

# NOTICE OF DETERMINATION

(Filing in compliance with Section 21108 or 21152 of the Public Resources Code.)

**TO:** Office of Planning & Research  
1400 Tenth Street, Room 121  
Sacramento, CA 95814

County Clerk, County of Kern  
1415 Truxtun Avenue  
Bakersfield, CA 93301

**FROM:** City of Bakersfield  
Development Services Dept. - Planning  
1715 Chester Avenue  
Bakersfield, CA 93301

RECEIVED WITH FEE  
RECEIPT # *De-1111*

**Project Title (No.):** Tentative Tract Map 6184 & Zone Change 03-0179      **State Clearinghouse No.:**

**General Location:** City of Bakersfield, County of Kern

**Specific Location:** Located on the north side of McKee Road between Stone Road and Akers Road; (APN #S14-010-05 thru 08).

**Project Description:** Vesting Tentative Tract 6178: A vesting tentative tract map containing 118 lots for single family residential purposes and 1 sump lot on 33.99 acres of land zoned R-1 (One Family Dwelling) and E (Estate). The project includes a request to make findings pursuant to Gov. Code Section 65402 for the proposed abandonment of Anna Marie Street and a request for waiver of signatures of mineral rights owners pursuant to BMC Section 16.20.060 (4.). The mineral rights estate in question represents a .37 acre area within which mineral extraction cannot physically be accomplished (12 foot strip of land which bisects this proposed subdivision). The owners of the mineral rights for the surrounding remainder of the subdivision have waived their surface entry rights. Zone Change 03-0179: A zone change from R-1 (One Family Dwelling) to E (Estate) on 17.72 acres of the subdivision listed above.

**Approving Agency:** City of Bakersfield

**Project Applicant:** Delmarter and Diefel Engineering  
(address) 2901 H Street  
Bakersfield, CA 93301

FILED  
KERN COUNTY  
  
APR 21 2003  
ANNIE GARNETT  
AUDITOR-CONTROLLER-COUNTY CLERK  
DEPUTY COUNTY CLERK

**Determination:**  
This is to advise that the City of Bakersfield, as the lead agency, has approved the above described project on April 17, 2003 and has made the following determinations regarding said project:

1. The project  will  will not have a significant effect on the environment.
2.  An environmental impact report was prepared for this project according to the provisions of CEQA.  
 A negative declaration was prepared for this project according to the provisions of CEQA.
3. Mitigation measures  were  were not made of condition of project approval.
4. A statement of overriding considerations  was  was not adopted for this project (EIR only).
5. Findings  were  were not made according to the provisions of CEQA.

**Record of Project Approval:**  
This is to certify that the  final EIR  negative declaration with comments, responses, and record of project approval is available to the general public at the City of Bakersfield Development Services Department - Planning Division (1715 Chester Avenue; Bakersfield, California 93301).

**Lead Agency Contact Person:** Louise Palmer      **Telephone:** (861) 326-3733

**Signature:** *Louise Palmer*      **Date:** April 18, 2003      **Title:** Associate Planner

Date received for filing at OPR:  
Notice of Environmental Document  
Posted by County Clerk on 04/21/03  
and for 30 days thereafter. Pursuant to  
Section 21152(C), Public Hearings Held  
#0372

**EXHIBIT B**

**INITIAL STUDY/NEGATIVE DECLARATION**  
 Environmental Checklist Form

1. **Project Title:** VESTING TENTATIVE TRACT MAP 6184
2. **Lead Agency Name and Address:** City of Bakersfield  
 1715 Chester Avenue  
 Bakersfield CA 93301
3. **Contact Person and Phone Number:** Louise Paimer, Associate Planner (661) 326-3733
4. **Project Location:** Located on the east side of Jewetta Avenue, between Snow Road and Olive Drive (APN #493-010-(21- 23))
5. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** SmithTech U.S.A., Inc.  
 1424 - 17<sup>th</sup> Street  
 Bakersfield, CA 93301
6. **General Plan Designation:** LR 7. **Zoning:** R-1 (One Family Dwelling)
8. **Description of Project:** A tentative tract map containing 366 lots for single family residential purposes and 1 canal lot on 100.54 acres zoned R-1 (One Family Dwelling). The applicant is requesting a modification to allow reverse corner lots, double frontage lots and a waiver of mineral rights owners signatures pursuant to BMC Section 16.20.060 B.1.
9. **Surrounding land uses and setting: Briefly describe the project's surroundings:**

The project site is depicted as LR (Low Density Residential) on the Land Use Element of the Metropolitan Bakersfield General Plan. The topography of the site is relatively flat. The site is surrounded by:

TABLE B: SURROUNDING USES

DIRECTION	LAND USE DESIGNATION	ZONING DISTRICT	EXISTING LAND USE
NORTH	ER,R-1A	A	Agriculture
SOUTH	GC, LR	C-2/PCD, R-1	Vacant Land, Proposed Residential (VTM 6077)
EAST	LR	R-1	Single Family Residential
WEST	SR	R-1, E	Single Family Residential

Land Use Designations: LR: ≤ 7.25 du/ha ER: Estate Residential  
 R-1A: Resource Intensive Agriculture GC: General Commercial

Initial Study  
VPM 6164

**ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:**

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

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

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

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project **COULD NOT** have a significant effect on the environment, and a **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A **MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a significant effect on the environment, and an **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required.
- I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or **NEGATIVE DECLARATION**, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Louise Palmer  
Signature

April 10, 2003  
Date

Louise Palmer, Associate Planner, City of Bakersfield Planning Department

Initial Study  
VPM 5184

**EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:**

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant W/ Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>I. AESTHETICS</b> -- Would the project				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES:</b> 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) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>III. AIR QUALITY</b> -- 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Initial Study  
VPM 6184

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant W/ Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</b> -- Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<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 established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>V. CULTURAL RESOURCES</b> -- Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS</b> -- Would the project:				
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Initial Study  
VPM 6184

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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"/>

**VII. 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Initial Study  
VPM 6184

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY</b> -- Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map, other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING</b> - Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>X. MINERAL RESOURCES</b> -- 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 delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Initial Study  
VPM 0184

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>XI. NOISE --</b>				
Would the project result in:				
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 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"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING --</b> Would the project:				
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES</b>				
a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



Initial Study  
VPM 8184

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>XIV. RECREATION --</b>				
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<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"/>
<b>XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC --</b> Would the project:				
a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS --</b>				
Would the project:				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Initial Study  
VPM 6184

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE –</b>				
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Initial Study  
VPM 6184

**Environmental Checklist Form  
Response Sheet  
Vesting Tentative Tract Map 6184**

**I AESTHETICS**

- a. The area is not regarded or designated within the Metropolitan Bakersfield 2010 Plan as visually important or "scenic". There is no scenic vista that would be impacted as a result of project implementation. No impact has been identified.
- b. The project does not include the removal of trees, the destruction of rock out-croppings or degradation of any historic building. There are no highways designated as "scenic" within the Metropolitan Bakersfield area. No impact has been identified.
- c. There are visual impacts with any new development but this project is typical of other urban development in the surrounding area. No evidence has been submitted for the record indicating that the project would substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. No impact has been identified.
- d. This project involves incremental growth of urban development typical of the area. Light from this development will not substantially affect views in this area either at night or daytime as the light generated is typical of urban development. No impact has been identified.

**II AGRICULTURE RESOURCES**

- a. The project will not result in the cancellation of a Land Use Contract made pursuant to the California Land Conservation Act of 1965 (Williamson Act) for any parcel of 100 acres or more. No evidence has been submitted for the record regarding conversion of prime farmland, unique farmland or farmland of Statewide importance. No impact has been identified.
- b. The existing site zoning is R-1 (One Family Dwelling) zone. No Williamson Act Land Use Contracts exist on the site. No impact has been identified.
- c. There are no special attributes of this project site, involving other changes to the existing environment related to location or nature, that will cause or could result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use. This project is in an area designated for urban development by the Metropolitan Bakersfield General Plan. No impact has been identified.

**III AIR QUALITY**

- a. WZI, Inc. prepared an *Air Quality Impact Study*, April 2003, (attached as Exhibit "B.1"). The area is a non-attainment area for Ozone and Particulate Matter, 10 microns. The California Clean Air Act requires reasonable stationary and mobile source control measures be implemented in non-attainment areas to help achieve a mandated, 5-percent per year reduction in ozone precursors, and to reduce population exposures. The Southern San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District encourages local jurisdictions to design all developments in ways that reduce air pollution from vehicles, which are the largest single category of air pollution in the San Joaquin Valley. The Guide to Assessing and Reducing Air Quality Impacts promulgated by Southern San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District, lists various land uses and design strategies that reduce air quality impacts of new development. Local standards, ordinances and general plan requirements related to landscaping, sidewalks, street improvements, level of traffic service, energy efficient heating and cooling building code requirements, location of commercial development in proximity to residential development are consistent with the listed strategies. This project is subject to local ordinances, which ensure compliance with these air quality strategies and does not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan.

Initial Study  
VPM 6184

Short-term Emissions: Fugitive particulate emissions will occur during construction as a result of grading, excavation, trenching and other construction activities. Regulation VIII of the San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District specifies control measures for outdoor fugitive particulate matter emissions. Due to phased construction, exhaust emissions should be less than significant. Implementation of District Regulation VIII and Rules 8011, 8021, and 8071 with local Zoning code regulations for dust control, the impacts from Short-term Emissions are considered less than significant.

Air quality impacts are considered to be less than significant with incorporation of the following mitigation measures:

1. *Mitigation Measures for Construction Equipment Exhaust:*

The following mitigation measures should be utilized during the construction phase of the project to reduce construction exhaust emissions. These mitigation measures are stated in the GAMAQI guidance document as approved mitigation for construction equipment:

- Properly and routinely, maintain all construction equipment, as recommended by manufacturer manuals, to control exhaust emissions.
- Shut down equipment when not in use for extended periods of time to reduce emissions associated with idling engines.
- Encourage ride sharing and use of transit transportation for construction employee commuting to the project sites.
- Use electric equipment for construction whenever possible in lieu of fossil fuel-fired equipment.
- Curtail construction during periods of high ambient pollutant concentrations; this may include ceasing of construction activity during the peak-hour of vehicular traffic on adjacent roadways.

2. *Mitigation Measures for Fugitive Dust Emissions:*

Construction of the project requires the implementation of control measures set forth under Regulation VIII, Fugitive PM<sub>10</sub> Prohibitions of the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District. The following mitigation measures, in addition to those required under Regulation VIII, can reduce fugitive dust emissions associated with these projects:

- All disturbed areas, including storage piles, which are not being actively utilized for construction purposes, shall be effectively stabilized of dust emissions using water, chemical stabilizer/suppressant, covered with a tarp or other suitable cover, or vegetative ground cover.
- All onsite unpaved roads and offsite unpaved access roads shall be effectively stabilized of dust emissions using water or chemical stabilizer/suppressant.
- All land clearing, grubbing, scraping, excavation, land leveling, grading, cut & fill, and demolition activities shall be effectively controlled of fugitive dust emissions utilizing application of water or by presoaking.
- When materials are transported offsite, all material shall be covered, or effectively wetted to limit visible dust emissions, and at least six inches of freeboard space from the top of the container shall be maintained.
- All operations shall limit or expeditiously remove the accumulation of mud or dirt from adjacent public streets at the end of each workday. (The use of dry rotary brushes is expressly prohibited except where preceded or accompanied by sufficient wetting to limit the visible dust emissions. Use of blower devices is expressly forbidden)
- Following the addition of materials to, or the removal of materials from, the surface of outdoor storage piles, said piles shall be effectively stabilized of fugitive dust emissions utilizing sufficient water or chemical stabilizer/suppressant.

Initial Study  
VPM 6184

- Within urban areas, trackout shall be immediately removed when it extends 50 or more feet from the site and at the end of each workday.
- Any site with 150 or more vehicle trips per day shall prevent carryout and trackout.
- Asphalt-concrete paving shall comply with San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District Rule 4641 and restrict the use of cutback, slow-cure and emulsified asphalt paving materials.
- Cease grading activities during periods of high winds (greater than 20 mph over a one-hour period).
- Limit construction-related vehicle speeds to 15 mph on all unpaved areas at the construction site.
- Wash off construction and haul trucks to minimize the removal of mud and dirt from the project sites.

3. *Mitigation Measures for Mobile Source Emissions:*

Transportation control measures and design features can be incorporated into the project to reduce emissions from mobile sources. The below-listed control measure provides a strategy to reduce vehicle trips, vehicle use, vehicle miles traveled, vehicle idling and traffic congestion for the purpose of reducing motor vehicle emissions. These features were incorporated into the emission estimates for the project and are therefore required in order to achieve the emission level presented above:

- Incorporate sidewalks throughout the project, with adequate safety signage and appropriate lighting. Connect sidewalks to any open space or recreational areas and to nearby transit loading areas and/or shelters.
- Provide pedestrian and bicycle facilities, including street trees to shade the walkways and/or Bikeways, and adequate bicycle parking.
- Select deciduous trees and locate them on southern and/or western exposures to shade structures in summer and allow sun in winter.
- Install electrical outlets and/or natural gas lines in backyard or patio areas to encourage electric landscaping equipment use and natural gas barbecues.
- Improve streets and traffic signals for intersections and street segments, which may impact the surrounding local roadway system due to traffic, generated by the proposed developments. Specific mitigation measures for improving the level of service on congested roadways are presented in the *Limited Traffic Study* prepared by Pinnacle Engineering.

4. *Additional Mitigation measures:*

Prior to recordation of Phase 2, the subdivider shall fully construct a project or projects selected by the City Public Works Department that will result in a reduction of ROG emissions of at least 1.12 tons per year. The improvements for said project must be accepted by the Public Works Department prior to recordation of Phase 1. The project selected shall be a project which is not otherwise funded or constructed with tract 6184. The Developer is responsible for all costs to determine the emission reductions associated with proposed Public Works projects.

1. Construction of a new, warranted signal.
2. Modification of an existing signalized intersection to add additional left turn storage or dedicated right turn capability.

Mitigation programs such as, but not limited to the following may also be considered by the subdivider to achieve the same reduction in emissions as described above in Number 40 above.

1. Car crushing of older model cars.
2. Modification to stationary diesel engines, such as for agricultural use.
3. Modification of fleet vehicles and/or other mobile sources.

If one or more of these programs is selected by the subdivider, proof of compliance with these measures must be provided to the satisfaction of the Planning Director prior to recordation of Phase 2. Proof of

Initial Study  
VPM 6164

compliance may include documentation of the number, type and year of cars crushed; location and type of engines modified, photo documentation and quantification of emission reduction by Air Pollution Control District or Air Quality consultant.

- b. See III.a.
- c. The *Air Quality Impact Study*, (April 2003) prepared by WZI, Inc. evaluated cumulative effect of air emissions as a result of the project. Cumulative impacts to Ozone, Particulate Matter -10 microns (PM-10), CO, and Hazardous Air Pollutant (HAP) were evaluated. The project is considered to be cumulatively less than significant with mitigation for NOx and ROG, SOx, HAP and PM-10. The proposed mitigation is designed to reduce the project impacts to a level that is individually less than significant. Therefore, impacts due to cumulative emissions are less than significant with incorporation of the mitigation measures listed in III.a.  
  
Pollution from this project was taken into consideration in previous environmental analysis (Metropolitan Bakersfield 2010 General Plan Final Environmental Impact Report) which identified the amount of urbanization and resultant air pollution, which would be generated within the general plan area. Mitigation from the Final Environmental Impact Report was incorporated into various policies, implementation measures and ordinances. No evidence has been submitted for the record to indicate that this project will have a significant impact on air resources. See Exhibit "B.1" for *Air Quality Study*.
- d. The *Air Quality Study* determined cumulative CO "hot spot" impacts would be less than significant. The only potential "hot spots" are located at intersections, which are "severely" congested. There are no adjacent intersections which are at a level of service "F" and therefore by definition no significant pollutant "hot spot" impacts are identified for this project. No impact has been identified.
- e. The land use permitted as a result of this project does not have the potential to create objectionable odors. This proposal is not on the list of those land uses generally regarded as the type to have site odor problems (for the list of projects please see table 4-2, Southern San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District Guide for Assessing and Mitigating Air Quality Impacts). No impact has been identified.

#### IV BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

- a. The project is subject to the terms of the Metropolitan Bakersfield Habitat Conservation Plan and associated Section 10 (a) (1) (b) and Section 2081 permits issued to the City of Bakersfield by the United States Fish and Wildlife Services and California State Department of Fish and Game, respectively. Terms of the permit require applicants for all development projects within the plan area to pay habitat mitigation fees, excavate known kit fox dens, and notify agencies prior to grading in areas of known dens. With implementation of the Metropolitan Bakersfield HCP, impacts are considered to be less than significant.
- b. See "IV.e." above.
- c. The project crosses no stream, either perennial or intermittent based on the United States Geological Survey topographic sheet for the area. There are no "Federally Protected Wetlands" identified in the project area. No impact has been identified.
- d. The project is not within the Kern River flood plain, or along a canal which has been identified by United States Fish and Wildlife Services as a corridor for native resident wildlife species. There is no evidence in the record that the project area is a nursery site for native wildlife species. No impact has been identified.
- e. The Metropolitan Bakersfield Habitat Conservation Plan has been adopted as policy and is implemented by ordinance. The plan addresses biological impacts within the Metropolitan Bakersfield General Plan Area. The development entitled by this proposal will be required to comply with this plan and therefore will not be in conflict with either local biological policy or ordinance. No impact has been identified.
- f. The existing Metropolitan Bakersfield HCP is the only plan applicable to this area which relates to biological resources. There are no other adopted plans. See answer to IV.e., above. No impact has been

Initial Study  
VPM 6184

identified.

#### V CULTURAL RESOURCES

- a. There are no existing structures on-site which are listed in or determined to be eligible by the State Historical Resources Commission for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources (Public Resources Code SS5024.1, Title 14 CCR Section 4850 et. Seq.) Resources on site are not listed in a local register of historical resources as defined in Section 5020.1 (k) of the Public Resource Code and are not found to be significant historical resources meeting the requirements of Section 5024.1 (g) of the Public Resources Code. An archeological study was prepared in December 2000 for Parcel Map 10751 (the subject project is Parcel 1 and 2 of PM 10751). The study concluded that there are no significant cultural resources on site. No impact has been identified.
- b. The California Archaeological Inventory at California State University Bakersfield has reviewed the existing literature for archaeological resources for this project and did not indicate an adverse change in the significance of any on site archaeological resource. No impact has been identified.
- c. This project is not located in the Shark Tooth Mountain bone bed which is the only unique paleontological resource identified in the Metropolitan Bakersfield area. No evidence has been submitted to indicate that implementation of the project will destroy any unique geologic structure. No impact has been identified.
- d. There is no evidence in the record to indicate that the project is located within an area likely to produce human remains. If any human remains are discovered, all work shall stop until the Kern County Coroner has been notified and has evaluated the remains. If any other archaeological artifacts are discovered during site development, all work shall stop until the find has been evaluated by a qualified archaeologist or historian. No impact has been identified.

#### VI GEOLOGY AND SOILS

- a.i. The proposed project is not within an area delineated on the most recent Alquist - Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map. No other evidence has been presented to indicate that the project is located in a fault area. No impact has been identified.
- a.ii. Bakersfield, located in the San Joaquin Valley, has been a seismically active area. According to the Metropolitan Bakersfield General Plan, major active fault systems border the southern portion of the San Joaquin Valley. Among these fault systems are the San Andreas, the Breckenridge-Kern County, the Garlock, the Pond Poso and the White Wolf. There are numerous additional faults suspected to occur within the Bakersfield area which may or may not be active. The active faults have a maximum credible Richter magnitude that ranges from 6.0 (Breckenridge -Kern Canyon) to 6.3 (San Andreas). Potential seismic hazards in the planning area involve strong ground shaking, fault rupture, liquefaction, and earthquake induced landslides.  
  
Future structures proposed on the project site will be constructed in accordance with the Uniform Building Code (seismic zone 4, which has the most stringent seismic construction requirements in the United States), and will adhere to all modern earthquake standards, including those relating to soil characteristics. This will ensure that all seismically related hazards remain less than significant. In addition, because of the relatively flat topography of the project site, landslides are not considered to be a potentially significant geologic hazard. Impacts are considered to be less than significant.
- a.iii. Liquefaction potential is a combination of soil type, ground water depth and seismic activity. This project site does not demonstrate the three attributes necessary to have a potentially significant impact. Also, see answer to a VI a i, and VI a ii.
- a.iv. See answer to VI a ii.
- b. The soil types prevalent on the proposed site are listed in the Kern County California Soil Survey for the

Initial Study  
VPM 8184

Northwestern region. Due to the characteristics of the on-site soil type and the relatively flat terrain, implementation of the project will not result in significant erosion, displacement of soils, or soil expansion problems. The project will be subject to City ordinances and standards relative to soils and geology. Standard compliance requirements include detailed site specific soil analysis prior to issuance of building permits and adherence to applicable building codes in accordance with the Uniform Building Code. City standards generally require the installation of sanitary sewers with residential development projects. No impact has been identified.

- c. See answer to VI a ii. In addition, the Seismic Hazard Atlas map of Kern County prepared by the United States Department of the Interior Geological Survey does not indicate that the project area is subject to subsidence, liquefaction or other unique geological hazard. No impact has been identified
- d. and e. See answer to VI b.

VII HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

- a. There is no evidence in the record which indicates this project (or this type of land use in general) involves the transport or use of hazardous materials in any quantity which has been identified by responsible agencies as having the potential to be a significant environmental impact. The proposed project, typical of urban development in Bakersfield, is not inconsistent with the adopted City of Bakersfield Hazardous Materials Area Plan (Jan.1997). This plan identifies responsibilities and provides coordination of emergency response at the local level in response to a hazardous materials incident. No impact has been identified.
- b. See answer to VII a.
- c. There is no evidence that this project or this category of projects has been identified by responsible agencies as having the potential to emit hazardous emissions at a level which is potentially significant. No impact has been identified.
- d. This project is not located on any site catalogued on the most recent hazardous materials list compiled pursuant to Government Code § 65962.5. No impact has been identified.
- e. This project is not located within any area subject to the land use restrictions within the adopted Kern County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (1998) (ALUCP) which covers all of Kern County. The proposed project is not located within Zone A, B1, B2 or C as defined in the ALUCP; therefore there is no identified safety hazard resulting from the project. No impact has been identified.
- f. See answer VII e. No impact has been identified.
- g. The proposed project, typical of urban development in Bakersfield, is not inconsistent with the adopted City of Bakersfield Hazardous Materials Area Plan (Jan.1997). This plan identifies responsibilities and provides coordination of emergency response at the local level in response to a hazardous materials incident. The proposed project would not interfere with emergency response or evacuation plans adopted by public safety agencies. No impact has been identified.
- h. This project is not located adjacent to a wildland area. No impact has been identified.

VIII HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

- a. The proposed project will be implemented in accordance with all applicable water quality standards and waste discharge requirements, which will ensure that the quality and quantity of surface water flowing from the site would not be substantially affected. No impact has been identified.
- b. The proposed development would not result in a need for significant additional systems, substantially alter



Initial Study  
VPM 6184

the existing water utilities, deplete groundwater supplies, or interfere with groundwater recharge in the area. The project applicant has submitted a "will serve" letter from City of Bakersfield Water Resources Department which indicates that the district has adequate capacity to serve the subject site. The appropriate water utility company to serve the subject site may require the project applicant to provide some water system improvements, if necessary, to adequately service the subject site. Impacts are considered to be less than significant.

- c. There are no streams or rivers on the project site. All subdivision projects must comply with Bakersfield Municipal Code Section 16.32.060 which will ensure that no significant drainage impacts will result from implementation of the proposed project. No impact has been identified.
- d. See answer to VIII c.
- e. See answer to VIII c.
- f. See answer VIII a.
- g. The project does not propose housing within a 100-year flood plain as identified by Flood Insurance Rate Map 060075-1005B or any other flood hazard map. No impact has been identified.
- h. The project does not propose any structures within a 100-year flood hazard area. See answer to VIII. g. No impact has been identified.
- i. The proposed project is not within the Lake Isabella dam failure inundation area or the 100 year flood plain for the Kern River as depicted on figure VIII-2 of the Metropolitan Bakersfield General Plan (Safety Element). The site is not subject to inundation by seiche, tsunami or mudflows. No impact has been identified.
- j. The project site is not located near any significantly sized body of water and is, therefore, not susceptible to a seiche or tsunami. The site is not located at the foot of any significant topographical feature with the potential to be subject to a mudflow. No impact has been identified.

IX LAND USE AND PLANNING

- a. The proposed project is a subdivision map which is intended to continue the existing development pattern or an infill development which does not physically divide any existing community. No impact has been identified.
- b. The project is required to be consistent with the Metropolitan Bakersfield General Plan and the City of Bakersfield Zoning Ordinance. There are no identified conflicts with policies or ordinances which were established to avoid or mitigate environmental effects. No impact has been identified.
- c. See answer to IV. a.

X MINERAL RESOURCES

- a. and b. The project is not located within a state designated oil field or within an area of other important mineral resources. Refer to Figure V-3 Conservation Element, Metropolitan Bakersfield General Plan. No impact has been identified.

XI NOISE

- a. Subject to mitigation, development of the project will not expose persons or generate noise, in excess of those standards found in the Metropolitan Bakersfield General Plan, Noise Element. No impact has been identified.

Initial Study  
VPM 6184

- b. See answer to XI a.
- c. Ambient noise levels will increase through any urban type of development of the site. Building Code requirements for energy conservation result in a 20 d.b.a. reduction in noise for interior space. In addition, the recommended mitigation contained in XI a., as well as Subdivision and Zoning Ordinance development standards will reduce substantial increases in the ambient noise levels of the adjoining areas. The project will not expose people to severe noise levels. Development standards that reduce noise impact include building setbacks (BMC § 17.08.150 and each Zoning designation); walls (BMC § 16.28.170; 17.08.180), and landscaping (BMC § 17.61.010; Planning Commission Resolution # 58-92). The impact is less than significant.
- d. Noise associated with construction of the project is the only temporary (or periodic) increase of ambient noise levels. This temporary change in ambient noise levels is considered to be less than significant.
- e. This project is not located within any area subject to the land use restrictions of the adopted Kern County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (1996) which covers all of Kern County. No impact has been identified.
- f. This project is not located within the vicinity of any private airstrip and therefore does not have the potential to cause significant noise impacts (Kern County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (1996)). No impact has been identified.

XII POPULATION AND HOUSING

- a. The project will induce population growth in this area but this impact is regarded as less than significant as the project is the logical extension of existing urban development or is an infill project. The population growth has been addressed in the Metropolitan Bakersfield General Plan and EIR (See Table A ). The impact is considered less than significant.

TABLE A: Population Projections

PROPOSED LAND USE	DWELLING UNITS	PERSON PER HOUSEHOLD*	POPULATION ESTIMATE
Single Family Residential	366 d.u.	3.01 pphh	1102 pop.

\* 2000 Federal Census

- b. and c. The project does not propose displacement of any existing housing or persons. No impact has been identified.

XIII PUBLIC SERVICES

Fire Protection? Fire protection services for the Metropolitan Bakersfield area are provided through a joint fire protection agreement between the City and County. This proportional increase in need for fire protection services would be paid for by property taxes generated by this development. No impact has been identified.

Police Protection? Police protection will be provided by the Bakersfield Police Department upon project build out. Current City Police services standards require 1.32 officers for each 1,000 people in the city. This proportional increase in services would be paid for by property taxes generated by this development. No impact has been identified.

Initial Study  
VPM 6184

**Schools?** The proposed development of the low density residential land use may necessitate the construction of additional school facilities to serve population. Pursuant to Government Code Sections 65995, 65996 and 65997, as amended and effective November 4, 1998, the local agency is prohibited from denying or refusing to approve a project on the basis of adequacy of school facilities. To address impacts resulting from this project, the project is subject to payment of statutory fees authorized under Education Code § 17620 and Government Code § 65995, 65995.5, 65995.6, and 65995.7, as amended and effective on November 4, 1998. Collection of the fees is at time of issuance of a building permit. Although authorized by said Government Sections, no Kern County school district has yet adopted alternate higher fees than stated above. Any alternate higher fee shall be based on the method and evidence as required by the Government Code. A statement of overriding considerations for impact on school facilities was adopted with the Polo Grounds EIR. Impacts are considered to be less than significant.

**Parks?** The project proposes an increase in population of 1102 people within the area and would result in an impact upon the quality and quantity of existing recreational opportunities by creating a need for new parks and recreational facilities to served the residents. As indicated in Table "B", the parkland requirement for the proposed project is calculated based on the General Plan and City Ordinance Park Standards (BMC § 15.80.050) of 2.5 acres per 1,000 population. An estimated 2.75 acres would be needed to serve the project as subdivided via the subdivision map. Compliance with the park land and the park development fee ordinances ensures that parks are provided and built in accordance with City standards as described in the General Plan. No impact has been identified.

TABLE B: Park Need - Proposed Project

TYPE OF DWELLING UNIT	DWELLING UNITS	PARK FACTOR (acres/du)	PARK ACREAGE NEEDED
Single Family	366	.0075	2.75

**Other Public Facilities?** Other public facility improvements from the proposed development and eventual buildup of this area will result in an increase in maintenance responsibility for the City of Bakersfield. The development is required to provide improvements, such as street, sewer, and drainage facilities, in accordance with Bakersfield Municipal Code §16.32.060 and Chapter 13.12, Development Improvement Standards and Specifications. This potential increase in maintaining services would be paid for by property taxes generated by this development. A statement of overriding considerations for overhead powerlines was adopted with the Polo Grounds EIR. No impact has been identified.

#### XIV RECREATION

a & b. See answer to "XIII: Parks". No impact has been identified.

#### XV TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC

a. The proposed project will generate additional vehicular traffic movement within an accepted range as allowed for the land use and zone designations of the project site. The project may potentially cause an increase in traffic in relation to the existing traffic load (volume) and capacity of the street system, and impact existing transportation systems. The project may also alter the present patterns of circulation or movement of people and goods by improving new streets to serve the project. A traffic analysis has not been required for this proposal. A traffic study was prepared in conjunction with General Plan Amendment P01-0219 for the project site and in consideration of the units proposed. Mitigation measures were evaluated for those facilities which showed degradation in level of service below LOS C by the year 2020. The regional traffic impact fee (RTIF) ordinance (BMC §15.84.010) covers most of the required

Initial Study  
VPM 6184

improvements. For those improvements which are not covered in the RTIF an additional proportionate share has been calculated and will be accessed at the time building permits are issued.

In addition, the Subdivision Ordinance (§ 16.32.060) requires the subdivider to construct street improvements within the development and a proportional share of boundary street improvements to serve traffic generated by this development. All road improvements are subject to compliance with adopted engineering standards as stated in the General Plan and Bakersfield Municipal Code Chapter 13.12, Development Improvement Standards and Specifications, which includes the City's Subdivision Design Manual, and CalTrans Standard Specifications. The impacts are reduced to less than significant.

- b. The project must comply with the Metropolitan Bakersfield General Plan level of service standard "C" which is a higher level than the Congestion Management Plan level of service standard "D" (See answer to XV a.) The impacts are reduced to less than significant.
- c. The project does not propose air traffic or impact air traffic patterns. No impact has been identified.
- d. All road improvements are to comply with adopted improvement standards as stated in the General Plan and Bakersfield Municipal Code Chapter 13.12. These standards are intended to reduce traffic hazards. There are no incompatible uses which have been identified with this project. No impact has been identified.
- e. All projects are, by ordinance, subject to the access requirements of the City of Bakersfield Fire Department which includes an evaluation of adequate emergency access. No impact has been identified.
- f. Section 17.58.010 of the Zoning Ordinance requires that parking appropriate to each type of land use be provided. No impact has been identified.
- g. The project would not be inconsistent with policies or programs supporting alternative transportation. Payment of the transportation impact fee (BMC §15.04.010) is required. This fee in part is used to support mass transit. BMC § 16.16.060 requires consultation with responsible transit agencies such as Golden Empire Transit Bus (GET) and Kern COG. No impact has been identified.

XVI UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

- a. This project will be connected to sanitary sewer and will meet the requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board. No impact has been identified.
- b. The proposed development would not result in the need for significant additional systems or substantially alter the existing water or wastewater facilities. All affected utility companies have been contacted regarding the proposal and to date, none have identified a significant impact in providing service to the project. Expansion of all utilities would be required to serve this development in accordance with § 16.32.060. No impact has been identified.
- c. New development is required to provide construction of new storm water drainage facilities or provide for approved drainage improvements in accordance with Bakersfield Municipal Code 16.32.060, and Chapter 13.12. Improvements are subject to compliance with accepted engineering standards as stated in the General Plan and Chapter 13.12. No impact has been identified.
- d. The proposed development would not result in a need for significant additional systems or substantially alter the existing water utilities in the area. Expansion of all water utilities would be required to serve this development in compliance with § 16.32.060, and engineering standards of Bakersfield Municipal Code Chapter 13.12. A "will serve letter" from the water purveyor, (see VIII b above), has been submitted for this project. No impact has been identified.
- e. The City of Bakersfield is the wastewater treatment provider and has indicated there is sufficient capacity in the existing plant to serve this project. No impact has been identified.

Initial Study  
VPM 6184

- f. The Bena Landfill serves the Metropolitan Bakersfield area. In 1991, the California Integrated Waste Management Board issued a permit to the Kern County Public Works Department (Kern County Waste Management Dept.) to operate the Bena Landfill. The facility design and operations are consistent with State Minimum Standards for Solid Waste Handling and Disposal as determined by the Local Enforcement Agency. The landfill will not need significant new or substantially altered facilities to accommodate this project. No impact has been identified.
- g. The project will not breach published national, state or local standards relating to waste reduction, litter control or solid waste disposal. See answer XVI f. No impact has been identified.

#### RESPONSES TO MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

- a. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?  
  
No. Based on the foregoing evaluation, the proposed project is not expected to degrade the quality of the environment, to significantly impact biological or cultural resource in a manner which cannot be reduced to a level of insignificance through implementation of regulatory requirements.
- 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)?  
  
No. Based on information contained in the record to date, there is no evidence that potential impacts cannot be reduced to a level of insignificance with adherence to local development standards and adopted ordinances.
- c. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?  
  
No. Implementation of adopted ordinances, development standards, implementation measures contained in the Metropolitan Bakersfield General Plan and mitigation included as part of this proposed subdivision, will ensure that the project has no adverse consequences for human health, safety, or welfare.

#### References

1. The Metropolitan Bakersfield General Plan and Appendices, City of Bakersfield, County of Kern, February 2003.
2. The Metropolitan Bakersfield General Plan (Update) Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR), State Clearinghouse (SCH) # 1989070302, City of Bakersfield and County of Kern.
3. FEIR Metropolitan Bakersfield Habitat Conservation Plan (MBHCP), Thomas Reid Associates for the City of Bakersfield and the County of Kern, March 1991.
4. MBHCP, Advisory Notice to Developers, 10 (a) (1) (b) and 2061 permits, 1994.
5. Title 17, Zoning Ordinance, Bakersfield Municipal Code.
6. Title 16, Subdivision Map Act, Bakersfield Municipal Code.

Initial Study  
VPM 6184

7. Water Balance Report, City of Bakersfield, 2000
8. Guide For Assessing and Mitigating Air Quality Impacts, San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District, January 10, 2002 as updated.

S:\TRACTS\6184\init\_study.wpd