



# CITY OF BISHOP

377 West Line Street - Bishop, California 93514  
P. O. Box 1236 - Bishop, California 93515  
City Hall 760-873-5863 Public Works 760-873-8458  
Fax 760-873-4873

## **Draft Negative Declaration of Environmental Impact**

**Date:** November 4, 2011

**Subject:** Owensville R/C Racing proposed Race Track

**Project Title:** Environmental Review / Radio Controlled Race Track

**Project Proponent:** City of Bishop  
P.O. Box 1236  
Bishop, CA 93515

**Project Location:** City of Bishop Park

**Project Description:** This Draft Negative Declaration and Initial Study concerns a request by Owensville R/C Racing to construct a race track to accommodate radio controlled vehicles within the Bishop City Park. The proposed project site is an approximate half acre area located southwest of the intersection of Hanby and Spruce Streets. The proposal includes an oval and road course track which will be sprinkler irrigated to control potential dust and provide earth berms to absorb potential track noise.

**Proposed Findings:** The Initial Study finds that the proposed project would not have a significant adverse impact on the environment for the following reasons:

- The 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. No significant adverse impacts are foreseen, and no mitigation measures are required.

The City of Bishop has determined that the project could not have a significant effect on the environment, and a Negative Declaration will be prepared. This Initial Study has been prepared to generally describe the proposed project and solicit input from agencies and the public regarding the scope of the proposed project.

The review period for this Draft Negative Declaration expires: December 10, 2011.

---

Keith Caldwell, Director of Planning

November 4, 2011

;;

**City of Bishop  
Environmental Initial Study**

1. Project title: *Environmental Review / Radio Controlled RaceTrack*
2. Lead agency name and address: *City of Bishop  
377 W. Line Street  
Bishop, Ca 93514*
3. Contact person and phone number: *Keith Caldwell 760/873-586*
4. Project location: *City of Bishop Park  
Intersection of Hanby and Spruce Streets  
Bishop, CA 93514*
5. Project sponsor's name and address: *Owensville R/C Racing  
202 Meadow Ln.  
Bishop, CA 93514*
6. General plan designation: *Open Space District*
7. Zoning: *O-S*
8. Description of project: (Describe the whole action involved, including but not limited to later phases of the project, and any secondary, support, or off-site features necessary for its implementation. Attach additional sheets if necessary.)  
*This Initial Study concerns a request by Owensville R/C Racing to construct a race track to accommodate radio controlled vehicles within the Bishop City Park. The proposed project site is an approximate half acre area located southwest of the intersection of Hanby and Spruce Streets. The proposal includes an oval and road course track which will be sprinkler irrigated to control potential dust and provide earth berms to absorb potential track noise.*
9. Surrounding land uses and setting: Briefly describe the project's surroundings:  
*The proposed project will be located at the eastern edge of the City of Bishop Park which is an O-S Zoning District (Open Space). The adjacent areas to the north, south and west are zoned Open Space and beyond the open space area are residential zoned areas. East of the proposed project area the border of the City limits and Inyo County. InyoCounty zoning designation for the adjacent area is RMH (Residential Medium-High Density) and beyond that area is an A Zoning District(Agricultural).*
10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement.)  
*N/A*

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.

|                               |                                    |                        |
|-------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------|
| Aesthetics                    | Agriculture Resources              | Air Quality            |
| Biological Resources          | Cultural Resources                 | Geology /Soils         |
| Hazards & Hazardous Materials | Hydrology / Water Quality          | Land Use / Planning    |
| Mineral Resources             | Noise                              | Population / Housing   |
| Public Services               | Recreation                         | Transportation/Traffic |
| Utilities / Service Systems   | Mandatory Findings of Significance |                        |

DETERMINATION:

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.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature Keith Caldwell – Director of Planning Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature Date

Issues:

|  | 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?<br><i>The project site is currently a graded dirt area used as a construction laydown yard and Park refuse area. The project will not affect scenic vista.</i>   |                                |   |                              | ◆         |
| b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?<br><i>There are no scenic resources on the proposed project site, therefore will not substantially damage any scenic resources.</i> |                                |   |                              | ◆         |
| c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?<br><i>The proposed project improvements will not have an adverse impact on the existing visual character or the quality of the site and its surroundings.</i>                            |                                |   |                              | ◆         |
| d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?<br><i>The project will not create any source of light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views.</i>   |                                |   |                              | ◆         |
| II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES: In determining whether impacts to agricultural  |                                |   |                              |           |

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

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?



*The project is not located on prime or unique farmland or farmland of statewide importance, therefore, no impact.*

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



*The project is located on non-agricultural land located within the City of Bishop.*

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?



*This project site is a non-agricultural use.*

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?



*The project proponent must comply with all applicable Great Basin Air Pollution Control District regulations. By implementing these measures, this potential impact will be reduced to a less than significant level.*

*The proposed project will provide a race track sprinkler irrigation system to control air quality*

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

*and dust in the project vicinity.*

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



*With the above measures implemented the proposed project will not cause a significant impact on air quality.*

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)?



*This project will not increase any criteria pollutant; therefore, will have no impact on air quality.*

d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?



*By implementing the above measures for controlling race track dust, this project will have no impact on any sensitive receptors.*

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



*This project will not create any objectionable odors, therefore, has 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?



*The project location is a previously disturbed area used as a construction lay down area, completely void of native vegetation, therefore, will not affect any sensitive species or their habitat.*

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

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

*The project location is a previously disturbed area used as a construction lay down area, containing no riparian habitat or other natural sensitive community.*



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?

*The project location is a previously disturbed area used as a construction lay down area, containing no wetlands.*



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?

*The project location is a previously disturbed area that will not interfere with native residents, migratory fish or wildlife movement, migration, or nursery habitat.*



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

*The project will not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources.*



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?

*The project will not conflict with any local, regional or state habitat conservation plan.*



V. CULTURAL RESOURCES -- Would the

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

project:

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

*No historical resources have been found on the project site.*



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

*No archaeological resources have been found on the project site.*



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

*The project will not destroy any unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature.*



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

*No human remains have been discovered, nor are any expected to exist on this project site.*



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.

*There is no evidence of an earthquake fault on this site according to Alquist- Priolo Special Studies Zones, SW 1/4 Bishop Quadrangle Official Map.*



ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?

*Strong seismic ground shaking is a possible at this site. The project is not proposing the construction*



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

*of any structures that would be affected by the possibility of strong seismic ground shaking, therefore, having no impact.*

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

*No Impact*



iv) Landslides?

*The project site is a flat graded lot with the adjacent area within 2 to 3 miles being relatively flat; therefore, the potential to landslides has no impact.*



b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

*The project site is a flat graded area. The development of the proposed project will have no adverse impact.*



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?

*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?

*The development of this site will not create a substantial risk to life or property due to soil stability.*



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?

*No impact.*



**VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS B** Would the project:

a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the

|   | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|
| <p>environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?</p> <p><i>The proposed project will not be transporting or using hazardous materials, therefore have no impact to the public or the environment.</i></p>   |                                |   |                              | ◆         |
| <p>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?</p> <p><i>The project will not be releasing hazardous materials into the environment therefore will have no impact to the public or environment.</i></p>   |                                |   |                              | ◆         |
| <p>c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?</p> <p><i>There is a school within a 1/4 mile of the project site. The proposed project will not emit hazardous materials, substances or waste; therefore have no adverse impact to existing or proposed schools.</i></p>  |                                |   |                              | ◆         |
| <p>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?</p> <p><i>This project site is not located on a list of hazardous material sites.</i></p>   |                                |   |                              | ◆         |
| <p>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?</p> <p><i>This project is within one mile of the Bishop airport and is close to the normal traffic pattern for Runway 30. The project development and will not significantly increase hazard.</i></p> |                                |   |                              | ◆         |
| <p>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?</p>  |                                |   |                              | ◆         |

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

*There is no private airstrip in the project area.*

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

*The project will not have an adverse impact with any emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.*



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

*The proposed project will require continued brush cleanup and site maintenance for control of potential fire hazards. The potential for a wild land fire will have a less than significant impact.*



VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY --  
Would the project:

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

*The project site will be a pervious surface with no retention of any drainage, therefore have no impact to water quality standards.*



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)?

*The proposed project will not require water service or deplete the groundwater table level. Having no impact on the aquifer.*



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?



|  | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|
| <i>This project will not alter any drainage pattern, course of a stream or river or cause any substantial erosion.</i>   |                                |   |                              |           |
| 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?<br><i>The project will not alter the course of a stream or river, or increase surface runoff which would result in flooding on or off site, therefore, having no impact to existing drainage patterns.</i> |                                |   |                              | ◆         |
| e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?<br><i>The project will not create runoff water or any additional sources of polluted runoff.</i>  |                                |   |                              | ◆         |
| f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?<br><i>No Impact.</i>   |                                |   |                              | ◆         |
| 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?<br><i>The project site is not within a 100-year flood hazard area (Flood Insurance Rate Map Panel #060074 0001 June 19, 1985), therefore, will have no adverse impact.</i>  |                                |   |                              | ◆         |
| h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?<br><i>The project site is not within a 100-year flood hazard area, therefore, will have no adverse impact.</i>   |                                |   |                              | ◆         |
| 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?   |                                |   | ◆                            |           |

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

*Flooding due to a dam failure at this project site is a possibility according to the inundation maps prepared by Southern California Edison Co. This possibility is so remote it is considered a less than significant impact.*

j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?  
*This project site is not subject to seiche, tsunami, or mudflow, therefore will have no adverse impact.*



IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING - Would the project:

a) Physically divide an established community?  
*As the project is designed it will not 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?  
*The proposed project will be required to comply with Bishop planning and zoning ordinances therefore will not conflict any applicable land use plan, policy or regulation.*



c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?  
*This project will not conflict with any conservation plan or community conservation plan.*



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?  
*No mineral resources exist on this site.*



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



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

use plan?

*No mineral resources exist on this site.*

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?



*The proposed project has the potential to increase noise above established noise levels and applicable standards, therefore, the project will provide earth berms in strategic areas around the track to absorb noise created by the radio controlled cars and limit track use to hours in compliance with Bishop Municipal Code Chapter 8.12. With these measures implemented periodic increase in noise levels are reduced to less than significant level.*

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



*This project will not create ground borne noise or vibration for any period of time to be considered an adverse impact.*

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



*The proposed project performed a decibel reading survey of several noise generating vehicles, including radio controlled cars, lawnmowers, motorcycles and passenger cars. At one hundred feet away a radio controlled car has an equivalent decibel reading as a moving passenger car recorded at the edge of the street. A lawnmower and motorcycle have a higher decibel reading than a radio controlled car. It's concluded the R/C track will have no more increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity than the existing street in the area. Therefore, will not have a less than significant impact on vicinity noise.*

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

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

*The proposed project has the potential to increase ambient noise above existing noise levels in the vicinity. The project will provide earth berms in strategic areas around the track to absorb noise created by the radio controlled cars and limit track use to hours in compliance with Bishop Municipal Code Chapter 8.12. With these measures implemented periodic increase in noise levels are reduced to less than significant level.*



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?

*This project is within one mile of the Bishop airport and is close to the normal traffic pattern for Runway 30. The project will not increase exposure to airport-related noise.*



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?

*The project is not near a private airstrip.*



**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)?

*The proposed project will not have an adverse impact by creating substantial growth in the area either directly or indirectly.*



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



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

*The proposed project will not displace any existing housing therefore have no impact to housing.*

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



*The proposed project will not displace substantial numbers of people therefore will have no impact on housing or population.*

**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?

*The proposed project will not impact fire protection services.*



Police protection?

*The proposed project will not significantly impact the City of Bishop Police Department.*



Schools?

*The proposed project will not have an adverse impact to the school aged population of the area.*



Parks?

*This project will not have an adverse impact on the city's parks.*



Other public facilities?

*The proposed project will have no impact to public facilities.*



**XIV. RECREATION --**

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

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?

*The proposed project will not accelerate deterioration of the existing neighborhood or park facility therefore have no impact.*



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?

*The project will not require the addition of any additional recreational facilities.*



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)?

*The proposed project will not cause a substantial increase in traffic to the existing traffic load; therefore, will have no impact on traffic conditions.*



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

*The proposed project will not cause a substantial increase in traffic to the existing traffic load; therefore, will have no impact on traffic conditions.*



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

*The proposed project will not create a change in*



|   | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|
| <i>air traffic patterns or an increase in air traffic levels.</i>   |                                |   |                              |           |
| d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?<br><i>The proposed project will not increase traffic hazards due to proposed design features. No impact.</i>   |                                |   |                              | ◆         |
| e) Result in inadequate emergency access?<br><i>The project will not interfere with any emergency response or emergency access.</i>   |                                |   |                              | ◆         |
| f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?<br><i>No impact</i>   |                                |   |                              | ◆         |
| g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?<br><i>This project will have no conflict with alternative transportation programs.</i>   |                                |   |                              | ◆         |
| <b>XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS B</b>   |                                |   |                              |           |
| Would the project:  |                                |   |                              |           |
| a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?<br><i>The project will not require the use of a waste water treatment, therefore have no impact.</i>  |                                |   |                              | ◆         |
| 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?<br><i>The project will not require the use of a waste water treatment, therefore have no impact...</i> |                                |   |                              | ◆         |
| c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could  |                                |   |                              | ◆         |

|  | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|
| cause significant environmental effects?<br><i>The project will not require expansion or construction of a storm water drainage facility.</i>  |                                |   |                              |           |
| d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?<br><i>The project will have sufficient water supplies available; therefore have no impact on existing water resources.</i>  |                                |   |                              | ◆         |
| 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?<br><i>The project will not require wastewater treatment services. Therefore, will have no impact on the wastewater treatment facility.</i>   |                                |   |                              | ◆         |
| f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project=s solid waste disposal needs?<br><i>Inyo County Sunland Landfill has adequate solid waste capacity for the proposed property.</i>   |                                |   |                              | ◆         |
| g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?<br><i>The project will comply with all federal, state and local statutes and regulation related to solid waste.</i>  |                                |   |                              | ◆         |
| <b>XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE --</b>   |                                |   |                              |           |
| 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 |                                |   |                              | ◆         |

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

California history or prehistory?

*The proposed project does not have the potential to degrade or reduce habitat of fish, plant or animal communities or eliminate periods of history.*

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)?

*The potential impacts are not cumulatively considerable to effect past, current, or future projects.*



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

*This project does not have any environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.*



City of Bishop

**Environmental Information Form**  
(To be completed by applicant)

Date Filed \_\_\_\_\_

**General Information**

1. Name and address of developer or project sponsor:

Owensville R/c Racing 202 Meadow Ln. Bishop Ca.

2. Name and address of property owner, if different:

City of Bishop 377 W. Line St. Bishop, Ca. 93514

3. Project address and assessor parcel number:

City Park corner of Spruce and Hanby St.

4. Name, address and telephone number of person to be contacted concerning this project:

Samuel E. Vargas 202 Meadow Ln, Bishop, Ca (760) 937-2403

5. List known permits and other public approvals required for this project, including those required by City, regional, state and federal agencies:

None

6. Existing zone district:

Open Space

7. Present use of site:

laydown yard and Park Refuse area

8. Proposed use of site:

Radio Controlled Racing tracks

**Project Description**

9. Size of site in acres or square feet:

180' x 120' = 21,600 sq. ft.

10. Number of stories:

N/A

11. Amount of existing off-street parking:

City Park existing parking

12. Proposed project schedule:

N/A

13. Associated projects:

N/A

14. Anticipated project stages or incremental development if not to be built all at once:

Irrigation system, building of tracks, building of racing platform (pactium)

15. Number of proposed residential units, sizes, sale prices or rents, and types of households:

N/A

16. Type and square feet including loading facilities for proposed commercial:

N/A

17. Type, employment per shift, square feet including loading facilities for proposed industrial:

N/A

18. Major function, employment per shift, occupancy, square feet including loading facilities, and community benefits provided by project for proposed institutional:

Conduct R.C. races (scheduled and non-scheduled), general public use

19. If the project involves a variance, conditional use or rezoning application, state this and indicate clearly why the application is required.

None

Are the following items applicable to the project or its effects? Discuss below all items marked "Yes" and attach additional sheets as necessary.

- Yes  No 20. Change in existing features of any streams, lakes or hills, or contours.
- Yes  No 21. Change in scenic views or vistas from existing residential areas or public lands or roads.
- Yes  No 22. Change in pattern, scale or character of general area of project.
- Yes  No 23. Produce a significant amount of solid waste or litter.
- Yes No 24. Change in dust, ash, smoke, fumes or odors in vicinity.
- Yes  No 25. Change in lake, stream or ground water quality or quantity, or alteration of existing drainage patterns.
- Yes  No 26. Change in existing noise or vibration levels in the vicinity.
- Yes  No 27. Site on filled land or on slope of 10% or more.
- Yes  No 28. Use of disposal of potentially hazardous materials, such as toxic substances, flammables or explosives.
- Yes  No 29. Change in demand for municipal services (police, fire, water, sewage for example).
- Yes  No 30. Increased fossil fuel consumption (electricity, oil, natural gas for example).
- Yes No 31. Relationship to a larger project or series of projects.

### Environmental Setting

32. On a separate sheet describe the project site as it exists before the project, including information on topography, soil stability, plants and animals, and any cultural, historical or scenic aspects. Describe any existing structures on the site, and the use of the structures. Attach photographs of the site.

33. On a separate sheet describe the surrounding properties, including information on plants and animals and any cultural, historical or scenic aspects. Indicate the type of land use (residential, commercial, etc.), intensity of land use (one-family, apartment house, shops, department stores, etc.) and scale of development, (height, frontage, set-back, rear yard, etc.). Attach photographs of the vicinity. Snapshots or Polaroid photos will be accepted.

**CERTIFICATION:** I hereby certify that the statements furnished above and in the attached exhibits present the data and information required for this initial evaluation to the best of my ability, and that the facts, statements, and information presented are true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief.

Samuel E. Vargas  
Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

SAMUEL E. VARGAS  
Name

-----  
**This Section For City Use**

Filing Fee:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Receipt/application number:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Accepted for processing (signature and date):

\_\_\_\_\_  
Staff action:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Planning Commission Action:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Remarks  
\_\_\_\_\_

Hanby Avenue

South Park of Bishop Creek

Senior Center

508

Spruce Street

earth berm barrier

pole barrier

fence

earth berm barrier

180 ft. x 120 ft track area  
dust control provided by sprinkler irrigation



RC Track in Bishop City Park  
June 26 2011  
Environmental Setting  
Attachment to  
Environmental Review

Environmental Setting  
Item number 32.

A. Describe project site as it exists before project:

- a) **Topography:** No distinctive land features on the proposed designated area.
- b) **Soil Stability:** The soil stability is disturbed and pre-compacted.
- c) **Plants and animals:** No visible animals. Plants are tumble weeds and scattered salt grass.
- d) **Cultural, historical or scenic aspects:** No known cultural, historical, or scenic aspects.
- e) **Existing structures on the site and the use of the structures:** No existing structures on the site.
- f) **Attached photographs of the site:** Attached.

Environmental Setting  
Item number 33.

B. Describe the surrounding properties:

- a) **Plants and animals:** South East View: fields, trees, various birds and animals. Eastern View: open fields. Western View: Bishop City Park. Northern View: trees and fields. Southern View: housing.
- b) **Cultural, historical or scenic aspects:** White Mountains Eastern View
- c) **Indicate the type of land use (residential, commercial, etc.):** Southern area is residential and Western Area is Bishop City Park intended for public recreational use by tourist and bishop residents.
- d) **Intensity of land use (one-family, apartment house, shops, department stores, etc.):** Same as stated above in section (c).
- e) **Scale of development (height, frontage, set-back, rear yard, etc.):** does not apply.
- f) **Attached photographs of the vicinity:** photographs attached.

Item number 14 on page 2 of 4:

Anticipated project stages or incremental development if not built all at once:

| Stage | Project                                    | Timeline |
|-------|--|----------|
| 1     | Irrigation System                          | Pending  |
| 2     | Building of Tracks                         | Pending  |
| 3     | Building of Racing Platform (Podium)       | Pending  |
| 4     | Building of Sound Barrier                  | Pending  |
| 5     | Park and Owensville R.C. Club Rules (Sign) | Pending  |

**Document Noise Reading**  
**Saturday, September, 17<sup>th</sup> 2011**

Decibel Meter Readings of Nitro Powered Radio Controlled Cars (R.C.)

| Amount of cars tested at one time | Type or Make of car tested  | Engine Type | Location                        | Decibel Meter Readings       |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------|
| 3                                 | 2 Revo (traxxis)            | 3.3         | Directly above cars not moving. | 89.2 Db.                     |
|                                   |                             |             | At 100 feet                     | 64.3 Db.                     |
|                                   | 1 Cen                       | 7.7         |                                 |                              |
| 1                                 | Revo (traxxis)              | 3.3         | 5 ft away                       | 85.0 Db.                     |
|                                   |                             |             | At 100 feet                     | 61.1 Db.                     |
| 1                                 | Craftsman Lawnmower         | 5hp         | Directly above mower            | 94.3 Db.                     |
|                                   |                             |             | At 50 feet                      | 69.4 Db.                     |
| 1                                 | 250 Yamaha Dirt Bike        | 250cc       | Standing Beside Dirt Bike       | 96.6 Db.                     |
|                                   |                             |             | At 50 Feet                      | 72.4 Db.                     |
|                                   |                             |             | At 100 Feet                     | 61.3 Db.                     |
| Numerous Vehicles Driving By site | Passenger cars and pick-ups | unknown     | Standing beside the road        | Varies between 64.5-67.3 Db. |

Meter Readings done by: Samuel E. Vargas and Derrick Lawrence