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

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

DRAFT MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT AND INITIAL STUDY

PROJECT TITLE: Big Pine Wastewater Treatment Facility Expansion

PROJECT LOCATION: The proposed Project is located approximately 0.6 miles east of U.S. Highway 395, adjacent to and south of State Route 168 and about a half mile northeast of the town of Big Pine in Inyo County, California (Map attached). The property is owned by the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power with an Accessor's Parcel Number of 018-090-19. The Project will add approximately 5 acres to the existing Big Pine Wastewater Treatment Facility 10.3 acre leased area operated by the Big Pine Community Service District.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The Project consists of expanding the existing Big Pine Wastewater Treatment Facility from 10.3 acres to 15 acres, an increase of approximately 5 acres. The expansion will increase the capability of the wastewater facility by adding an additional new rapid infiltration basin in the expanded 5 acre lease area. The existing wastewater disposal facility has proven insufficient in years when the ground water is elevated in the area. This has occurred in 2017, 2019 and 2023 which were record snow and runoff years. Site soils will be used to create berms to enclose and create the new basin at a high higher elevation than the current existing infiltration/percolation basins located on the existing treatment facility area. This higher elevation of the new rapid infiltration basin will provide the needed separation from the ground water to provide the proper treatment and hydraulic head to allow for infiltration of the treated effluent into the ground water. The additional basin will also allow for continued compliance with the waste discharge requirements of the permit with the State Water Board. In addition to the new rapid infiltration basin there are projected future plans for the installation of a ground mount solar array which will provide needed power to the plant and allow it to have a net zero energy usage allowing ability to keep the rates in the community stable. The solar array will be installed through the future application of a building a building permit.

FINDINGS:

A. The proposed project is consistent with the goals and objectives of 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 Mitigated Negative Finding for the Mandatory Findings required by Section 15065 of the CEQA Guidelines.

The 30-day public review period for this Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration will expire on December 9, 2023. 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 if you have any questions regarding this project.

Cathreen Richards
Director, Inyo County Planning Department

11/7/23
Date

INYO COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT

CEQA APPENDIX G: INITIAL STUDY & ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).

2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.

3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.

4) "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section XVII, "Earlier Analyses," may be cross-referenced).

5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:

a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.

b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.

c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.

6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.

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

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

9) The explanation of each issue should identify:
   a) the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
   b) the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance issues.

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

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

INYO COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT

APPENDIX G: CEQA INITIAL STUDY & ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

1. Project title: Big Pine Wastewater Treatment Facility Expansion

2. Lead agency name and address: Inyo County Planning Department, PO Drawer L, Independence, CA 93526

3. Contact person and phone number: Danielle Visuaño: 760-878-0268

4. Project location: The proposed project is located approximately 0.6 miles east of U.S. Highway 395, adjacent to and south of State Route 168 and about a half mile northeast of the town of Big Pine in Inyo County, California.

5. Project sponsor's name and address: Big Pine Community Service District, 180 N. Main Street, Suite D, Big Pine, CA 93513

6. General Plan designation: Natural Resources (NR)

7. Zoning: Open Space (OS)

8. Description of project: Expansion of the wastewater treatment facility on the north side of the existing Big Pine Wastewater Treatment Facility from 10.3 acres to 15 acres, an increase of approximately 5 acres. The expansion will increase the capability of the wastewater facility by adding a new rapid infiltration basin in the expanded 5 acre lease area.

9. Surrounding land uses and setting:

Location:	Use:	Gen. Plan Designation	Zoning
North	Vacant	(NR) Natural Resources	(OS) Open Space
South	Vacant	(PF) Public Service Facilities	(OS) Open Space
East	Vacant	(NR) Natural Resources	(OS) Open Space
West	Vacant	(A) Agriculture	(OS) Open Space

10. Other public agencies whose approval is required: Los Angeles Department of Water and Power; Great Basin Air Pollution Control District; Inyo County Building and Safety, Inyo County Public Works, and the Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board.

11. Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1? If so, has consultation begun? Inyo County started the 30-day Tribal Consultation opportunity period according to Public Resource code section 21080.31 by sending out a certified written notices on March 13, 2023 and May 8, 2023, inviting the Tribes to consult on the project. The tribes that were notified are: Big Pine Tribe of Owens Valley, Bishop Paiute Tribe, Fort Independence Indian Community of Paiutes, Lone Pine Paiute-Shoshone Tribe, Timbisha Shoshone tribe, Twenty-Nine Palms Band of Mission Indians, Cabazon Band of Mission Indians and the Torrez Martinez Desert Cahuilla Indians. In an email dated May 8, 2023, the Big Pine Paiute Tribe of the Owens Valley stated they would be requesting formal consultation through a formal response. A formal response was never received by Inyo County. However, there have been conversations outside of tribal consultation.

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

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 Resources	☐ Agriculture & Forestry	☒ Air Quality
☒ Biological Resources	☐ Cultural Resources	☐ Energy
☐ Geology /Soils	☐ Greenhouse Gas Emissions	☐ Hazards & Hazardous Materials
☐ Hydrology/Water Quality	☐ Land Use / Planning	☐ Mineral Resources
☐ Noise	☐ Population / Housing	☐ Public Services
☐ Recreation	☐ Transportation	☐ Tribal Cultural Resources
☐ Utilities / Service Systems	☐ Wildfire	☐ 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.

Danielle Visuaño, Associate Planner
Inyo County Planning Department

11/7/23
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐

No, the area to be developed is a 5 acre expansion of an existing 10.3 acre wastewater treatment facility area. The expansion will increase the capability of the wastewater facility by adding a new rapid infiltration basin in the expanded 5 acre lease area. The expansions would not be visible from residential areas as most of the phased areas will be surrounded by 4-5 foot berms and the closest residence is about ½ a mile away. There are no officially designated State Scenic Highways within sight of the Project. Any viewer groups will be motorists traveling on State Route 168. However, the visibility of the wastewater treatment facility is fully obstructed by the 4-5 berms surrounding the new infiltration basin and separating it from State Route 168. The berms would not limit the views of the surrounding areas and mountains from residences or businesses.

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

No, although the Project is located adjacent to State Route 168, State Route 168 is not designated as a scenic highway. The Project is not visible from U.S. Highway 395 and there are only distant views of the Inyo Mountains. The area is highly disturbed and there are also no buildings or rock outcroppings of significance within the proposed project area. The Project will entail minor alteration of land and vegetation and would remove one of two elm trees on the Project site. Since the elm trees are a potential roosting habitat for the Hoary Bat (Lasiuris cinereus), a pre-construction survey is required for the potential existence of any roosting Hoary Bats prior to removal of the one elm. A mitigation requirement is included in Section IV Biological Resources.

c) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?	☐	☐	☐	☒

No, the Project is a 5 acre expansion of the existing 10.3 acre wastewater treatment facility. The Project would involve clearing weeds and brush that has grown over the disturbed area adjacent to the existing treatment facility. There would be 4-5 foot berms surrounding the new rapid infiltration basin blocking views of the interior of the basin, and would separate the basin from view with State Route 168. The surrounding areas are currently covered in desert scrub. Therefore, the Project will not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site or its surroundings.

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

No, the Project is a 5 acre rapid infiltration basin expansion of the existing 10.3 acre wastewater treatment facility. The closest residence is about ½ mile southwest of the Project. Due to the small size and location, this Project would not impact day or nighttime views.

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:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	☐	☐	☐	☒
No, the Project is not located on land designated as Farmland.				
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	☐	☐	☐	☒
No, the Project is not located on land zoned exclusively for agriculture. Inyo County has no Williamson Act contracts.				
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 is not zoned for forest or timberland.				
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	☐	☐	☐	☒
No, the Project is not located on forestland.				
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?	☐	☐	☐	☒
No, the Project is not located on Farmland.				

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, there is not an air quality plan for the area in which the Project is proposed. The Project will be required to follow best management practices for dust control during short-term construction. Once the construction is complete, dust from the operations will be minimal and primarily from personnel vehicle use.				
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	☐	☐	☒	☐
No, there are no air quality standards being violated in the area which the Project is proposed. The Project will conditioned to obtain a secondary source permit from GBUAPCD before construction begins, which will have conditions to limit emissions from dust and diesel engines during construction. The Project must also follow District Rule 401 – Fugitive Dust and must "take reasonable precautions to prevent visitable particulate matter from being airborne, under normal wind conditions, beyond the property from which the emission originates." The Project will establish dust mitigation measures for any land clearing and grading that will apply to all Project construction periods involving the construction of different areas of the Project site and any future construction of the Project site. Water would be applied to disturbed surfaces at a sufficient frequency and quantity for dust control purposes and all exposed soil surfaces will be moistened as required to avoid nuisance conditions and inconveniences for local residents, businesses and travelers of nearby roadways. All mobile and portable equipment will comply with the requirements of the State of California including all equipment being used during construction having the appropriate registrations.				

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

During construction, temporary erosion control measures such as berms, silt fences, fiber rolls, erosion control blankets or other methods shall be installed as necessary to prevent discharge of earthen materials form the site during period of precipitation or runoff. All exposed soil surfaces to remain after grading shall be reseeded to stabilize the surrounding soils and areas.

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

No, the Project is a 5 acre expansion of a 10.3 acre existing wastewater treatment plan and involves short-term construction equipment impacts from dust and exhaust emission, but GBUAPCD considers these construction emissions to be less than significant. It is not within an area that is in non-attainment for any criteria pollutants and none of the project components will release emissions that exceed ozone thresholds. No additional projects within the vicinity of this Project have been identified that are likely to be under construction during the same time period as this Project that would result in cumulatively significant impacts due to particulate matter.

d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

No, the Project will not expose sensitive receptors to any new substantial pollutant concentrations. The Project itself will limit any pollution as governed by the GBUAPCD permits and requirements. The Project site is in a remote and rural location and the nearest residential area is about ½ mile to the southwest. Due to the remote location and compliance with the requirements of GBUAPCD and the State of California discussion in Section III b, construction and operation of the Project will not impact sensitive receptors.

e) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

No, the effluent to be pumped and applied to the new rapid infiltration basin is the same wastewater that has been applied and infiltrated on the existing lease area. The main source of odor is located at the waste sludge drying beds, located on the existing facility site that has been in existence and operation since 1972. The existing waste sludge drying beds are where the waste sludge from the secondary clarifier is pumped to dry. The existing and new Project area are surrounded by leased LADWP grazing and the closest residence is about a 1/2 mile away from the wastewater treatment plant.

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, less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. A Biological Survey of the Project was conducted in April 26, 2023 by the firm TEAM Environmental, TEAM Biologist Greg Foote. The survey included an initial overview with the project proponent, review of existing data including searches of the California Native Plant Society (CNPS) online inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants, California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW), California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB), USFWS Information for Planning and Consultation (IPaC) website and preliminary literature search. The entire Project site is disturbed and no undisturbed natural habitat occurs at the proposed project area and due to significant disturbance and clearing of vegetation this area would not be considered a natural vegetation community. The survey was conducted using meandering transections and were conducted on foot and all visible flora and fauna were identified to the lowest possible taxon. There are several special status plants or wildlife with the potential to occur on the site, but no sensitive or special status species were observed during the survey conducted on April 26, 2023.

For special status plants, the biologist concluded it is unlikely any of the special status plants are to occur at this site due to the lack of preferred habitat and disturbed nature of the Project site. For those with marginal habitat existence on the Project site, they are not expected to occur on the site due to the disturbed nature, altered hydrology and active grazing practices.

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

For special status wildlife, while the biologist did not observed any special status wildlife species during the survey, the biologist determined that two of the ten species identified have the potential to occur at the site. Although the Rufous Hummingbird (Selasphorus rufus) and the Hoary Bat (Lasiurus cinereus) were not identified on the site during the survey, the potential habitats were identified on the Project site.

Impacts to the potential Rufous Hummingbird potential breeding habitat at the site are not expected as noise from construction activities have the potential to disturb nesting birds. However, since there is potential habitat on the site for the Rufous Hummingbird, conditions will be added to the project to mitigate possible impacts by either: implementing construction outside the normal breeding season; or requiring a pre-construction nesting bird survey if construction takes place during the nesting season (typically between January 1 through September 15 in the Owens Valley) and construction cannot be avoided. If a pre-construction nesting bird survey is required, it must be done prior to any grading or building activities for the Project.

Impacts to the potential roosting sites for the Hoary Bat are unlikely, however, the existence of two elm trees on the Project site provide a potential site for roosting. Since the Project proposes to remove one of the two elm trees on the Project site, a pre-construction survey is required for the potential existence of any roosting Hoary Bats prior to removal of the one elm tree.

All other wildlife special status species were determined by the biologist not to occur due to the site: being disturbed; being unsuitable for breeding and reproduction; having a diminished quality of habitat for breeding due to periodic mowing; being used for ranching operations; being in close proximity to the existing wastewater treatment plant; having periodic clearing of vegetation; no sandy habitat; and pre-existing and existing human activity.

The biological report can be found at: https://www.inyocounty.us/services/planning-department/current-projects

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

No, there is no riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community within the project site based on the USFWS National Wetlands Inventory Mapping Tool.

c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	☐	☐	☒	☐

No, there is no federally designated wetland area within the Project site based on the USFWS National Wetlands Inventory Mapping Tool. The closest wetland area is north of the Project site which varies between approximately 190 feet through 330 feet. This wetland area is designated as Freshwater Emergent Wetland characterized by erect, rooted, herbaceous hydrophytes, dominated by trees, shrubs and persistent emergent, but also includes wetlands lacking vegetation within an area of 2.25 acres that extend further northeast of the Project site and has a water depth of less that 2.5 meters. However, under this designation waters are determined to present for only brief periods (from a few days to a few weeks) during the growing season with the water table usually lying well below the ground surface for most of the season. Most significantly, this wetland is separated from the Project area by State Route 168. This separation by the state route is significant in that this route consists of consistent vehicle traffic and presents a boundary between the wetland and the Project. This boundary is further made significant by the construction of the state route itself, which involved various compacted materials beneath the roads surface further creating a barrier between the Project site and the wetland. The distance between the wetland and the Project site, along with the separation by State Route 168, would present no substantial adverse effects through direct removal, filling or hydrological interruption of the wetland.

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, although the Project site could potentially have occurrences of wildlife species, the Project will not interfere with migratory fish or wildlife species.

e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree	☐	☐	☐	☒

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

preservation policy or ordinance?

No, there are no local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources that pertain to the Project site.

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, the property is owned by LADWP and falls under LADWP's Owens Valley Habitat Conservation Plan for its operations, maintenance and management and the project will not conflict with this plan. In fact, the current wastewater treatment plant for which this Project is an extension of is under the same plan with LADWP. The Project site does not fall under any other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plans.

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, a records search was completed by the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS), UC Riverside and the results were provided in a letter dated March 24, 2023. The search indicated that no cultural resource properties have been recorded within the boundaries of the Project area, and that the Project area has not been examined for cultural resources. It further states that by state and federal law if any cultural resources are found during construction, work is to stop and the lead agency and cultural resources professional be consulted to determine the importance of the find and its appropriate management. The letter did not indicate that there may be any cultural resources within the boundaries or the surrounding area. However, the Project is to be conditioned with a Tribal Monitor presence during construction as requested by the Big Pine Paiute Tribe of the Owens Valley in conversations outside of Tribal Consultation.

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

No, the March 24, 2023 letter from CHRIS noted there were no cultural resource properties within the Project boundaries. Should any archaeological or cultural resources be discovered on the site during construction, work shall immediately stop and the lead agency and cultural resource professional be consulted to determine the importance of any find and its appropriate management. Additionally, Inyo County staff shall be immediately notified per Chapter 9.52 Disturbance of Archaeological, Paleontological and Historical Features of the Inyo County code. Further, the Project is to be conditioned with a Tribal Monitor presence during construction as requested by the Big Pine Paiute Tribe of the Owens Valley in conversations outside of Tribal Consultation.

c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?	☐	☐	☐	☒

No, there are no known human remains or burial sites within the project area. Refer to the response to (V b) for the potential for archaeological resources. While unlikely, human remains are a potential archaeological resource, and will be handled similar to other archaeological resources, as outlined in (V b). Also, based on conversations outside of tribal consultation with the Big Pine Paiute Tribe of the Owens Valley Tribal Historic Preservation Officer a condition is being added to the Project that Tribal Monitor will be onsite during construction activities.

VI. ENERGY: Would the project:

a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?	☐	☐	☐	☒

No, the Project is an extension of 5 acres to an existing 10.3 acres wastewater treatment facility. The short-term construction will involve minimal excavation and grading to create the new rapid infiltration basin, berms and surrounding areas needed for continues

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

operation. Further, with a future application for a building permit, the Project will construct a 25kW connected ground mounted solar array to provide the power needs for the wastewater treatment facility.

b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	☐	☐	☐	☒

No, the Project is not located in one of the County's Solar Energy Development Areas (SEDA), as identified by the General Plan.

VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS: Would the project:

a) Directly or indirectly cause 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, the Project is not in an Alquist-Priolo zone and does not include any habitable structures or a mapped active fault.

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	☐	☐	☐	☒

No, as discussed above (VII. a), the Project would not include any habitable structures. Ground shaking may occur anywhere in the region, but compared to much of the rest of California, this is a less than average seismically active area.

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	☐	☐	☐	☒

No, the Project site is located on the valley floor of the Owens Valley and the area is generally not susceptible to liquefaction during a seismic event. Due to the dense and cohesive nature of the underlying soils, the potential for liquefaction occurring at the site is considered low. There are no habitable structures on the project site.

iv) Landslides?	☐	☐	☐	☒

No, the Project site is virtually flat and does not contain slopes in the surrounding area that would be subject to landslides.

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

No, topsoil removed during clearing activities shall be stockpiled within the approved limits of construction for re-application to slopes and disturbed areas upon Project completion. Construction activities and topsoil stockpile locations are to be in compliance with the approved Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and/or Report of the Wast Discharge as applicable. Temporary erosion control facilities shall be in place prior to commencing any grading operations. Project grading activity would be conducted in accordance with the requirements of a grading permit secured from the County prior to construction; such requirements include erosion controls as a standard best management practice. The Project also has to comply with the California State Water Quality Control Board Waste Discharge Requirements as amended. During construction, temporary erosion control measures such as berms, silt fences, fiber rolls, erosion control blankets or other methods shall be installed as necessary to prevent discharge of earthen materials form the site during period of precipitation or runoff. All exposed soil surfaces to remain after grading shall be reseeded to stabilize the surrounding soils and areas.

During the operation phase of the Project, ongoing operation and maintenance activities will be very similar to those presently occurring on the existing wastewater treatment plant. Maintenance vehicles will use the dirt access road and roads within the current wastewater treatment facility area currently being used along with an additional new 10 foot wide dirt road to be established around the new expansion area. Therefore, impacts of soil erosion or topsoil will be 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	☐	☐	☒	☐

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

spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?

No, the Project site is essentially flat, and the immediate surrounding landscape does not contain slopes that would be subject to landslides. As discussed above in section VII a) and b), geologic instability is not expected during construction or future operation of the wastewater treatment facility. There is no significant effect expected as the probability of geologic hazards, such as slope instability, landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, collapse, differential settling and soils affecting the Project site are considered low. Implementation of standard engineering practices would ensure consideration of any effects in the final design plans and therefore any potential impact will be less than significant. Constructing the new infiltration basin would not lend itself to potential lateral spreading, subsidence, or liquefaction.

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 Project is not located in an area with a known expansive soil type. If any questions arise about the quality of the soil during construction, the applicant/developer shall work with Inyo County's Public Works Department to employ the proper design standards that mitigate for expansive soils. A Soils Report prepared by TEAM Environment dated August 3, 2022 with discussion of excavation activities conducted on July 28, 2022 was utilized in the design preparations for the new rapid infiltration basin.

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 wastewater?	☐	☐	☐	☒

No, the Project involves the expansion of an existing wastewater treatment facility. A Soils Report prepared by TEAM Environment dated August 3, 2022 with discussion of excavation activities conducted on July 28, 2022 was utilized in the design preparations for the new infiltration basin.

f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	☐	☐	☐	☒

No, the Project site does not include unique paleontological or geological features.

VIII. 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 5 acre expansion of the wastewater treatment facility will not have a significant impact on the environment and will not generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, other than the use of heavy equipment and haul trucks to move material on the site or remove material from the site during construction. These types of actions will be governed by the laws of California and the permitting of the GBUAPCD. Once the construction is complete, dust from the operations will be minimal and primarily from personnel vehicle use during maintenance.

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

No, the 5 acre expansion of the wastewater treatment facility will not cause conflicts with a plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing greenhouse gasses.

IX. 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?	☐	☐	☒	☐

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

No, construction activities would be temporary and will not involve any use of hazardous materials other than fueling and servicing of construction equipment. In general, this type of handling would be done on the project site while the equipment is stored during down times. The applicant will need to comply with the Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board regulations regarding waste handling from the facility operations.

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, construction activities may involve limited transport, use, or disposal of some hazardous materials, such as limited on site fueling/servicing of construction equipment and the transport of such materials. These types of materials are not acutely hazardous, and compliance with existing federal, state, and local regulations would ensure that construction impacts related to reasonably foreseeable accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials would be minimal.

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 is not within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school, nor will it emit hazardous emissions, or handle acutely hazardous materials, substances or waste.

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 proposed Project is not located on a site included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. There are no DTSC sites mapped within or adjacent to the project area on Geotracker or EnviroStor databases.

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 Project is not included in an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public or public use airport.

f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

No, the proposed Project is in a mostly unpopulated rural setting. No evacuation plan exists for the project area.

g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires,? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

No, the only structure in the area after construction would be the new rapid infiltration basin. If a wildfire is present or imminent in the area the wastewater treatment plant will cease operations, thus not exposing the operation staff to the risk of wildfire exposure.

X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY:

Would the project:

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

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

requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?

No, the Project is designed to maintain or improve the ground water quality in the area. It is designed to provide a treated effluent discharge area that has greater separation from the ground water than the existing facility. The existing percolation/infiltration ponds are subject to ground water surfacing in high runoff years. The California Regional Water Quality Control Board plans to revise the current permit to include the new area as an authorized disposal site. The long term operation of the Project would include routine monitoring and maintenance to inspect the performance of the wastewater treatment facility.

b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	☐	☐	☐	☒

No, the Project will provide the same amount of treated effluent as the existing wastewater treatment facility for infiltration and percolation into the ground water.

c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:				
i) result in a substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;	☐	☐	☐	☒
ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite;	☐	☐	☐	☒
iii) 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; **or**	☐	☐	☐	☒
iv) impede or redirect flood flows?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The Project is an enclosed earthen basin that will receive treated effluent from the existing wastewater treatment plant. It is treated to secondary standards. No impervious surfaces are proposed in the Project. It will not alter a stream or river course. It will not alter the existing drainage pattern of the site.

d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	☐	☐	☐	☒

No. the Project is not located in or near a flood hazard, tsunami or seiche zone or at risk of release of pollutants due to project inundation. The land around the facility slopes from west to east along the valley floor toward the Owens River, which is located about 0.8 miles eastward near the center of the valley. Big Pine Creek flows from west to east about 800 feet south of the existing wastewater treatment plant.

e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	☐	☒	☐	☐

No, the Project is not proposed in an area that is included in a water quality control or sustainable ground water management plan.

XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING: Would the project:

a) Physically divide an established community?	☐	☐	☐	☒

No, the Project is the expansion of an existing wastewater treatment facility and is contiguous with the existing wastewater treatment facility. Although the project expansion would be close to State Route 168 on the north side of the Project site there is still a strip of land about 100 feet wide between the Project and State Route 168 for continued cattle grazing as allowed by LADWP, along with the east, south and west sides remaining open to continued grazing. The project will not segment the surrounding grazing areas and will remain surrounded by Open Space and Agriculture use. The Project will not disrupt or divide an established community, and would

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

comply with the County's land-use requirements. Furthermore, construction vehicles and equipment would utilize existing dirt roads on the site and a new 10 foot wide road around the perimeter of the new Project site. As such, there would be no impact.

b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

No, the area of the Project is zoned Open Space and is occasionally used for cattle grazing. The Project expansion of the existing wastewater treatment plant will not interfere with this use. The Project and the existing wastewater treatment facility are surrounded by the General Plan designations of Agriculture to the west, and Natural Resources to the north, south and the east. The County of Inyo General Plan also outlines the County's land use goals, which provides for quasi-public uses under the Agriculture designation, and the managed production of resources under the Natural Resources designation.

XII. 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, according to the State of California Department of Conservation Division of Oil, Gas, and Geothermal Resources, there are no known valuable mineral resources in the vicinity of the proposed Project.

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, the Project site is not delineated as a locally important mineral resource recovery site in the Inyo County General Plan. Further, no active mines or mineral prospects exist on or near the proposed Project site.

XIII. NOISE: Would the project result in:
a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

No, the Inyo County General Plan requires noise-reducing mitigation measures be implemented during construction when residential uses or other sensitive receptors are located within 500 feet of the site. No noise sensitive receptors are located within 500 feet of the proposed Project site. Post construction operations of the new Project area would create a noise equivalent to that of a standard water pump resulting from the installation of two (2) submersible pumps. This noise level is intermittent and is already found at the existing site.

b) Generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

No, the Project will have the installation of pumps for the new infiltration basin which provide minimal noise and vibration and the ancillary pipelines would not require blasting or other vibration causing events.

c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or, 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 Eastern Sierra Regional Airport is located about 14 miles north from the proposed project site.

XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING: Would the project:
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

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

either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

No, no new homes are proposed, and no new roads, other than a new 10 foot wide dirt maintenance road around the perimeter of the new expansion area. The expansion of the existing wastewater treatment facility by adding the new infiltration basin would not result in the relocation of individuals, impact housing, commercial facilities or change the distribution of the population. The nearest residence is located about ½ mile to southwest of the project site.

b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

No, no housing or other residences currently exist within the Project site.

XV. PUBLIC SERVICES: Would the project:

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

Fire protection? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

No, fire suppression services of the Big Pine Volunteer Fire Department would respond from its existing station located on Main Street in the town of Big Pine approximately 1 mile away, and the Project area is able to accommodate large fire protection vehicles. The Project operations must comply with all applicable code and ordinance requirements for access, water mains, fire flows and fire hydrants and those would not be changed by the Project.

Police protection? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

No,the Inyo County Sheriff has primary law enforcement authority in the unincorporated areas of Inyo County, and patrols the community of Big Pine and its surroundings from its existing sub-station in the City of Bishop.

Schools? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

No, the nearest schools are located within Big Pine about 0.8 miles southwest from the Project site. The Project expansion of the existing wastewater treatment plant would not cause a need for more school services in the area.

Parks? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

No. No new parks will be required because of this Project.

Other public facilities? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

No. No other public facilities are located in the vicinity.

XVI. 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? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

No, the Project would not increase the demand for neighborhood or regional parks, or other recreational facilities in the area because it would not increase the local population.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

No, the Project would not include any new recreational facilities, require expansion of existing recreational facilities, or adversely affect recreational services since it would not increase the local population.

XVII. TRANSPORTATION:

a) Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?	☐	☐	☐	☒

No, the Project will not significantly increase traffic, and therefore, will not affect public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities. During construction of the Project the anticipated additional traffic would be minor and not expected to have a significant impact on the surrounding roadways and can be accommodated by the current transportation systems in the area. Post construction, the traffic to and from the site would be as it currently is for the existing wastewater treatment plant. Additionally, the Project would conform to all policies, goals, and ordinances related to the County's transportation systems.

b) Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines § 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	☐	☐	☐	☒

No, the Project is a 5 acre extension of an existing 10.3 acre wastewater treatment facility. There will be no increase in personnel. This will not be in conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b) as the transportation impact of the completed Project along with the existing wastewater treatment facility will result in no increased traffic. Therefore, the Project will result in less than significant impacts to this resource. The subject site is not within one-half mile of either an existing major transit stop or high quality transit corridor.

c) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses?	☐	☐	☐	☒

No, the Project will not result in any design features for transportation that increase hazards.

d) Result in inadequate emergency access?	☐	☐	☒	☐

No, the Project expansion of the existing wastewater treatment facility will utilize the existing dirt roads and the new 10 foot wide dirt road around the perimeter of the expansion site. There is a planned gate on the north side of the new project site area that would prevent unauthorized vehicle access to the wastewater treatment plant but would be opened in case of emergency to allow fire trucks or other emergency vehicles access to that area.

XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES: Would the project:
cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code § 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:

i) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or	☐	☒	☐	☐

No, a letter dated March 24, 2023 indicated no cultural resource properties within the boundaries of the Project area.

ii) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code § 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code	☐	☒	☐	☐

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

§ 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.

No, there are no specific tribal cultural resources identified, but the project area could be identified as sensitive for tribal cultural resources. Based on conversations outside of tribal consultation with the Big Pine Paiute Tribe of the Owens Valley Tribal Historic Preservation Officer a condition is being added to the Project that a Tribal Monitor be on site during construction activities. Additionally, Inyo County staff shall be immediately notified per Chapter 9.52 Disturbance of Archaeological, Paleontological and Historical Features of the Inyo County code.

XIX UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS:
Would the project:

a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?	☐	☐	☒	☐

No, the Project is the expansion of an existing wastewater treatment facility by 5 acres and there are plans to install a ground mounted solar array, through a future building permit application, to power the entire wastewater treatment plant. Although there is to be an expansion of the facility's power, these are extensions of the existing plant with no new facilities required. Stormwater will be addressed under the Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan, and there is no natural gas or telecommunication facilities on the expansion site.

b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?	☐	☐	☐	☒

No impact, the water demand for the project construction activities is low and would be needed during construction only. The operation of the new wastewater treatment plant expansion system would not require use of water supplies.

c) Result in a determination by the waste water 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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

No, the Project is the expansion of the existing wastewater treatment facility being brought forth by the provider/operator of the wastewater treatment facility. The project would not increase the demand for water treatment on the existing wastewater treatment facility.

d) Generate solid waste in excess of state or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?	☐	☐	☐	☒

No, limited solid waste is expected to be garnered during the Project construction activities, such as packing materials used during transport of wastewater treatment system components. To the extent possible, construction materials would be recycled and disposed of to minimize solid waste generation by the Project and would not affect landfill capacity. Based on the available capacity of the Bishop-Sunland Landfill, there is sufficient capacity to accommodate the limited amount of solid waste not suitable for recycling that would be generated during Project construction.

e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	☐	☐	☐	☒

No impact, the Project would comply with all federal, state, and local statues and regulations related to solid waste. None of the solid waste generated during the Project construction and implementation are anticipated to be hazardous. All waste will be handled as required by federal, state and local regulation.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XX. WILDFIRE:				
a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒

No, the Project area is State Responsibility Area for fire protection. Cal Fire would be the lead response department to any fires in the project area and would be backed up and supported by Big Pine Volunteer Fire Department. That responsibility would not change regardless of the status of the Project.

b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?	☐	☐	☐	☒

No, the Project area would be unoccupied after construction except during the time of maintenance operations. If a fire occurs or is in progress, all operations would be suspended during fire suppression activities.

c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?	☐	☐	☐	☒

No, the Project includes an access road through the Project site. State Route 168 would serve as a fuel break as well as access to the Project site for maintenance and emergencies. Power lines are in the near vicinity but are separately maintained by the power company.

d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?	☐	☐	☐	☒

No, the Project is located outside of the developed area of Big Pine. No building structures are downhill of the site. It is located on LADWP open land that is used for grazing and has an extensive network of flood irrigation ditches for spreading water to grow native grasses. The gentle gradient of the land does not lend itself to landslides or significant runoff from unvegetated ground. Flooding is unlikely as Big Pine Creek is to the south of the project and the Owens River is to the east in the bottom of the valley. Any operations would be suspended as a result of wildfire or other emergency.

XXI. 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 a 5 acre expansion of an existing 10.3 acre wastewater treatment facility in an undeveloped-rural area. The existing wastewater treatment facility has been operating since 1972. The Project would not adversely affect the quality of the environment or eliminate important examples of a major period of California history or prehistory. The Project area has been previously disturbed, including disturbance from the creation of the existing wastewater treatment facility. The Project will not reduce or eliminate any plant or animal species with the exception of mitigation for the potential Rufous Hummingbird nesting and possible Hoary Bat roosting. With the implementation of the preconstruction nesting surveys, if construction is to be done during the Rufous Hummingbird nesting season between January 1 through September 15, and the pre-tree removal survey for the possible roosting of the Hoary Bat in one elm tree, the project would avoid possible disturbance or impact on any nesting Rufous Hummingbirds and roosting Hoary Bats. With these mitigations, the impacts would be less than significant.

b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively	☐	☐	☒	☐

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

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)?

No, the Project does not have impacts that are individually limited but cumulatively considerable. Due to the sparseness of the natural environment, lack of, or unlikely, disturbance to plant or potential animal habitat, this location is well suited for the proposed development.

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

No, the Project has no known environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings either directly or indirectly. The Project would not adversely impact the residences to the west and southwest and provides the residences of Big Pine with a necessary service.