



INITIAL STUDY ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

1. **Project** (*Title & No.*): Majestic Gateway. GPA/ZC No. 21-0184; VTPM No. 12438
Site Plan Review No. 21-0185
2. **Lead Agency** (*name and address*): City of Bakersfield
Development Services Department
1715 Chester Avenue
Bakersfield, California 93301
3. **Contact Person** (*name, title, phone*): Cassandra Gale, Principal Planner
661.326.3411
4. **Project Location:** East of SR-99, west of South H Street, north of Hosking Avenue and south of Berkshire Road; Bakersfield, CA
5. **Applicant** (*name and address*): Majestic Realty Co.
13191 Crossroads Parkway North, 6th Floor
City of Industry, CA 91746
6. **General Plan Designation:** GC (General Commercial)
7. **Zoning:** C-2-PCD (General Commercial/Planned Commercial Development)
8. **Description of Project** (*describe the whole action involved, including but not limited to later phases of the project, and any secondary, support, or off-site features necessary for its implementation.*):

Applications filed with the City of Bakersfield include a General Plan Amendment and Zone Change for the warehouse portion of the Project Site, a Zone Change with Development Plan for the commercial portion of the Project Site, a Site Plan for the warehouse portion of the Project Site, and a Vesting Tentative Parcel Map to subdivide the ±90.6 gross-acre property and dedicate right-of-way, resulting in ±86.7 net acres available for development.

The warehouse component of the Project entails the construction and operation of one distribution warehouse building having a maximum of 1,012,185 square feet (s.f.) of building space. The commercial component of the Project entails the construction and operation of 12 commercial buildings collectively having a maximum of 187,500 s.f. of building space. Other features of the Project include an on-site detention basin, landscaping, parking areas, drive aisles, lighting, signage, and frontage improvements to Berkshire Avenue and South H Street. Off-site widening and improvements to South H Street between Berkshire Road and Hosking Avenue also are included as part of the Project.

The warehouse component would have office areas positioned at any or all of the corners of the building to support the warehouse functions, with the remainder of the building used as warehouse. The building's tenant is not known at this time. The proposed building is rectangular in shape and would be positioned with the long sides of the building facing east and west and the shorter sides of the building facing north and south. The structure would have a maximum height of ±50 feet to the top of the office area parapet. The building is designed in a contemporary style and is proposed to be painted shades of white, gray, and dark gray, with blue accents.

Vehicular access to the warehouse building would be provided by two driveways connecting with Berkshire Road, with the westernmost driveway at Colony Street signalized. Three driveways would

connect with South H Street, with the center driveway signalized. Truck access would use the Berkshire driveways, with trucks primarily circulating counter-clockwise within the site around the warehouse building and traveling to and from SR-99 by using the Hosking/SR-99 on- and off-ramps. Passenger vehicles would primarily use the South H Street private driveways, where the employee and visitor parking lot is planned. No trucks would use the driveways connecting with South H Street. The building's truck courts would be screened and secured by a combination of solid walls, fencing, and landscaping. The employee and visitor parking lot is planned on the east side of the building, with shade trees meeting the City's landscaping requirements.

Twelve commercial buildings are proposed, with three buildings located in the northwestern portion of the Project site and nine buildings located in the southern portion of the Project site. In total, a maximum of 187,500 s.f. of building space is planned among the 12 commercial structures. The proposed commercial structures would range in height from ± 29 ft to ± 43 feet. The buildings are designed in a contemporary style and are proposed to be painted shades of white, gray, and tan, with a mixture of color accent materials including but not limited to brick and siding.

To connect the two areas of commercial development and to avoid the need to travel on public roads, an internal private frontage driveway is planned paralleling SR-99 internal to the site. Vehicular access from Berkshire Road is anticipated to be provided by a signalized intersection at Colony Street and vehicular access from South H Street is anticipated to be provided by a signalized intersection at a private driveway connecting to South H Street.

9. Environmental setting *(briefly describe the existing onsite conditions and surrounding land uses):*

The Project site is vacant, undeveloped land located within the southern portion of the City of Bakersfield. The surrounding area is a mixture of land uses. Vacant and undeveloped land borders the Project site to the north, Kern Island Canal and single-family residential home to the east, vacant land and commercial development to the south, and SR-99 to the west.

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

- San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District – Indirect Source Rule compliance
- Water Resources Control Board – National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System General Permit

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

As indicated by the checklist on the following pages, the project would result in potentially significant impacts with respect to the environmental factors checked below (*Impacts reduced to a less than significant level through the incorporation of mitigation are not considered potentially significant.*):

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

ENVIRONMENTAL 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 has been (1) adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and (2) addressed by mitigation 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 have been (1) analyzed adequately in an earlier **environmental impact report or negative declaration** pursuant to applicable legal standards, and (2) avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier **environmental impact report or negative declaration**, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.



Signature

03/01/2022

Date

Kassandra Gale, AICP, Principal Planner

Printed name

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 significant.
-

Environmental Issue

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

I. AESTHETICS: Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:

- | | | | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcrops, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 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? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| a) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES:

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

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Convert prime farmland, unique farmland, or 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)) or timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526) or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Result in the loss of forestland or conversion of forest land to non-forest? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

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? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) 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? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| a) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

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 Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 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 Wildlife or US Fish and Wildlife Service? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with an established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Environmental Issue

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES: Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS: Would the project:				
a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv) landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous material into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Environmental Issue

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY: Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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:				
i) result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite;	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) 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; or	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv) impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING: Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site that is delineated in a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING: Would the project:				
a) Induce substantial unplanned 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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
XV. PUBLIC SERVICES:				
a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
i. Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Environmental Issue

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
ii. Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii. Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv. Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
v. Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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

XVII. TRANSPORTATION: Would the project:

a) Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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 Section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in the 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:

a) Listed of 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)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) 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 Section 5021.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reductions statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

XX. WILDFIRE: If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:

a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Environmental Issue

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE:

a. Does the project have the potential to substantially 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, substantially 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?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

I. AESTHETICS

- a. **Less-than-Significant Impact.** The Project Site is located in Bakersfield near the southern end of the San Joaquin Valley and is characterized by flat and gently sloping terrain typical of the southern Central Valley and include regional shopping centers, SR-99, local roadways, tract home developments, and outlying areas of agricultural and rural residential (Google Earth, 2021). In the far distance on clear days, views are possible to the Tehachapi Mountains ridgelines to the south, the Coast Range to the west, and the Sierra Nevada Mountains to the northeast. The nearest scenic areas to the Project Site include areas between the Kern River and Lake Ming, located approximately 15 miles from the Project site, which are not visible due to distance and intervening development. The Project Site is not located in an area designated as scenic in the Metropolitan Bakersfield General Plan, is not within the City's Hillside Development Combining Zone (Bakersfield Municipal Code Chapter 17.66) and is not within a Class I or II Visual Resource Area, Viewshed, or Slope Protection Area. The Project Site is relatively flat and does not contain any significant landforms (Google Earth, 2021). For these reasons, development of the Project Site as proposed with commercial and warehouse land uses would not result in a substantial adverse effect to an existing scenic vista. Therefore, the Project has a less than significant potential to create a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista, and no further analysis of this topic is required.
- b. **Less-than-Significant Impact.** There are no designated or eligible State scenic highways within the Project Site's immediate vicinity (Caltrans, 2021). The nearest eligible State scenic highway in Kern County is the SR 14 extension from SR 58 (near Mojave) to SR 395 (near Little Lake), located approximately 50.4 miles southeast of the Project Site. The view from the Project Site to this eligible State scenic highway is obscured by the Piute Mountains. Additionally, there are no rock outcroppings or known historic buildings in the vicinity of the Project Site. Due to the distance of this highway to the Project Site and the presence of intervening development and topography, the Project Site does not offer views of scenic resources from this road segment. Thus, implementation of the Project would result in less than significant impacts associated with a State scenic highway and no further analysis is required.
- c. **Potentially Significant Impact.** The Project Site is located in an urbanized area, and thus consistency with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality is the evaluation metric. The Project Applicant submitted applications to the City of Bakersfield for a General Plan Amendment and Zone Change for the distribution warehouse portion of the Project Site and a Zone Change with Development Plan for the commercial portion of the Project Site.

As such, the Project is not consistent with the property's current zoning designation of Regional Commercial-Planned Commercial Development Combining (C-2/PCD). Evaluation of the Project's consistency with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality shall require further assessment in the EIR.

- d. **Potentially Significant Impact.** Under existing conditions, the Project Site is undeveloped and contains no sources of artificial lighting other than perimeter street lights. Development of the proposed Project would introduce new sources of artificial light to the property, including parking lot lighting and building lighting. All new light sources associated with the Project would be required to comply with the City's Municipal Code standards for exterior lighting, which prevent light spillover, glare, nuisance, inconvenience, or hazardous interference of any kind on adjacent properties and streets. Regardless, the potential lighting and glare impact associated with the Project is regarded as a potentially significant impact which warrants further assessment in the EIR.

II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES

- a. **No Impact.** According to information available from the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP), the entire Project Site is designated as Grazing Land. Grazing Land is land on which the existing vegetation is suited to the grazing of livestock (CDC, 2020). There is no Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland) located on the Project Site. Therefore, the Project does not have the potential to directly or indirectly convert Farmland to non-agricultural use, and no impact would occur. No further analysis is required on this subject.
- b. **No Impact.** According to the California Department of Conservation, the Project Site is not located on land that is subject to a Williamson Act contract (CDC, 2020). Under existing conditions, the Project Site is zoned C-2-PCD. As such, the proposed Project has no potential to conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract. No land zoned for agricultural use or Williamson Act contract lands are located near the Project Site (CDC, 2020). Based on the foregoing, the Project has no potential to impact lands zoned for agricultural use or conflict with any Williamson Act contracts. No impact would occur and no further analysis is required on this subject.
- c. **No Impact.** The Project Site is not located on lands designated as forest lands, timberlands, or Timber Production by the City's General Plan, and none of the surrounding properties are designated as forest lands or timberlands. Accordingly, the proposed Project would not have the potential to conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code §12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code §4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code §51104(g)). As such, no impact would occur and no further analysis of this topic is required.
- d. **No Impact.** As noted in the preceding response, the Project Site is not located on or near forest land. Therefore, the proposed Project would not result in the loss of any forest land or convert forest land to non-forest use. No impact would occur and no further analysis is required on this subject.
- e. **No Impact.** As noted in the preceding responses, the Project Site is not located on or near lands designated Farmland or forest land. There is no Farmland, forest land, or timberland near the Project Site. As such, the proposed Project has no potential to involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use, or conversion of forest land to non-forest use. Therefore, no impact would occur and no further analysis is required on this subject.

III. AIR QUALITY

- a. **Potentially Significant Impact.** The Project Site is located in the San Joaquin Valley Air Basin (SJVAB) and under the jurisdiction of the Southern San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD). The SJVAPCD is principally responsible for air pollution control and has adopted a

series of Air Quality Attainment Plans to reduce air emissions in the SJVAB. The San Joaquin Valley (SJV) is a nonattainment area for the State and Federal ozone and Particulate Matter 2.5 (PM2.5) standards and the State Particulate Matter 10 (PM10) standard (CARB, 2021). The proposed Project would emit pollutants into the SJVAB during short-term construction and long-term operational activities, as equipment operates on the Project Site and vehicles travel to and from the site. The Project's construction and operational activities will emit pollutants, thereby potentially conflicting with or obstructing implementation of the SJVAPCD's Air Quality Attainment Plans. As such, an air quality technical report will be prepared and the required EIR will evaluate the proposed Project's potential to conflict with the adopted SJVAPCD Air Quality Attainment Plans.

- b. **Potentially Significant Impact.** The proposed Project would result in temporary construction and long-term operational related air pollutant emissions associated with stationary-area sources and energy sources associated with the proposed warehouse and commercial buildings, and mobile-source emissions from vehicles coming to and from the Project Site. Emissions associated with Project construction equipment exhaust, fugitive dust emissions, emissions from consuming energy such as natural gas, and mobile source emissions could exceed thresholds established by the SJVAPCD. Therefore, impacts are considered potentially significant. A technical report will be prepared for air quality assessment, and potential impacts compared to air quality standards will be further addressed in the EIR.
- c. **Potentially Significant Impact.** The Project has the potential to expose nearby sensitive receptors to air quality pollutants during the Project's construction and operation. Known sensitive receptors located within one mile of the Project Site include residential uses to the north, east, and west, school uses to the east and west, recreational use to the west, and possible future medical uses to the north (Google Earth, 2021). Construction of the Project would generate short-term air pollutant emissions that could potentially impact these sensitive receptors. Under long-term operation, the operation of warehouse and commercial uses could potentially expose nearby sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations associated with diesel-fueled vehicles (trucks and tractor trailers) traveling to and from the site and operating on the site. The Project's potential for exposing nearby sensitive receptors to substantial air quality pollutants during construction and operational activities shall be evaluated in a Project-specific air quality technical report and discussed in the required EIR.
- d. **Potentially Significant Impact.** Any temporary odor impacts generated during construction activities on the Project Site, such as asphalt paving and the application of architectural coatings, would be short-term and cease upon completion of the construction phase of the Project. The warehouse and commercial uses proposed for the Project Site are not expected to involve activities that generate substantial or noticeable amounts of odor during long-term operation. The SJVAPCD has screening odor thresholds based on the distance of the odor source within the facility to nearby sensitive receptors, and recommends a "case-by-case" analysis of odor impacts, including an evaluation of complaint records for a particular facility as compared to similar facilities. The potentially significant impacts of odors associated with facility operations and/or maintenance activities will be evaluated in the EIR.

IV. **BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES**

- a. **Potentially Significant Impact.** Under existing conditions, the Project Site consists of vacant/disturbed land. Notwithstanding, the Project Site has the potential to contain species identified as candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local, or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. A qualified biologist will evaluate the site's existing biological resources and determine the presence or absence of any sensitive species. The results of the biological resources assessment will be evaluated in the EIR.
- b. **No Impact.** Under existing conditions, the Project Site consists of vacant/disturbed land and is not known to contain any riparian habitats or other protected habitat communities. A qualified biologist will evaluate the Project Site to confirm absence of riparian habitat and sensitive natural

communities identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. The results of the biological resources assessment will be disclosed in the EIR.

- c. **No Impact.** The Project Site is not known to contain any State or federally-protected wetlands and a search of the USFWS National Wetlands Inventory resulted in no wetlands mapped on the Project site (USFWS, 2021b). A qualified biologist will conduct a field survey to confirm absence of State and federally-protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.). The results of the biological resources assessment will be disclosed in the required EIR.
- d. **Potentially Significant Impact.** The Project Site is disturbed and does not support a diversity of native wildlife. Paved roads and developed land surrounding the Project Site block terrestrial wildlife movement from all directions. Accordingly, the site is not expected to serve as a wildlife movement corridor. Notwithstanding, development of the Project Site has some potential to impact the San Joaquin Kit Fox because the Project Site provides suitable denning habitat for denning. Also, avian species that are protected by the federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act or nesting birds protected by California law could be present. The Project's potential to impact wildlife movement during construction and long-term operation will be evaluated in the required EIR.
- e. **Potentially Significant Impact.** The adopted Metropolitan Bakersfield Habitat Conservation Plan (MBHCP) addresses biological impacts within the Metropolitan Bakersfield General Plan area. The Project Site is within the boundaries of the MBHCP and, therefore, development of the proposed Project could conflict with the goals and policies of the MBHCP. Impacts are potentially significant, and further analysis is warranted in the EIR.
- f. **Potentially Significant Impact.** As discussed above, the Project is subject to the goals and policies of the MBHCP, and development of the proposed Project could potentially conflict with those provisions. Impacts are potentially significant, and further analysis is warranted in the EIR.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

- a. **Potentially Significant Impact.** The Project Site is currently vacant and there are no known historical resources present. However, the potential exists for historical resources to be present beneath the surface of the site. Therefore, this potential impact will be further evaluated in the EIR.
- b. **Potentially Significant Impact.** The potential exists for buried archaeological resources to either be disturbed or destroyed during site preparation and grading. A site investigation will be performed in order to assess the actual potential for archaeological resources within future developable areas, and a records search will be conducted at the Archaeological Information Center at California State University, Bakersfield to reveal previously identified archaeological resources. The California Native American Heritage Commission will be notified to assist in the identification of any ethnohistoric or culturally sensitive resources of interest to the local Native American community. The disturbance of such resources would be considered potentially significant; further evaluation will be provided in the EIR.
- c. **Less-than-Significant Impact.** The Project site does not contain a cemetery. Nevertheless, the remote potential exists that human remains may be unearthed during grading and excavation activities associated with Project construction. If human remains are unearthed during Project construction, the construction contractor would be required by law to comply with California Health and Safety Code, Section 7050.5 "Disturbance of Human Remains." According to Section 7050.5(b) and (c), if human remains are discovered, the County Coroner must be contacted and if the coroner recognizes the human remains to be those of a Native American or has reason to believe that they are those of a Native American, the Coroner is required to contact, by telephone within 24 hours, the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). Pursuant to California Public Resources Code Section 5097.98, whenever the NAHC receives notification of a discovery of Native American human remains from a county coroner, the NAHC is required to immediately notify those persons it believes to be most likely descended from the deceased Native American. The descendants may, with the permission of the owner of the land, or his or

her authorized representative, inspect the site of the discovery of the Native American human remains and may recommend to the owner or the person responsible for the excavation work means for treatment or disposition, with appropriate dignity, of the human remains and any associated grave goods. The descendants will complete their inspection and make recommendations or preferences for treatment within 48 hours of being granted access to the site. According to Public Resources Code Section 5097.94(k), the NAHC is authorized to mediate disputes arising between landowners and known descendants relating to the treatment and disposition of Native American human burials, skeletal remains, and items associated with Native American burials. With mandatory compliance to California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 and Public Resources Code Section 5097.98, any potential impacts to human remains, including human remains of Native American ancestry, would be less than significant.

VI. ENERGY

- a. **Potentially Significant Impact.** The Project's expected energy consumption will be determined to analyze the consumption of energy related to electricity, fuel, and other related energy sources during construction and operation of the Project. Impacts related to energy use are potentially significant and will be further analyzed and evaluated in the EIR.
- b. **Less-than-Significant Impact.** It is not anticipated that implementation of the Project would conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for energy efficiency. Regardless, the Project's potential to conflict with applicable plans, policies, or regulations related to renewable energy or energy efficiency will be analyzed in a Project-specific energy analysis, the results of which will be disclosed in the EIR.

VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

- a. The following discusses the potential for the project to expose people or structures to substantial adverse effects as a result of various geologic hazards.
 - i) **No Impact.** According to the California Department of Conservation, the Project Site is not within a delineated Alquist-Priolo Earthquake fault zone (CDC, 2021). The nearest Fault Zone is approximately 10 miles east of the Project Site and associated with the Edison Fault. Since the Project Site is not within a delineated Alquist-Priolo Earthquake fault zone, rupture of a known earthquake fault would not occur as a result of implementation of the Project. No impacts would occur and no further analysis is warranted.
 - ii) **Less-than-Significant Impact.** Due to the location of active faults in the general region, strong seismic ground shaking could occur at the Project Site, resulting in damage to structures that are not properly designed to withstand strong ground shaking. This risk is not considered substantially different than that of other similar properties in the Southern California area and is considered adequately mitigated to protect public health, safety, and welfare if buildings are designed and constructed in conformance with applicable building codes and sound engineering practices. As a condition of Project approval, the Project would be required to be constructed in accordance with the California Building Standards Code (CBSC, Title 24, Part 11 of the California Code of Regulations) and the Kern County Building Code (Chapter 17.08). The CBSC and Kern County Building Codes have been specifically tailored for California earthquake conditions and provide standards that must be met to safeguard life or limb, health, property, and public welfare by regulating and controlling the design, construction, quality of materials, use and occupancy, location, and maintenance of all buildings and structures. In addition, the CBSC (Chapter 18) requires development projects to prepare geologic engineering reports to identify site-specific geologic and seismic conditions and provide site-specific recommendations including, but not limited to, recommendations related to ground stabilization, selection of appropriate foundation type and depths, and selection of appropriate structural systems, to preclude adverse effects resulting from strong seismic ground-shaking. With mandatory compliance with State and local building codes,

impacts associated with strong seismic ground shaking would be reduced to less-than-significant levels. Accordingly, no further analysis of this topic is required.

- iii) **Less-than-Significant Impact.** According to Metropolitan Bakersfield General Plan Figure VIII-2, Geologic Hazards, the Project Site is not located in an area with the potential for liquefaction (City of Bakersfield, 2007). To confirm the lack of liquefaction potential, a geotechnical study will be prepared for the Project, which will evaluate the Project Site's potential to be subject to seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction. The results of the site-specific geotechnical evaluation will be disclosed in the Project's EIR.
 - iv) **No Impact.** Due to the generally flat-lying nature of the site and surrounding areas, landslides would not occur on the Project Site. Therefore, the proposed Project would not expose people or structures to substantial adverse effects involving landslides, and no impacts would occur. No further analysis is warranted.
- b. **Potentially Significant Impact.** Project construction activities would disturb the Project Site and have the potential to result in erosion and sedimentation from the Project Site. Grading activities could lead to exposed soils susceptible to runoff and wind erosion. Therefore, impacts associated with erosion and loss of topsoil are considered potentially significant and warrant further analysis in the EIR.
 - c. **Less-than-Significant Impact.** Although the Project Site is relatively flat and is not expected to require earth modifications to great depths, soil would require excavation and recompaction. There is potential that seismically induced hazards such as subsidence, laterally spreading soils, and other hazards could occur within the Project Site boundaries; however, the Project would be required to comply with the latest CBSC standards and the Project's geotechnical engineering requirements, all of which are specifically designed to prevent significant damage from unsuitable soils. Therefore, with incorporation of mandatory requirements of the CBSC and the requirements prescribed by the Project Site's geotechnical report, impacts would be less than significant. Further discussion of these requirements will be included in the EIR.
 - d. **Potentially Significant Impact.** Expansive soils are fine-grained soils (generally high plasticity clays) that can undergo a significant increase in volume with an increase in water content and a significant decrease in volume with a decrease in water content. Changes in the water content of a highly expansive soil can result in severe distress to structures constructed on or against the soil. Impacts would be considered less than significant. The EIR will confirm the presence or absence of expansive soils within the Project area and discuss risks to life and property that may result from the presence of expansive soils.
 - e. **No Impact.** The proposed Project would not use septic tanks or other systems to dispose of wastewater generated by the Project. The Project would be served by domestic sewer systems installed as part of the Project, the flows from which would be treated at one of the City's wastewater treatment plants. No impacts would occur, and further analysis is not warranted.
 - f. **Potentially Significant Impact.** If paleontologically sensitive formations are located under the Project Site, ground disturbance could result in potentially significant impacts to paleontological resources. The Project's EIR will evaluate whether the Project Site is located in an area with high potential to contain unique paleontological resources and whether such resources could be impacted by Project construction activities.

VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

- a. **Potentially Significant Impact.** Construction and operational activities associated with the Project would emit air pollutants, several of which are regarded as greenhouse gasses (GHGs). GHG emissions associated with the proposed Project would primarily be associated with tailpipe emissions from Project-related traffic. In addition, construction activities, energy consumption, water consumption, and solid waste generation also would contribute to the overall generation of GHGs. Specifically, construction and operational activities would result in the emissions of

carbon dioxide (CO₂), nitrogen dioxide (NO₂), and methane (CH₄), which are GHGs. A GHG emissions analysis will be prepared to quantify and evaluate the Project's GHG emissions. Because climate change is a global phenomenon and not limited to a specific locale such as the Project Site and its immediate vicinity, emissions have the potential to be significant on a cumulatively considerable basis. The proposed Project's potential to generate GHGs, either directly or indirectly, that could have a significant impact on the environment, will be analyzed in a GHG analysis report which will be discussed in the required EIR.

- b. **Potentially Significant Impact.** The Project's potential impacts due to GHG emissions will be assessed in a GHG emissions report based on consistency with applicable plans, policies, and regulations adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases. The EIR will document the findings of the Project-specific GHG emissions report and will evaluate the Project for consistency with applicable plans, policies, and regulations adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions, including, but not limited to, Assembly Bill 32 and Senate Bill 375.

IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

- a. **Potentially Significant Impact.** During Project construction, limited amounts of hazardous materials typical of construction activities would be transported to, stored, and used on the Project Site (e.g., fuel, lubricants, architectural coatings). There is potential that hazardous materials may be used and stored on the Project Site as part of routine business operations. The required EIR will evaluate the Project's potential to create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials during short-term construction and long-term operation.
- b. **Less-than-Significant Impact.** If businesses that use or store hazardous materials occupy the Project, the business owners and operators would be required to comply with all applicable federal, State, and local regulations to ensure proper use, storage, use, emission, and disposal of hazardous substances. Thus, the Project would not 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. Impacts would be less than significant, and further analysis of this topic is not required.
- c. **No Impact.** There are no schools within 0.25 mile of the proposed Project Site. The closest school is Granite Pointe Elementary School, which is 0.3 mile west of the site along Berkshire Road. Therefore, the proposed Project would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within 0.25 mile of an existing or proposed school. Nonetheless, because the nearest school is 0.3 miles away, this topic will be further discussed in the EIR.
- d. **No Impact.** According to preliminary information provided by the California Department of Toxic Substances Control, the Project Site is not located on the list of hazardous materials sites pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. Notwithstanding, an ESA will be prepared for the Project, which will include the results of governmental hazardous materials database search. The results of the ESA's database search will be disclosed in the Project's EIR.
- e. **Less-than-Significant Impact.** The nearest public airport identified by the Kern County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP) is the Bakersfield Municipal Airport, which is 2.5 miles northeast of the Project area (Kern County, 2012). Therefore, the proposed Project is not within an airport land use plan or within 2 miles of a public use airport. It is anticipated that impacts would be less than significant. Impacts will not be further discussed in the EIR.
- f. **Less-than-Significant Impact.** The Project Site does not contain any emergency facilities nor does it serve as an emergency evacuation route. During construction and long-term operation, the proposed Project would be required to maintain adequate emergency access for emergency vehicles. Therefore, no impacts related to impairment of the implementation of, or physical interference with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan are

anticipated. No further analysis is required; therefore, this issue will not be addressed in detail in the EIR.

- g. **No Impact.** The Project is not adjacent to a wildland area. The Project Site consists of vacant, undeveloped land and is surrounded by paved road and existing and proposed development. Development of the site as proposed would reduce brush on the site and reduce the potential for a wildfire. Therefore, wildland fires do not have the potential to affect the site, and no impacts would occur. No further discussion is warranted in the EIR.

X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

- a. **Potentially Significant Impact.** Implementation of the Project would involve clearing, grading, paving, utility installation, building construction, and landscaping activities, which could result in the generation of water quality pollutants such as silt, debris, chemicals, paints, and other solvents with the potential to adversely affect water quality. As such, short-term water quality impacts have the potential to occur during construction of the Project in the absence of any protective or avoidance measures. Additionally, runoff under post-development conditions could contain pollutants in the absence of protective or avoidance measures. The Project's potential to violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements during short-term construction and/or long-term operational activities shall be fully analyzed in the required EIR.
- b. **Potentially Significant Impact.** The groundwater sub-basin underlying Bakersfield is the Kern County sub-basin. The Kern County sub-basin is one of the seven sub-basins within the San Joaquin Valley Basin that transport, filter, and store water. Depth to groundwater beneath the Project Site is approximately 43 feet. The proposed Project would add one distribution warehouse building totaling up to 1,012,185 square feet, 12 commercial buildings with a maximum of 187,500 square feet, associated parking lots, internal drives, and roadway frontage improvements on ±90.6 gross acres, which would considerably decrease the amount of pervious surfaces on the site and thereby potentially affect groundwater recharge. This issue is considered potentially significant, and further analysis is warranted in the EIR.
- c. The following discusses the potential for the Project to substantially alter the existing drainage pattern for the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition impervious surfaces.
 - i) **Potentially Significant Impact.** The existing drainage pattern on the Project Site would be altered by construction of the Project, directing the development's stormwater to a detention and water quality basin proposed on the site southwest of the warehouse building. All development within the City is required by ordinance to comply with an approved drainage plan that avoids on-site and off-site erosion and siltation issues. Although the Project would alter the Project Site's internal drainage patterns, such changes are not expected to result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site, either during construction or during long-term operation due to mandatory erosion control requirements. Regardless, this topic will be further analyzed in the EIR.
 - ii) **Less-than-Significant Impact.** The existing drainage pattern on the Project Site would be altered by construction of the Project, directing the development's stormwater to a detention and water quality basin proposed to be located southwest of the warehouse building. Stormwater would be managed by the Project's stormwater drainage system inclusive of the proposed basin, preventing any reasonable possibility of causing flooding on- or off-site. Although the Project would alter the Project Site's internal drainage patterns, such changes would not result in substantial flooding on- or off-site, either during construction or during long-term operation. Accordingly, implementation of the Project would result in a less than significant impact associated with flooding, and further analysis of this topic is not required.
 - iii) **Potentially Significant Impact.** The existing drainage pattern on the site would be altered through the construction of the Project. A site-specific preliminary hydrology study will be

prepared to evaluate whether the Project would result in a substantial change in the rate or amount of runoff from the site. The results of the site-specific hydrology study shall be documented in the required EIR.

- iv) **Less-than-Significant Impact.** According to Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRM) produced by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), the Project Site is located within "Flood Zone X (unshaded)," which includes "Areas determined to be outside the 0.2% annual chance floodplain" (FEMA, 2021). As such the Project has no reasonable potential to impede or redirect flood lows and no further analysis of this topic is required.
- d. **Potentially Significant Impact.** The Project Site is not located near any significantly-sized enclosed body of water or coastal area and is, therefore, not susceptible to a seiche or tsunami. The Kern Island Canal is an irrigation canal located east of the site that primarily serves farmland south of Bakersfield and has no reasonable potential of flooding the Project site. The Project Site is, however, approximately 39 miles southwest of Lake Isabella and within the dam failure inundation zone. The Project Site's location within the dam inundation area will be further evaluated in the EIR.
- e. **Potentially Significant Impact.** The Project Site is located in Kern County sub-basin for groundwater and is located in the Greenfield County Water District (CWD), which obtains all of its water from groundwater resources. Since the Kern sub-basin is a non-adjudicated basin, there are currently no restrictions on groundwater pumping and the limit of available water is the pump capacity of Greenfield CWD's existing wells to pump groundwater. Greenfield CWD's service area lies within the Kern River Groundwater Sustainability Agency's 361 square-mile plan area; the governing Groundwater Sustainability Plan is the "Kern River Groundwater Sustainability Plan" dated January 2020 and Greenfield CWD's service area is included in the "Agricultural Management Area" of the Sustainability Plan. As such, the EIR will evaluate the potential of the proposed Project to conflict with the Plan.

XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING

- a. **No Impact.** There is no reasonable possibility of the Project dividing a community. SR-99 borders the Project Site. Vacant land planned for commercial development and Hosking Avenue border the Project Site on the south. South H Street borders the Project Site on the east, beyond which is the Kern Island Canal and a residential neighborhood. Land immediately north of the Project Site on the north side of Berkshire Road is vacant and anticipated to be developed with a medical facility. Further north on the north and south sides of Panama Lane and the east and west sides of Colony Street is large-scale commercial development. Therefore, there would be no community division and further discussion is not warranted in the EIR.
- b. **Potentially Significant Impact.** The proposed Project Site is within the City of Bakersfield and is subject to the land use designations, goals, and policies contained within the Metropolitan Bakersfield General Plan (MBGP) and the Bakersfield Municipal Code, Title 17: Zoning. The proposed Project requests a General Plan Amendment (GPA) and concurrent Zone Change (ZC). The proposed GPA would change the General Plan designation for the 56.9-gross-acre warehouse portion of the Project Site from General Commercial (GC) to Light Industrial (LI). The proposed ZC would change the zoning classification for the 56.9-gross-acre warehouse portion of the Project Site from Regional Commercial/Planned Commercial Development (C-2/PCD) to Light Manufacturing (M-1) and the 33.7-gross-acre commercial portion of the Project Site from C-2/PCD to PCD Exclusive. The potential for impacts related to the Project inclusive of these discretionary actions, and subsequent development of the proposed project, is considered potentially significant and will be analyzed in the EIR.

XII. MINERAL RESOURCES

- a. **No Impact.** The principal mineral resources extracted within the Metropolitan Bakersfield area are oil, natural gas, sand, and gravel. Areas used for sand and gravel extraction are concentrated primarily along the floodplain and alluvial fan of the Kern River, which is an important resource for

construction, development, and other improvements. Because of the Project's location away from any alluvial fans and the Kern River, it is unlikely that the Project Site would contain sand and gravel that would be considered a valuable commodity; therefore, there would be no impact to aggregate resources. In addition, the region is a major oil-producing area, with substantial oil and gas fields existing within the Metropolitan Bakersfield area. However, according to the California Geologic Energy Management Division (Cal-GEM) there are no known oil, gas, or injection wells located within the boundaries of the Project Site (Cal-GEM, 2021). Therefore, the proposed Project would not 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, and there would be no impact. No further discussion is warranted in the EIR.

- b. **No Impact.** The Project Site is not identified as a locally-important mineral resources recovery site by the MBGP or any other land use plan. As such, the Project would not 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 impact would occur and no further analysis of this topic is required.

XIII. NOISE

- a. **Potentially Significant Impact.** Project-related construction activities, as well as long-term operational activities including warehouse and commercial operations and the associated increases in vehicular travel along area roadways resulting from the Project, may expose persons in the vicinity of the Project Site to noise levels in excess of standards established by the Noise Element of the MBGP. An acoustical analysis will be prepared and the required EIR will analyze the potential for the Project to expose people, on- or off-site, to noise levels in excess of established noise standards during both near-term construction and long-term operation.
- b. **Potentially Significant Impact.** Construction activities on the Project Site may produce groundborne vibration or groundborne noise. The required EIR will analyze the potential of the Project to expose persons to excessive groundborne vibration. Long-term operation of the Project is not anticipated to result in perceptible levels of groundborne vibration or groundborne noise; regardless, the EIR will evaluate the potential for groundborne vibration and noise in the long-term.
- c. **No Impact.** The proposed Project is not within an airport land use plan nor within 2 miles of a public use airport. The proposed Project is also outside of the area subject to the land use restrictions of the adopted County of Kern 2012 Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (Kern County, 2012). As such, no impacts would occur and no further analysis is warranted in the EIR.

XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING

- a. **Less-than-Significant Impact.** The proposed Project would have a beneficial effect on the area's employment base by developing a vacant site with a warehouse building and commercial buildings. The new jobs generated would provide additional employment opportunities for residents in the area. The Project Site is currently designated by the MBGP for General Commercial (GC), and the Project does not propose any uses that would result in unplanned population growth that is not already allowed by the General Plan. Moreover, it is anticipated that any future employees generated by the Project could be accommodated by existing residential communities and/or by future residential uses to be constructed in accordance with the City's General Plan and/or the general plans of other nearby jurisdictions, and that no additional unplanned housing would be required to accommodate Project-related employees. Additionally, the infrastructure and public services have already extended beyond the site to the east and south. A less-than-significant impact would occur and no further analysis is required on this subject.
- b. **No Impact.** Under existing conditions, there are no homes on the Project Site and the Project Site does not contain any existing residents. Therefore, there would be no displacement of existing people or housing, and no impact would occur. No further analysis is required on this subject.

XV. PUBLIC SERVICES

- a. The following discusses whether the project would result in substantial adverse physical impacts to public services. The need for additional public service is generally directly correlated to population growth and the resultant additional population's need for services beyond what is currently available.
- i) **Less-than-Significant Impact.** Fire protection services for the Metropolitan Bakersfield area are provided through joint implementation measures between the Metropolitan City of Bakersfield and the County of Kern. The nearest fire station is the Kern County Fire Department, Station 52 (Greenfield), at 312 Taft Highway, approximately 1.4 miles southeast from the Project Site. Other nearby stations are Bakersfield Fire Department (BFD) Station No. 13, located approximately 1.7 miles to the west, and BFD Station No. 5, located approximately 2.4 miles to the north. Although the Project Site is currently vacant, the site is designated by the City's General Plan for commercial development and is planned to be served by existing fire stations. A new fire station or physical alteration of existing fire stations would not be needed to serve the Project, and thus further analysis is not required in the EIR.
 - ii) **Less-than-Significant Impact.** Police protection services for the Metropolitan Bakersfield area are provided through joint implementation measures between the Metropolitan City of Bakersfield and Kern County. The Project's development would result in an incremental increase in demand for police protection services, but is not anticipated to require or result in the construction of new or physically altered police facilities. The nearest first response police station is located at 1601 Truxton Avenue, which is approximately 5.8 miles from the Project Site. Due to the proximity of existing police stations, the Project would not cause the need for the physical construction of a new police station or require physical alteration of an existing station. No further analysis is warranted.
 - iii) **Less-than-Significant Impact.** The proposed Project would not affect schools. The Project is a warehouse and commercial center that would not directly generate any additional school children or the need for additional schools or the physical alteration of schools. The Project would provide employment opportunities in the area; however, the proposed uses would not require a highly specialized labor force and are likely to draw employees from the existing population. Therefore, the Project is unlikely to attract into the area a substantial number of new workers with children that would require school services. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant and further analysis is not warranted in the EIR.
 - iv) **No Impact.** The Project does not propose any type of residential use or other land use that may generate a population that would result in a demand for parkland resources, and no recreational facilities are proposed as part of the Project. Thus, the Project would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered recreational facilities, or due to the need for new or physically altered recreational facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for parks and recreational resources. No impact would occur, and further analysis of this topic is not required.
 - v) **No Impact.** The Project would not directly substantially increase the residential population in the City and therefore is not expected to result in a demand for other public facilities/services, including libraries, community recreation centers, post offices, and animal shelters. As such, implementation of the proposed Project would not adversely affect other public facilities or require the construction of new or modified public facilities and no impact would occur. No further analysis is required on this subject.

XVI. RECREATION

- a. **No Impact.** The Project does not involve any type of residential use or other land use that may generate a population that would increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities. Accordingly, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in the increased use or substantial physical deterioration of an existing neighborhood or regional park, and no impact would occur. No further analysis of this subject is required.
- b. **No Impact.** The Project does not involve the construction of any new on- or off-site recreation facilities. The Project would not expand any existing off-site recreational facilities. Therefore, no impacts related to the construction or expansion of recreational facilities would occur with implementation of the proposed Project. Additional analysis of this subject is not required.

XVII. TRANSPORTATION

- a. **Potentially Significant Impact.** The proposed Project would generate an increase in daily and peak hour vehicle trips, including truck traffic, as compared to existing conditions. A traffic study will be prepared for the Project to identify roadway facility improvements that would be necessary to comply with applicable programs, plans, policies, and ordinances of affected jurisdictions, including but not limited to the City of Bakersfield. The required EIR will disclose the findings of the traffic study and also will evaluate the Project's potential to conflict with applicable plans, ordinances, and policies that establish a minimum level of performance for various modes of travel, including those related to transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities.
- b. **Potentially Significant Impact.** Senate Bill 743 (SB 743), which was codified in Public Resources Code section 21099, required changes to the CEQA Guidelines regarding the analysis of transportation impacts. Pursuant to Section 21099, the criteria for determining the significance of transportation impacts must promote the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, the development of multimodal transportation networks, and a diversity of land uses. To that end, in developing the criteria, the Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR) proposed, and the California Natural Resources Agency certified and adopted, changes to the CEQA Guidelines that identify vehicle miles traveled (VMT) as the most appropriate metric to evaluate a project's transportation impacts. Updates to the State CEQA Guidelines that were approved in December 2018 included the addition of CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, of which Subdivision b establishes criteria for evaluating a project's transportation impacts based on project type and using VMTs as the metric. The proposed Project would result in the generation of vehicles, which would lead to a net increase in the amount of VMT within the region. OPR released a Technical Advisory on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA in December 2018, which provides guidelines and recommendations for VMT evaluation and thresholds. As of October 2021, the City of Bakersfield has not finalized or adopted any policies or methodologies for VMT analysis, therefore the OPR Technical Advisory will be used for evaluation of the Project's VMT impact to determine significance.
- c. **Potentially Significant Impact.** All improvements planned as part of the Project would be in conformance with applicable City of Bakersfield standards and would not result in any hazards due to a design feature. However, additional turning movements associated with site ingress and egress could increase traffic hazards, warranting an analysis of turning movements in the EIR. Also, due to the number of signals the Project proposes on South H Street, an analysis for design exception will be conducted to evaluate signal spacing.
- d. **Potentially Significant Impact.** The proposed Project would be required to comply with all City of Bakersfield emergency access requirements. Site access requirements are set forth in General Provisions for Fire Safety within the City of Bakersfield Municipal Code. Specific requirements, such as appropriately designed street widths to provide fire apparatus with an adequate turning radius, appropriately designed cul-de-sacs, and appropriately marked hydrants and signage, must be included in all developments. These requirements and all others to be included in the Project design would be verified by the Fire Marshall prior to Project approval. The adequacy of emergency access will be analyzed in the EIR.

XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

- a. **Potentially Significant Impact.** A study will be conducted to determine whether the Project Site contains any resources 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). In accordance with AB 52, the City of Bakersfield is required to send notifications of the proposed Project to Native American tribes with possible traditional or cultural affiliation to the area and will consult with interested tribes regarding the Project's potential to affect a tribal cultural resource. The results of the Native American consultation will be disclosed in the EIR, which will evaluate the Project's potential to cause a substantial adverse change to tribal cultural resources that are 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).
- b. **Potentially Significant Impact.** This topic will be evaluated in the required EIR, as explained above under the discussion of Threshold XVIII(a). Native American consultations will be conducted as required by AB 52.

XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

- a. **Less-than-Significant Impact.** The Project would construct an on-site network of water and sewer pipes and stormwater facilities that would connect to existing water, sewer and storm water drains. The Project would also install connections to existing electricity, natural gas, and communications infrastructure that already exist in the area. The installation of water and sewer line connections, stormwater drainage facilities, electricity, natural gas, and communications infrastructure as proposed by the Project would result in physical impacts to the environment; however, these impacts are considered to be part of the Project's construction phase and are evaluated under the individual environmental topic areas addressed in this Initial Study. In instances where potential significant environmental impacts have been identified for the Project's construction phase, a detailed analysis will be provided in the EIR. There are no components of the Project's proposed utility connections that would result in significant environmental effects beyond what already will be evaluated in the required EIR for the Project's construction phase under associated environmental topic areas. Therefore, no further analysis of this topic is required.
- b. **Potentially Significant Impact.** The Project Site is located within the Greenfield CWD service area. Greenfield CWD is a domestic water supplier with a service area of approximately 3.3 square miles that is bound by the Arvin-Edison Intake Canal to the north, Cottonwood Road to the east, Di Giorgio Road to the south, and State Route 99 to the west and part of the service area is within the Bakersfield city limits, including the Project Site. Greenfield CWD's sole water supply source is groundwater. Although the Project Site was annexed into the Greenfield CWD service area, water demand associated with the Project's development is not accounted for in Greenfield CWD's Urban Water Management Plan. The operation of a warehouse and commercial buildings on the Project Site would result in an increase in potable water demand compared to the site's existing vacant condition. A water supply assessment will be prepared to analyze whether sufficient water supplies are available, and will be summarized in the EIR.
- c. **Potentially Significant Impact.** Bakersfield Department of Public Works (BDPW), Wastewater Division, provides wastewater service to the City of Bakersfield, including the Project Site. The Project Site is within the service boundary of Treatment Plant No. 3, located at 6901 McCutchen Road, approximately 2.8 miles west of the Project site. The analysis in the required EIR will discuss the treatment plant capacity and ability to service the proposed Project.
- d. **Potentially Significant Impact.** Under existing conditions, the Project Site is vacant and no solid waste is being generated. As a result of Project implementation, the proposed development would result in an increase in the waste stream to area landfills. BDPW, Solid Waste Division, would provide solid waste disposal services to the proposed Project. In addition to providing landfill services, BDPW, Solid Waste Division, operates a recycling program. The Metropolitan Bakersfield area is served primarily by two landfills. The proposed Project would likely be served by the

Bakersfield Metropolitan (Bena) Sanitary Landfill, which is operated by the County Waste Management Department. The landfill is approximately 14 miles east of the Project Site at 2951 Neumarkel Road in Caliente, California. Potential Project-related impacts to landfill capacity and solid waste reduction goals through recycling and other means will be further analyzed in the EIR.

- e. **Less-than-Significant Impact.** The Project would be required to comply with all local, State, and federal requirements for integrated waste management (e.g., recycling) and solid waste disposal. As such, future building users at the Project Site would be required to work with refuse haulers to develop and implement feasible waste reduction programs, including source reduction, recycling, and composting. Additionally, in accordance with the California Solid Waste Reuse and Recycling Act of 1991 (Cal Pub Res. Code § 42911), the Project would be required to provide adequate areas for collecting and loading recyclable materials where solid waste is collected. The collection areas are required to be shown on construction drawings and be in place before occupancy permits are issued. The implementation of these programs would reduce the amount of solid waste generated and diverted to landfills, which in turn will aid in the extension of the life of affected disposal sites. The Project would be subject to all federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. As such, a less-than-significant impact would occur, and further analysis of this topic is not required.

XX. WILDFIRE

- a. **No Impact.** The Project Site is not located in or near State responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones. Further, the Project is not anticipated to physically impede the existing emergency response plans, emergency vehicle access, or personnel access to the site. Fire protection services to the Project Site are and would continue to be provided by the Kern County Fire Department. The Project Site is not identified as part of any adopted emergency response plans or emergency evacuation plans, and the Project has no potential to conflict with any such plans. As such, no impacts to adopted emergency response plans or emergency evacuation plans would occur with implementation of the proposed Project, and no further analysis of this topic is required.
- b. **Less-than-Significant Impact.** The Project Site is not located in or near State responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones. Further, given the flat topography of the site, it is not anticipated the Project would expose Project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or uncontrolled spread of a wildfire due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors. The Project would result in construction and operation of a warehouse building and several commercial buildings with exterior impervious surfaces and irrigated landscaping, which would not result in any exacerbation of fire hazards in the local area. Therefore, the Project has no potential to exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby exposing people to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire. A less-than-significant impact would occur, and further analysis of this topic is not required.
- c. **No Impact.** The Project Site is not located in or near State responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones. Aside from standard building construction requirements, including the installation of fire sprinklers, the provision of fire hydrants, and the use of irrigated landscaping, the Project does not include any fire protection-related infrastructure that could result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment. No impact would occur, and further analysis of this topic is not required.
- d. **No Impact.** The Project Site is not located in or near State responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones. The Project Site occurs in a portion of the City of Bakersfield that exhibits generally flat topography, and there are no large slopes in the Project vicinity that could be subject to landslide hazards as a result of post-fire slope instability. Additionally, there are no components of the Project that could result in or exacerbate flooding hazards associated with wildland fire hazards. No impacts would occur, and further analysis of this topic is not required.

XVIV. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

- a. **Potentially Significant Impact.** Biology studies for the Project Site will be conducted. The EIR's biological resources section will discuss specific project impacts on plants and wildlife, including avian species. The EIR will also discuss impacts to any important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory, if present.
- b. **Potentially Significant Impact.** The Project Site is located within the City of Bakersfield, and other portions of the City of Bakersfield as well as nearby unincorporated Kern County areas and other nearby cities have a number of on-going development projects. The Project, in addition to concurrent construction and operation of other development projects in the area, has the potential to result in cumulatively-considerable impacts. The required EIR will evaluate the Project's potential to result in cumulatively-considerable contributions to cumulatively significant impacts.
- c. **Potentially Significant Impact.** The potential for the proposed Project to directly or indirectly affect human beings, including human health, will be evaluated in the required EIR particularly with respect to air pollutant emissions, greenhouse gas emissions, noise, and transportation safety.

BIBLIOGRAPHY/REFERENCE LIST

This Initial Study was prepared by:

City of Bakersfield

Paul Johnson, Planning Director

Kassandra Gale, AICP, Principal Planner

T&B Planning, Inc.

Tracy Zinn, AICP, Principal

Connie Anderson, Project Manager

Kristen Goddard, AICP, Senior Planner

The following information sources were used during the preparation of this IS:

<u>Cited As</u>	<u>Reference</u>
<i>Cal-GEM, 2021</i>	California Geologic Energy Management Division. <i>Well Finder</i> . Retrieved September 2021 from: https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/doggr/wellfinder/#openModal/-119.02499/35.28270/15
<i>CARB, 2021</i>	California Air Resources Board. <i>Maps of State and Federal Area Designations</i> . Retrieved September 2021 from: https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/resources/documents/maps-state-and-federal-area-designations
<i>CDC, 2020</i>	California Department of Conservation. <i>California Important Farmland Finder</i> . Retrieved September 2021 from: https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/DLRP/CIFF/
<i>CDC, 2021</i>	California Department of Conservation. <i>Earthquake Zones of Required Investigation</i> . Retrieved September 2021 from: https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/EQZApp/
<i>City of Bakersfield, 2007</i>	City of Bakersfield. <i>Metropolitan Bakersfield General Plan</i> .

- FEMA, 2021* Federal Emergency Management Agency. *FEMA's National Flood Hazard Layer (NFHL) Viewer*. Retrieved September 2021 from:
<https://hazards-fema.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=8b0adb51996444d4879338b5529aa9cd&extent=-117.51213951851739,34.062752455796826,-117.50874384190405,34.06497443466799>
- Google Earth, 2021* Google Earth Pro, Version No. 7.3.4.8248 (64-bit), Computer Software
- Kern County, 2012* Kern County, *Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan*; November 13, 2012. Retrieved September 2021 from:
<https://www.liveuptehachapi.com/DocumentCenter/View/3400/ALUCP2012?bidId=>
- USFWS, 2021b* *National Wetlands Inventory Website* [July]. Washington, D.C.: Author. Retrieved from
<http://www.fws.gov/wetlands/>