



CITY OF RIDGECREST

Planning Division

100 W. California Ave. · Ridgecrest, CA 93555 · (760) 499-5063

CEQA INITIAL STUDY

Project Description

1. Project Title: Tentative Tract Map 7358
2. Lead Agency Name and Address: City of Ridgecrest
100 W. California Ave.
Ridgecrest, CA 93555
3. Contact Person and Phone Number: Heather Spurlock
(760) 499-5063
4. Project Location: East of Downs Street
(APN 067-050-22)
5. Project Sponsor and Address: PAM Ridgecrest Ventures, LLC
1820 W. Kettleman Ln. Ste. D.
Lodi, CA 95242
6. General Plan & Zoning: Residential Low (RL), Residential (R-1)

7. Description of Project:

Tentative Tract Map 7358 is a request to subdivide 11.08 acres gross, and 10.16 acres net of vacant land into 43 single family residential lots with a minimum lot size of 6,000 Sq. Ft. and 1 drainage sump. The project consists of a map approved June of 2006, which subsequently expired in 2018.

8. Surrounding Land Uses:

North-single family residential. South- vacant land zoned general commercial. West- Downs Street, High Desert Alano and vacant residential zoned land. West- vacant residential zoned land.

9. Required Approvals: Tentative Tract
10. Other Approval (Public Agency): None



LOCATION MAP



TENTATIVE TRACT MAP

TENTATIVE TRACT MAP 7358

CONTAINING 44 UNITS, 11.08 ACRES GROSS, 10.16 ACRES NET, MIN. LOT SIZE 6,000 SQ. FT. BEING A DIVISION OF PARCEL 2 OF PARCEL MAP NO. 5909, RECORDED IN BOOK 26 OF PARCEL MAPS AT PAGE 65 IN THE OFFICE OF THE KERN COUNTY RECORDER, A DIVISION OF THE W 1/2 OF THE W 1/2 OF THE SW 1/4 OF SECTION 33, TOWNSHIP 26 SOUTH, RANGE 40 EAST, MT. DIABLO MERIDIAN, COUNTY OF KERN, STATE OF CALIFORNIA.



- GENERAL NOTES:**
1. THIS MAP IS THE PROPERTY OF THE CITY OF KERN COUNTY AND IS NOT TO BE REPRODUCED OR TRANSMITTED IN ANY FORM OR BY ANY MEANS, ELECTRONIC OR MECHANICAL, INCLUDING PHOTOCOPYING, RECORDING, OR BY ANY INFORMATION STORAGE AND RETRIEVAL SYSTEM.
 2. APPROVED FOR THE CITY OF KERN COUNTY BY RESOLUTION NO. 215197.
 3. WATER RIGHTS ARE SHOWN AS PER THE WATER RIGHT RECORDS OF THE COUNTY OF KERN.
 4. DRAINAGE IS IN ACCORDANCE WITH CITY OF KERN COUNTY RECORDS.
 5. EXISTING LAND USE: VACANT.
 6. EXISTING OCCUPANCY: SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL.
 7. EXISTING OCCUPANCY: SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL.
 8. EXISTING OCCUPANCY: SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL.
 9. EXISTING OCCUPANCY: SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL.
 10. EXISTING OCCUPANCY: SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL.
 11. EXISTING OCCUPANCY: SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL.
 12. EXISTING OCCUPANCY: SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL.
 13. EXISTING OCCUPANCY: SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL.
 14. EXISTING OCCUPANCY: SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL.
 15. EXISTING OCCUPANCY: SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL.
 16. EXISTING OCCUPANCY: SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL.
 17. EXISTING OCCUPANCY: SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL.
 18. EXISTING OCCUPANCY: SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL.
 19. EXISTING OCCUPANCY: SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL.
 20. EXISTING OCCUPANCY: SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL.
 21. EXISTING OCCUPANCY: SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL.
 22. EXISTING OCCUPANCY: SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL.
 23. EXISTING OCCUPANCY: SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL.
 24. EXISTING OCCUPANCY: SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL.
 25. EXISTING OCCUPANCY: SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL.
 26. EXISTING OCCUPANCY: SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL.
 27. EXISTING OCCUPANCY: SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL.
 28. EXISTING OCCUPANCY: SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL.
 29. EXISTING OCCUPANCY: SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL.
 30. EXISTING OCCUPANCY: SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL.
 31. EXISTING OCCUPANCY: SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL.
 32. EXISTING OCCUPANCY: SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL.
 33. EXISTING OCCUPANCY: SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL.
 34. EXISTING OCCUPANCY: SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL.
 35. EXISTING OCCUPANCY: SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL.
 36. EXISTING OCCUPANCY: SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL.
 37. EXISTING OCCUPANCY: SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL.
 38. EXISTING OCCUPANCY: SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL.
 39. EXISTING OCCUPANCY: SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL.
 40. EXISTING OCCUPANCY: SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL.
 41. EXISTING OCCUPANCY: SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL.
 42. EXISTING OCCUPANCY: SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL.
 43. EXISTING OCCUPANCY: SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL.
 44. EXISTING OCCUPANCY: SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL.

FLOOD DESIGNATION:
FLOODPLAIN FOR THE TRACT MAP NO. 5909 IS IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE ANNUAL CHANCE FLOODPLAIN MAP FOR THE TRACT MAP NO. 5909, EFFECTIVE SEPTEMBER 24, 2004.

BASIS OF BEARING:
THE CENTERLINE OF NORTH DOWNS STREET FOR PARCEL MAP 5909 IS BEARING N 0° 00' 00" W, 100.00 FEET TO THE CENTERLINE OF OFFICIAL RECORDS IN THE COUNTY OF KERN TAKEN TO BE N0P21542E.

RECORD OWNER:
KERN COUNTY
100 WEST KATELLAMOUNT AVE, SUITE 100
KERN, CALIFORNIA 93522

EASEMENTS OF RECORD:

IN FAVOR OF: ADJACENT PROPERTY OWNERS AND THE CITY OF KERN COUNTY.
DESCRIPTION: AS RECORDED IN BOOK 4088, PAGE 47 OF OFFICIAL RECORDS.
DATE: AUGUST 14, 1975

REQUESTED VARIANCES:
ALL LOTS WILL HAVE AT LEAST ONE TREE TYPED ON NORTH HEREIN.

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 | <input type="checkbox"/> Agricultural & Forestry Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Geology/Soils |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions | <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology/Water |
| <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"/> Utilities/Service Systems | <input type="checkbox"/> 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 mitigated measures based on the earlier analysis as described on the 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 the applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to the earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigated measures that are imposed upon the project, nothing further is required.

Heather Spurlock
 Signature
 Heather Spurlock, Analyst 2

08/18/2021
 Date

I. AESTHETICS: Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than significant with mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on scenic vista?				X
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a scenic highway?				X
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?				X
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?				X

Comments:

The project site is not located within a designated as a scenic view portion of the city.

In addition, the development meets the development standards of the General Plan and Municipal Code that limits building heights and requires all exterior lighting fixtures to be hooded and directed downwards to minimize light and glare impacts on neighboring properties and the night sky.

Consequently, the development of the site will not substantially degrade the existing visual characteristics or quality of the site and its surroundings. As such, the development of the project would have no impact upon aesthetics.

II. AGRICULTURAL 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 measure methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. – Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than significant with mitigation	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				X

Program of the California Resource Agency, to non-agricultural use?				
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				X
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))?				X
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				X
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				X

Comments:

The city and the Sphere of Influence (SOI) are located in the Mojave Desert bioregion. This region does not include forest land.

Within the City, no agriculture land has been identified.

Therefore, this project will not have an impact upon forest land or agricultural land.

III. AIR QUALITY: Where available, the significant 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:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than significant with mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?				X
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?				X
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)?				X
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?				X
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?				X

Comments:

The city is within the Indian Wells Valley Attainment Area. The Eastern Kern Air Pollution Control District has conducted studies and lists the Indian Wells Valley as an attainment (maintenance) area. The IWV is an arid valley with several dry lakes and some farming. Average precipitation is four inches per year. The areas one community of significant size is Ridgecrest and the main base of Naval Air Weapons Station (NAWS) China Lake. Primary roadways that traverse the area are State Route 178, Highway 14, and Highway 395. The region is dominated by military activities related to NAWS. Other

sources of pollution are those associated with the community, infrastructure, service industries, and vehicular activities.

Therefore, the development of single-family residential units will not have an impact on the air quality.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES: Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than significant with mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?			X	
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 the US Fish and Wildlife Service?				X
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 pools, coastal, etc..) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?				X
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?			X	
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as tree preservation policy or ordinance?				X
f) Conflict with provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?				X

Comments:

The project site lies within the known range of the Mohave ground squirrels (MGS), a State listed threatened species (California Department of Fish and Wildlife 2015). This species has a relatively limited range, occurring in southwestern Inyo, eastern Kern, northwestern San Bernardino, and northeastern Los Angeles counties. The site is within the known range of the species. However, it is not within any of the four core population areas or movement corridors.

The site is also with the known range of two sensitive species of birds that may be residents: Burrowing Owl (*Athene cunicularia*) and LeConte’s Thrasher (*Toxostoma lecontei*).

A Biological Resources Assessment was performed for the site by Kiva Biological Consulting. The assessment found no live desert tortoise signs were observed on the property. The proposed project site is not within Critical Habitat for the desert tortoise by the Bureau of Land Management. The

project site is mostly denuded, surrounded by homes and heavily impacted by human use with dirt roads and motorcycle trails that bisect the site.

No Mohave ground squirrels were observed during the survey. The development is infilling undeveloped land that has been impacted by the surrounding land development for many years. The property is not likely and will never be part of a larger, functional ecosystem.

No signs of Burrowing Owls or LeConte’s Thrashers were observed.

The city is within the Mojave Desert and contains no wetlands.

Therefore, the development’s impact on biological resources is less than significant.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES: Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than significant with mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Cause substantial adverse changes in the significance of historic resources as defined in § 15064.5?				X
b) Cause substantial adverse changes in the significance of an archeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?				X
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature?				X
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside a formal ceremony?				X

Comments:

The site contains no historic, archeological, paleontological resources. The site has been impacted by the surrounding developments and human activities for many years.

Therefore, the project will have no impact to cultural resources.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS: Would the project?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than significant with mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:			X	
i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone 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.			X	
ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?		X		
iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?			X	
iv. Landslides?				X
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?				X

c) Be located on a geological 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?				X
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risk to life or property?				X
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use if septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?				X

Comments:

The site is not within an earthquake fault zone; however, it is located within 4,200 feet of the Little Lake Fault Zone. The CGS has not yet evaluated the seismic or liquefaction of the area. The site is not within a high ground shaking area as determined by the CSG.

A soils study was conducted for the site by Krazan & Associates, Inc. The study concluded that ground rupture is not considered a major concern at the site. The site will likely be subject to at least one moderate to severe earthquake and the associated seismic shaking during its lifetime, as well as periodic slight to moderate earthquakes. Structural damage will be reduced by adherence to seismic design codes for current Building Code.

Therefore, the development will have a less than significant impact.

VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS: Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than significant with mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have significant impact on the environment?			X	
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?				X

Comments:

Although the addition of housing has the potential to generate additional vehicle trips, the site is an infill area that is surrounded by developed infrastructure that could lead to residents moving from outer community areas and reducing vehicle travel to commercial areas and employment. Therefore, the project has less than significant impact on greenhouse gas emissions.

VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS: Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than significant with mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	--------------------------------	---------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------

a) Create significant hazards to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?				X
b) Create significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?				X
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				X
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 656962.5 and, as a result, would create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?				X
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 living or working in the project area?			X	
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?				X
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				X
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?				X

Comments:

The city borders the Naval Air Weapons Station (NAWS) China Lake. The project site is within the Military Influence Area as identified in the General Plan. The project site is not within the existing or potential departure tracts for flights from China Lake. The site is not within the Military Operation Area.

The development will have a less than significant impact on hazards and hazardous materials.

IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY: Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than significant with mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?				X
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			X	

preexisting nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?				
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?			X	
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?				X
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?				X
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?				X
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?				X
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structure which would impede or redirect flood flows?				X
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?				X
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				X

Comments:

The Indian Wells Valley Groundwater Basin has been designated by the California Department of Water Resources as a basin in critical overdraft. The Indian Wells Valley Groundwater Authority (IWVGA) has been implementing projects and management actions to mitigate the reduction of groundwater. These mitigations do not include restrictions on residential developments in the area classified by the IWVGA studies as urban. Water reducing methods have been adopted by the city including low or no irrigation landscaping requirements on all new developments.

The project is not located within a flood hazard zone, tsunami or seiche zone and would not result in the risk of pollutants due to the project.

Therefore, impacts to local water quality standards or waste discharge requirements would be less than significant.

X.LAND USE AND PLANNING: Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than significant with mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Physically divide an established community?				X
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				X

program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?				
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?				X

Comments:

Project will result in construction of single-family residential units on a vacant lot. Single family residential exist on northern adjoining properties.
 Therefore, the proposal will not result in physically dividing an established community but will further infill residential areas that are currently underutilized.
 The development complies with all land use and planning. Therefore, it will have no impact.
 The proposed project would not conflict with any regional land use or environmental plans. No environmental plans or policies of state of regional agencies are directly applicable or would be affected by the project.

XI. MINERAL RESOURCES: Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than significant with mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?				X
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?				X

Comments:

No known mineral resources of any value to the region and the residents of the state have been identified within the City of Ridgecrest and on the project site. The project would not result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on the local general plan, any specific plan or other land use plan.

XII. NOISE: Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than significant with mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in exceed of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?				X
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground borne vibrations or ground borne noise levels?				X
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				X

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

Comments:

The site is located outside of the NAWS baseline noise zone as determine in the 2011 Air Installations Noise Contour study.

The development will include block walls along the exterior that will provide a buffer to reduce noise and vibration impacts.

Therefore, a less than significant impact to noise will occur.

XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING: Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than significant with mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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)?			X	
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X

Comments:

The development will increase housing in the area. The development consists of a less than significant increase in housing with the addition of 43 residential units. The Kern Council of Governments Regional Housing Needs Allocation Plan has determined that Ridgecrest has an unmet need of housing for moderate to above moderate income of 1,055. The inclusion of this development will increase needed housing stock.

With an approximate 2016 population of over 28,000, the City of Ridgecrest has the second largest population in Kern County. The Indian Wells Valley where the city is located is estimated to have over 40,000 people. Assuming that all residents of the proposed project come from outside the city, its contribution to the City’s population would be minimal. Further, the project would provide additional services as well as pay fees to improve such services as required by various servicing agencies. Consequently, approval of the proposed project will have a less than significant impact on population and housing.

XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES: Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than significant with mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered government 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?			X	
Police protection?			X	
Schools?			X	
Parks?			X	
Other public facilities?			X	

Comments:

The Kern County Fire Department and Office of Emergency Services (KCFD) provide fire protection services in the City of Ridgecrest. Fire Stations No. 77 and 74 provide primary service with Fire Station No. 73 located in Inyokern serving as the backup.

The Ridgecrest Police Department (RPD) provides police protection services to the city.

The city is located within the Sierra Sands Unified School District which provides education services to students in K–12 grades.

The city also offers a variety of recreation opportunities through its parks and recreational programs. The proposed project would not create any significant adverse impacts to public services, nor would it necessitate the construction of new facilities for fire, police, school services or parks. Prior to building permits and/or occupancy permits, the project will be required to pay capital improvement fees and other fees imposed by individual service providers.

Therefore, the proposed project would not result in an impact related to public services.

The development will be connected to the existing water and sewer services. Full street improvements comprised of curb, gutter, and sidewalk will be constructed within the project. Additionally, development impact fees will be assessed at the time that the building permits are issued for construction of the site. These fees are designed to ensure that appropriate levels of capital resources will be available to serve the development. Therefore, the impact of the map on public services is less than significant.

XV. RECREATION: Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than significant with mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that				X

substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be altered?				
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effects on the environment?				X

Comments:

The development is located within a mile from existing park facilities at Freedom Park, Pearson Park, and Petroglyph Park. The developments additional housing units will have a less than substantial impact on the recreational facilities. Therefore, the proposed map will have a less than significant impact on recreation.

XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC: Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than significant with mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?				X
b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?				X
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?				X
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				X
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?				X
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?				X

Comments:

The project will require the design of new streets is consistent with the City of Ridgecrest General Plan Circulation and Transportation Elements and Engineering Design Standards. A traffic impact fee will be paid by the developer at time of building permit issuance. Therefore, no significant impact is associated with the project.

XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS: Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than significant with mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?				X
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?				X
c) Require or result in construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environment effects?				X
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?				X
e) Results 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 existed commitments?				X
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs?				X
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statues and regulations related to solid waste?				X

Comments:

The proposed project will increase the amount of wastewater however water and sewage capacity will be sufficient for the use.

The Indian Wells Valley Groundwater Authority does not restrict development. New entitlements are not needed.

XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE: Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than significant with mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 major periods of California history or prehistory?				X
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are				X

considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of the past projects, the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?				
c) Does the project have environmental effects which cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?				X

Comments:

Based on analysis contained in Section IV Biological Resources and VI Geology and soils of this Initial Study, approval of requested entitlements and subsequent construction of the proposed project would not 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. According to a biotic assessment of the project site, no evidence of 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 were found on the site. Additionally, geotechnical engineering investigation of the project site did not reveal any evidence of presence of any important examples of major periods of California history or prehistory. Therefore, the proposed project would not have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment. The proposed project is a residential use located within an increasingly urbanizing area. The proposed project will meet all the City of Ridgecrest’s development standards as defined by the Unified Building Code as well as all requirements defined by the California Building Code. Therefore, the project would have less than significant impacts that are individually limited. According to the environmental evaluation, there are no aspects of the proposed residential project that would have a substantial adverse effect on human beings, either directly or indirectly. Under each environmental condition addressed herein, the proposed project is considered to have either no impact, or less than significant impact. Therefore, the proposed project would have less than significant impacts on human beings, either directly or indirectly.