



# 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:** May 23, 2014

**Subject:** Proposed Recreation Field within the Bishop City Park

**Project Title:** Environmental Review / Recreation Field

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

**Project Location:** City of Bishop Park

**Project Description:** This Initial Study concerns a proposed project between the City of Bishop and Bishop School District to construct an irrigated green area for recreational sports use within the Bishop City Park. The proposed project site is a previously disturbed area which is approximately three acres in size located at the southwest corner of the intersection of Hanby and Spruce Streets.

**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: June 17, 2014.

Gary Schley, Planning Director

May 23, 2014

l.;

**City of Bishop  
Environmental Initial Study**

1. Project title: *Environmental Review / Recreation Field*
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  
South west corner of Hanby and Spruce Streets  
Bishop, CA 93514*
5. Project sponsor's name and address: *City of Bishop and Bishop School District  
377 West Line Street  
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 proposed project between the City of Bishop and Bishop School District to construct an irrigated green area for recreational sports use within the Bishop City Park. The proposed project site is a previously disturbed area which is approximately three acres in size located southwest of the intersection of Hanby and Spruce Streets.*
9. Surrounding land uses and setting: Briefly describe the project's surroundings:  
*The proposed project is located between East Pine Street and Spruce Street, east of North Third Street and west of Hanby Street in the City of Bishop's 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 is the City limit border with Inyo County. Inyo County zoning designation for the adjacent area is RMH (Residential Medium-High Density) and beyond that area is an A Zoning District (Agricultural). The project would be located within a portion of the park that is leased from the City of Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP).*

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.

*Gary Schley*

Signature Gary Schley –Planning Director

05/23/2014

Date

Signature

Date

Issues:

	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
<b>I. AESTHETICS -- Would the project:</b>				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? <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? <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? <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?				◆

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

*The project will not create any source of light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views.*

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?



*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 site is zoned as Open Space located on non-agricultural l 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 would not contribute to the generation*

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

*of significant levels of any air contaminant and would thus not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of any of the plans of the Great Basin Air Pollution Control District.*

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

*The project is not expected to increase any air quality impacts, therefore, have no impact on air quality standards.*



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 could generate some dust from grading activities during construction of the field. Soils would be watered in accordance with GBUAPCD's, which would minimize emissions and therefore reduce any potential significant or cumulative impacts to less than significant levels.*



d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

*By implementing the above measures the project will have no impact on any sensitive receptors.*



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

*The generation of odors during the construction period would be temporary and would tend to be dispersed within a short distance from the active work area, therefore, would 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



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

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?

*A good portion of the project area is a previously disturbed area used as a construction lay down area, the south and southwest edges of the proposed project contain several species of native grasses none of which are identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species, therefore, the project will not affect any sensitive species or their habitat.*

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 which is near the historic dry bed of the south fork of Bishop Creek. The propose recreation field site contains no riparian habitat or other natural sensitive community, therefore will have no impact.*

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. The project would have no impacts on wetlands or waters of the United States as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act.*

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,*



	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<i>migratory fish or wildlife movement, migration, or nursery habitat.</i>				
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? <i>The project will not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources.</i>				◆
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? <i>The project will not conflict with any local, regional or state habitat conservation plan.</i>				◆
<b>V. CULTURAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:</b>				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in '15064.5? <i>The project site is a previously disturbed area from past grading activities and has no known significant historical resource features.</i>				◆
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to '15064.5? <i>No archaeological resources have been found on the project site. If the remote potential of unearthing undiscovered archaeological resources occurs proper notification and best practices will be employed.</i>			◆	
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? <i>Unique paleontological or unique geologic features are not expected in the project area. The project would not impact paleontological resource or unique geologic feature.</i>				◆
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?			◆	

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

*No human remains have been discovered, nor are any expected to exist on this project site. If human remains were unearthed, the Inyo County Coroner would be contacted and disposition of native American remains would comply with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(e) and 43 CFR 10, Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Regulations.*

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 ¼ 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 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?



*The project is not proposing the construction of any structures that would be affected by the possibility of seismic related ground failure, therefore, having 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.*

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?</p> <p><i>The project site is a flat graded area. The development of the proposed project will have no adverse impact.</i></p>				◆
<p>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?</p> <p><i>The project site is not located on an unstable geologic unit The project would be built on an area that likely is comprised of fill material. The project would not cause geologic instability.</i></p>				◆
<p>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?</p> <p><i>The project site soils are not considered to be expansive and are suitable for subgrade. The development of this site will not create a substantial risk to life or property due to soil stability.</i></p>				◆
<p>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?</p> <p><i>The project would not require the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems. No impact.</i></p>				◆
<p>VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS B Would the project:</p>				
<p>a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the 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</p>				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>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 ¼ 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 25. The project development will not significantly increase a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area as a result to the proximity to the airport..</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> <p><i>There is no private airstrip in the project area.</i></p>				◆
<p>g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</p>				◆

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

*The project would not interfere with any emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan, therefore, have no impact.*

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 would be constructed within an open area. The area will be predominantly landscaped and groomed vegetation. The risk of starting a wildfire on the project site will be minimal.*

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)?



*Recreation fields typically use a large amount of irrigation water. Since this area is not irrigated now, the irrigation water used on this field will be an increase to water pumped by the City of Bishop wells. Groundwater sources appear to be adequate for this additional demand, therefore will have a less than significant 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
--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

*The project design provides a swale along the fields north and east perimeter which directs field drainage toward historic drainage. Therefore the project will not alter any drainage pattern, course of a stream or river or cause any substantial erosion.*

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?



*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.*

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?



*The project will not create runoff water or any additional sources of polluted runoff.*

f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?



*The project would not degrade water quality or serve as a source of potential pollutants to local waterways, or impact ground water.*

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?



*The project site is not within a 100-year flood hazard area (FEMA 2009), therefore, will have no adverse impact.*

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



*The project site is not within a 100-year flood zone (FEMA 2009), therefore, will have no adverse impact.*

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

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?



*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. The proposed project would also not influence or cause any flooding events.*

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?

*The project would result in a positive effect on the 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 is located in designated Parks and open space land use and zoned as Open Space (O-S). All proposed improvements are consistent with existing land use and zoning for the area. 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. No conflicts are expected to occur.*



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?

*No mineral resources are known to exist on the project 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 use plan?

*No mineral resources are known to exist on the project 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?

*Noise generated from the proposed project would be related to construction activities. The noise would be variable, temporary, and short term in nature. The project would be limited to construction between the hours of 7 am and 7 pm. The project proponent will designate someone to respond to any complaint about construction noise and institute measures to correct the noise problem. 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 will experience periodic noise during day light hours from youth sporting*



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

*events. These noise levels would consist of children yelling, laughing, and occasional cheering. These ambient noises already exist in the area, therefore, will have a less than significant 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 potential to increase temporary ambient noise levels, although no more than existing temporary noise levels in the vicinity, therefore,, less than significant 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?



*This project is within one mile of the Bishop airport and is close to the normal traffic pattern for Runway 25. 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?



*The proposed project will not displace any existing*

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

*housing therefore will 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 have negative impact on 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?

*The project would require several man hours per week from park staff for ongoing landscape and grounds maintenance. This impact will not require the addition of any staff, therefore, will have a less than significant impact.*



Other public facilities?



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

*See above*

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?



*The expected increased use of the recreational facilities of the park would not be significant enough to cause substantial deterioration to existing facilities therefore will have a less than significant 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.*

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>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?</p> <p><i>The proposed project will not create a change in air traffic patterns or an increase in air traffic levels.</i></p>				◆
<p>d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?</p> <p><i>The proposed project will not increase traffic hazards due to proposed design features or an incompatible use. No impact.</i></p>				◆
<p>e) Result in inadequate emergency access?</p> <p><i>The project will not interfere with any emergency response or emergency access.</i></p>				◆
<p>f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?</p> <p><i>The proposed project identifies the development of an additional 40 parking spaces. The additional 40 spaces along with existing parking areas within the park result in adequate parking for the proposed facility.</i></p>			◆	
<p>g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?</p> <p><i>This project will have no conflict with alternative transportation programs.</i></p>				◆
<p><b>XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS B</b>  Would the project:</p>				
<p>a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?</p> <p><i>The project will not require the use of a waste water treatment, therefore have no impact.</i></p>				◆
<p>b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or</p>				◆

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</p> <p><i>The project will not require the expansion of existing waste water treatment facilities, therefore have no impact...</i></p>				
<p>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?</p> <p><i>Water runoff from construction and stormwater during post construction would not drain into an existing storm drain. Stormwater from the park absorbs into the surrounding soils The project will not require expansion or construction of a storm water drainage facility.</i></p>				◆
<p>d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?</p> <p><i>Recreation fields typically use a large amount of irrigation water. Since this area is not irrigated now, the irrigation water used on this field will be an increase to water pumped by the City of Bishop wells. Sufficient water sources and supplies appear to be adequate for this additional demand, therefore no new or expanded entitlements are needed.</i></p>			◆	
<p>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?</p> <p><i>The waste water treatment provider has adequate capacity to serve the proposed project. Therefore, will have no impact on the wastewater treatment facility.</i></p>				◆
<p>f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project=s solid waste</p>				◆

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

disposal needs?

*Inyo County Sunland Landfill has adequate solid waste capacity for the proposed project. Efforts would be made to reduce the amount of waste brought to the landfill by reusing it, where available on the project. Over excavated soils would be spread throughout the project site, as appropriate. Recycling bins could be located at the field to further reduce the impact on the landfills over the life of the field.*

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

*The project will comply with all federal, state and local statutes and regulation related to solid waste.*



**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?

*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.*



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?



*This project does not have any environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly. The project would have a positive effect on humans.*





Spruce Street

Hanby Avenue

South Fork of Bishop Creek

Bishop Creek Canal

Senior Center

506

Recreation Field

East Elm Street

275

287

291

297

293

596

592

586