



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

**Phone: (760) 878-0263**  
**FAX: (760) 878-0382**  
**E-Mail: [inyoplanning@](mailto:inyoplanning@inyocounty.us)**  
**[inyocounty.us](http://inyocounty.us)**

## **DRAFT NEGATIVE DECLARATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT** **AND INITIAL STUDY**

**PROJECT TITLE:** Tentative Parcel Map #391/Cline

**PROJECT LOCATION:** 1821 Valley View, Bishop (east terminus of West Street; APN 010-353-11)

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:** A proposal to subdivide a 3.18-acre parcel into four parcels (ranging in size from 9,353 sq.ft. to 21,381 sq.ft.) and a remainder (1.68 acres in size). The four proposed parcels would be accessed by extending West Street eastward, ending in a cul-de-sac; access to the remainder parcel (which has an existing home) will remain unchanged off Valley View Road. Sewer service will be provided to the four proposed lots by extending a sewer main in West Street eastward (lift stations may be required). Water will be provided by individual wells.

The proposed eastward extension of the existing sewer main and West Street may provide the means to subdivide additional property located to the north of the project site, which has been contemplated (i.e., four parcels and a remainder proposed by Tentative Parcel Map #386).

### **FINDINGS:**

An Initial Study and Evaluation of Potential Impacts has been prepared by the Planning Department (attached). Staff finds that the proposed project will **NOT** have a significant adverse impact on the environment for the following reasons:

- A. The proposed project is consistent with goals and objectives of the Inyo County General Plan.
- B. The proposed project is consistent with the provisions of the Inyo County Zoning Ordinance.
- C. Potential adverse environmental impacts will not exceed thresholds of significance, either individually or cumulatively.
- D. Based upon the environmental evaluation of the proposed project, the Planning Department finds that the project does not have the potential to create a significant adverse impact on flora or fauna; natural, scenic and historic resources; the local economy; public health, safety, and welfare. This constitutes a Negative Finding for the Mandatory Findings required by Section 15065 of the CEQA Guidelines.

The 30-day review period for this Negative Declaration expires on **June 7, 2010**. Inyo County is not required to respond to any comments received after this date.

Additional information is available from the Inyo County Planning Department. Please contact Project Planner Tanda Gretz if you have any questions regarding this project.

---

Mike Conklin  
Director, Inyo County Planning Department

---

Date

**Attachments:**

1. Tentative Parcel Map #391
2. "Will Serve" Letter from Eastern Sierra Community Services District
3. Project Description Details

# INYO COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT

## CEQA APPENDIX G: INITIAL STUDY & ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

### EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

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

document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.

7) **Supporting Information Sources:** A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.

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

9) The explanation of each issue should identify:

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



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

**Phone: (760) 878-0263**  
**FAX: (760) 878-0382**  
**E-Mail: [inyoplanning@](mailto:inyoplanning@inyocounty.us)**  
**[inyocounty.us](http://inyocounty.us)**

## **INYO COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT**

### **APPENDIX G: CEQA INITIAL STUDY & ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM**

- 1. Project title:** Tentative Parcel Map #391/Cline
- 2. Lead agency name and address:** Inyo County Planning Department.
- 3. Contact person and phone number:** Tanda Gretz, Senior Planner, (760) 878-0263.
- 4. Project location:** 1821 Valley View, Bishop (east terminus of West Street; APN 010-353-11)
- 5. Project sponsor's name and address:** Patrick Cline, P.O. Box 834, Bishop, CA 93514
- 6. General Plan designation:** Residential Medium Density (RM)
- 7. Zoning:** Residential Mobile Home, 7200 sq.ft. minimum (RMH)
- 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):

A proposal to subdivide a 3.18-acre parcel into four parcels (ranging in size from 9,353 sq.ft. to 21,381 sq.ft.) and a remainder (1.68 acres in size). The four proposed parcels would be accessed by extending West Street eastward, ending in a cul-de-sac; access to the remainder parcel (which has an existing home) will remain unchanged off Valley View Road. Sewer service will be provided to the four proposed lots by extending a sewer main in West Street eastward (lift stations may be required). Water will be provided by individual wells.

The proposed eastward extension of the existing sewer main and West Street may provide the means to subdivide additional property located to the north of the project site, which has been contemplated (i.e., four parcels and a remainder proposed by Tentative Parcel Map #386).

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

Location:	Use:	Gen. Plan Designation	Zoning
Site	Residential	RM	RMH
North	Residential & Industrial	RM & LI	RMH & M-2 (Light Industrial)
East	Residential	RM	RMH
South	Residential	RM	RMH
West	Residential	RM	RMH

**10. Other public agencies whose approval is required** (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement):

Eastern Sierra Community Services District (sewer).

**ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:**

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

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

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

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.

---

Tanda Gretz  
Senior Planner  
Inyo County Planning Department

---

Date

## INYO COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

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

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

a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

*No. The four proposed lots and remainder are located within, and of a comparable size to, the surrounding existing residential neighborhood.*

b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

*No. The project site is located in a residential neighborhood and not within a state scenic highway.*

c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

*No. See I.a above.*

d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

*No. See I.a above.*

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

Would the project:

a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

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

*No. The project site is located in a residential neighborhood and doesn't involve farmland.*

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

*No. See II.a above.*

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

*No. The project site is located within a residential neighborhood and does not involve forest land.*

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

*No. See II.c above.*

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

*No. See II.c above.*

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

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

*No. The creation of four additional residential lots along with the extension of West Street will not result in any appreciable permanent reductions to air quality.*

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

*No. See III.a above. There may be temporary reductions to air quality when the West Street extension or new homes are constructed, but these air quality changes would be temporary in nature and not significant.*

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

No. See III.a & b above.

Note: Although there are portions of Inyo County within non-attainment areas for Federal and State PM10 (particulate matter 10 microns or less in diameter) ambient air quality standards, the primary source for this pollution is the Owens dry lake, located approximately 65 miles from the project site. As a result of this distance, the project will not increase PM10 pollutants over existing levels, and the project will have a less than significant impact on PM10 levels.

d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

No. See III.a & b above.

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

No. See III.a & b above.

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

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

No. There are no such species known to exist on the 3.18-acre project site, which is surrounded by existing residential development.

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

No. There are no such habitats or communities known to exist on the project site, which is surrounded by existing residential development.

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

No. There are no such wetlands known to exist on the project site.

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

*No. The 3.18-acre project site is surrounded by existing residential development and is functioning as an in-fill development.*

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

*No. There are no such ordinances that would apply to the proposed four lot subdivision project.*

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?

*No. There are no such plans that would apply to the proposed four-lot subdivision project.*

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

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

*No. There are no known cultural resources on the project site, as it is an in-fill project and surrounded by already-existing residential development that has been in place for many years.*

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

*No. See V.a above.*

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

*No. See V.a above.*

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

*No. See V.a above.*

**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.

*No. There is no known earthquake fault on the project site.*

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?

*Ground shaking may occur anywhere in the region, due to numerous earthquake faults, regardless of whether the project site is within an identified Alquist-Priolo zone or not. However, the Uniform Building Code insures that future structures shall constructed to required seismic standards (Level IV) in order to withstand such shaking, and so this potential impact is considered less than significant.*

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

*No. The soils on the project site and surrounding residential neighborhood are not prone to liquefaction or ground failure*

iv) Landslides?

*No. The project site and surrounding residential neighborhood is largely level, with no topography that could result in landslide events.*

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

*No. Any future development on the project site and/or four proposed lots will need to conform to "Best Management Practice (BMP)" requirements as set forth by the Inyo County Public Works Department, Inyo County of Inyo Environmental Health Services Department, the California Regional Water Quality Control Board (Lahontan), and other associated regulatory agencies. As a result of this regulation, potential impacts are considered less than significant.*

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. The soils and geology of the project site and surrounding residential neighborhood are not prone to such events.*

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?

*No. The soils on the project site and surrounding residential neighborhood are not of a type that could pose such substantial risks.*

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?

*Sewer is proposed for the project site.*

**VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS:**

Would the project:

a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?

*No. The proposed four-lot subdivision, surrounded as it is by a long-standing existing residential neighborhood, will not significantly increase such gas emissions*

b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

*No. See VII.a above.*

**VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS:**

Would the project:

a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?

*No. No routine use of hazardous materials is proposed.*

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?

*No. The project doesn't involve any known use of hazardous materials.*

c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

*No. The project site is not within one-quarter mile of a school.*

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?

*No. The project site is not located on any known hazardous materials site.*

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?

*No. The proposed subdivision project site is not within two miles of a public airport.*

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?

*No. The project is no within the vicinity of a private airstrip.*

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

*No. The project proposes the creation of four additional lots on a site surrounded by existing residential development, with no possible impairment of any such plans.*

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?

*No. The project functions as an in-fill project within a long-standing existing residential neighborhood where there are no wildlands.*

**IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY:** Would the project:

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

*No. An extension of an existing sewer main for the four lots is proposed. Inyo County Environmental Health Services staff have verified the existence of adequate supplies of water for the project, which proposes individual water wells for each of the lots. All construction and installation of such facilities will be reviewed and permitted by appropriate staff and agencies, with the result that no such violations will occur.*

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)?

*No. See IX.a above.*

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?

*No. The project site and surrounding residential neighborhood is largely flat and while there is a pond and irrigation ditch on the remainder parcel, the project doesn't propose any activity that would result in 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?

*No. See IX.c above.*

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?

*No. The proposed extension of West Street will be reviewed and permitted according to Inyo County Roads Department standards, which will prevent such occurrences.*

f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?

*No. There is little elevation on the project site and the proposed extension of the existing sewer main on West Street may require a lift station(s). Such construction will be reviewed and permitted according to code, so that there will be no leakage or contamination of the surrounding water wells/water supply.*

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?

*No. The project site is not located within such a flood hazard area.*

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

*No. See VIII.g above.*

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?

*No. The project site is not located within such an area.*

j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

*No. The project site is located on level ground and distant enough from any large water body so that such events are not possible.*

**X. LAND USE AND PLANNING:** Would the project:

a) Physically divide an established community?

*No. The creation of the four proposed lots functions as an infill project, as the 3.18-acre site is surrounded by existing residential development.*

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

*No. The proposed four lots are consistent with the General Plan designation and zoning established for the project site.*

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

*No. The project functions as an infill project and has no impact on any such plans.*

**XI. MINERAL RESOURCES:** Would the project:

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

*No. The project is a 3.18-acre in-fill site, surrounded by existing residential development.*

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. See XI.a above.*

**XII. NOISE:** Would the project result in the:

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

*No. The creation of the four proposed lot, the extension of West Street, and the extension of an existing sewer main would all involve increased temporary noise levels during construction activities, but such activities would be temporary in nature and would not constitute significant/substantial impacts.*

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

*No. See XII.a above.*

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

No. See XII.a above.

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

No. See XII.a above.

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?

No. The project site is not within two miles of a public airport.

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?

No. The project site is not in the vicinity of a private airstrip.

**XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING** -- Would the project:

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

The proposed four lots do not constitute nor support what could be defined as substantial population growth. Even should the proposed project and its proposed extension of West Street result in the eventual subdivision of the property to the north of the project site (i.e., TPM #386 – four lots & a remainder), the number of resulting lots and families could not be considered as substantial.

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

No. The project doesn't involve displacement.

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

No. See XIII.b above.

**XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES:** Would the project:

a) Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the

construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

*No. The proposed subdivision project creates four additional lots, and its extension of West Street and an existing sewer main allows the potential future subdivision of 5.84 acres to the north (i.e., TPM #386). The number of lots and resulting population do not constitute substantial increases given the population of the surrounding Bishop area (approx. 6,500+ residents). In addition, the project site – as well as the potential future subdivision site to the north of the project site – constitutes in-fill development for an existing residential neighborhood.*

Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**XV. RECREATION:** Would the project:

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

*No. The project proposes the creation of four additional lots, which is not a large enough number of lots to stress or put at risk existing park facilities*

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

*No. See XV.a above.*

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

a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including, but not limited to, intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

*No. The project proposes the extension of West Street to the east in order to provide street frontage and access for the four proposed lots. This extension of West Street will not conflict with any such transportation measures, nor result in added traffic to a degree that would pose any*

traffic/circulation-related or public health & safety concerns.

b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to, level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?

No. See XVI.a above.

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?

No. See XVI.a above.

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

No. See XVI.a above.

e) Result in inadequate emergency access?

No. The proposed project has been reviewed by the Bishop Rural Fire Protection District. The extension of West Street and the proposed cul-de-sac will be constructed to standards approved by the Inyo County Roads Department.

f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?

No. See XVI.a above.

**XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS --**

Would the project:

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

No. The proposed lots will be serviced by sewer: the Eastern Sierra Community Services District (CSD) has issued a "will serve" letter for the project, which involves an extension of a CSD sewer main. The CSD's recommendations and requirements will serve as conditions of approval for the project. As such, the project will be adequately reviewed and permitted to meet all necessary wastewater requirements.

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

No. See XVII.a above.

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?

*The West Street extension will be constructed to all pertinent road standards to allow for adequate stormwater drainage, and be reviewed and approved by the Inyo County Roads Department. Similarly, grading for each of the proposed lots will be reviewed and permitted by County staff to assure adequate drainage.*

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

*There are adequate water supplies – verified by Inyo County Environmental Health Services staff – to support the proposed four new lots.*

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

*Yes. The Eastern Sierra Community Services District has issued a "will serve" letter for the project.*

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

*Yes. There is adequate room in the Bishop landfill to provide for the proposed four lots.*

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

*Yes. See XVII.f above.*

**XVIII. 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?

*No. The project is an in-fill project within a long-standing residential neighborhood. There will be no such significant*

*impacts resulting from the creation of the four proposed lots.*

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 project proposes the extension of West Street and an existing sewer main, the construction of which would allow the 5.84-acre property to the north of the project site to potentially develop, as has been tentatively proposed through TPM #386, which proposes four new lots and a remainder.*

*Even should both proposed projects eventually develop, the total number of new lots resulting would be only eight, which is not a number deemed to result in significant cumulative impacts.*

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

*No. The project proposes the creation of four additional lots within an already-existing residential neighborhood. As such, it functions as an in-fill project, and adequately provides for water, wastewater and access.*