk of growth inducement; instead, the Housing Element goals are intended to accommodate housing needs to the extent possible. Replacement housing is among the goals identified in the Housing Element. The replacement goal is site specific, applying only to parcels found to be unsafe for occupancy. This represents a very small portion of the overall program: only 6 homes were rated as dilapidated during the August 2013 housing survey. The City's objective is for the units to be situated on the same site as the dilapidated units they replace. None of the Housing Element programs have the potential to cause displacement of substantial number of housing units or residents.

**XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES**

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

Fire protection?



Police protection?



Schools?



Parks?



Other public facilities?



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

**Potentially  
Significant  
Impact**

**Less Than  
Significant  
with Mitigation  
Incorporation**

**Less Than  
Significant  
Impact**

**No  
Impact**

**XIV. RECREATION**

a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?



b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?



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

**XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC** -- Would the project:

a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?



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



c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?



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



e) Result in inadequate emergency access?



f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?



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



**DISCUSSION OF TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC:** The draft Housing Element contains goals, policies and actions rather than specific projects. Specific projects will have subsequent review for their cumulative impact on the City's circulation system. Therefore, the draft Mobility Element will not result in adverse impacts associated with transportation and traffic.

**XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS**

Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?				◆
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				◆
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?			◆	
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?				◆
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the projects projected demand in addition to the providers existing commitments?				◆
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the projects solid waste disposal needs?				◆
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				◆

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

**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,				◆
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)?				◆

**Potentially  
Significant  
Impact**

**Less Than  
Significant  
with  
Mitigation  
Incorporation**

**Less Than  
Significant  
Impact**

**No  
Impact**



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

**DISCUSSION OF MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE:** The 2014 Housing Element can be adopted and implemented by the City of Bishop without significant impacts to the environment. The entire record of information provided in this Initial Study indicates that there would be no significant cumulative impacts, or substantial adverse impacts on human beings, or substantial adverse impacts on fish or wildlife or sensitive species or cultural resources.