Draft Environmental Impact Report

SCH# 2022080056

Volume 2

Appendices A - I

MALIBU VINEYARDS INDUSTRIAL PARKWAY PROJECT by Malibu Vineyards, LP (PP21116)

Adoption of Specific Plan General Plan Amendment No. 9, Map No. 80 General Plan Amendment No. 23, Map No. 81 Zone Classification Change No. 13, Map No. 80 Zone Classification Change No. 92, Map No. 81 Precise Development Plan No. 2, Map No. 80 Precise Development Plan No. 74, Map No. 81 Precise Development Plan No. 75, Map No. 81



Kern County Planning and Natural Resources Department Bakersfield, CA

July 2024

Appendix A Notice of Preparation





August 8, 2022

Janice Mayes, Planner 3 Kern County Planning Department 2700 "M" Street, Suite 100 Bakersfield, CA 93301

Re: Draft EIR-Malibu Vineyards Industrial Parkway Project, Bakersfield

Dear Janice Mayes:

In review of the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) I see reference to the County of Kern - Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP) map in Figure 7. I don't see any reference to the ALUCP in the Chapter 3 Section XI – Land Use and Planning.

Portions of this project appears to be in the B2 zone, C zone and under the flight pattern for the Meadows Field Airport as defined in the ALUCP. This area is subject to Residential and Other Use Density Restrictions and Open Land Requirements. In addition, there is a significant risk for development within the B2 zone as aircraft are commonly below 800 ft. above the ground, with associated significant aircraft noise.

Please make note that this is an area of concern because of the aircraft that use this flight pattern. This area is subject to over flight, noise, vibration, and will be subject to height, light and other restrictions as defined in the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Regulations and the ALUCP. FAA regulations may require that the applicant file Form 7460-1 with the Federal Aviation Administration for any development in this area. This can be accomplished by going to the web site

https://oeaaa.faa.gov/oeaaa/external/portal.jsp. We would recommend that all building and lighting plans be presented to the Kern County Department of Airports for review and comment to avoid encroachment on airfield operations or compromising aviation safety. We also recommend the dedication of an avigation easement, as defined in the ALUCP, as part of this process to notify future tenants/owners that they are under the approach path for Meadows Field Airport and to ensure the safe and secure aircraft operations at Meadows Field.

Please contact me if you have any questions.

Respectfully.

YOUR GATEWAY TO BOUNDLESS TRAVEL

3701 Wings Way, Suite 300, Bakersfield, CA. 93308 | 661.391.1800 | MeadowsField@KernCounty.com



Transmission Technical Services Department

9400 Oakdale Ave Chatsworth, CA 91311 SC9314

August 22, 2022

Matthew Hall Kern County hallmat@kerncounty.com

Subject: Malibu Vineyards Industrial Parkway Project by Malibu Vineyards, L.P.; GPA 9, Map 80; GPA 23, Map 81; ZCC 13, Map 80; ZCC 92, Map 81; PD 2, Map 80; PD 74, Map 81; PD 75, Map 81

DCF: 1545-22NC

The Transmission Department of SoCalGas does not operate any facilities within your proposed improvement. However, the Distribution Department of SoCalGas may maintain and operate facilities within your project scope.

To assure no conflict with the Distribution's pipeline system, please e-mail them at:

NorthwestDistributionUtilityRequest@semprautilities.com

Best Regards, Nerses Papazyan SoCalGas Transmission Technical Services <u>SoCalGasTransmissionUtilityRequest@semprautilities.com</u>



August 24, 2022

Mr. Matthew Hall Kern County Planning and Natural Resources 2700 M Street, Suite 100 Bakersfield, California 93301

Re: NOTICE OF PREPARATION OF A DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT (EIR) FOR THE Malibu Vineyards Industrial Parkway Project, By Malibu Vineyards, L.P. (PP21116)

Dear Mr. Hall:

Kern Council of Governments (Kern COG) requests the EIR for the Malibu Vineyards Industrial Parkway Project, by Malibu Vineyards, L.P. (PP21116) set aside the indicated ROW on the enclosed map for this major regional transportation facility as identified in the Kern County Circulation Plan and in the Kern COG Kern Area Regional Goods-Movement Operations (KARGO) Phase I project. The following link is to the KARGO Study: <u>https://www.kerncog.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/01/KARGO P1 2021.pdf</u> . Enclosed is a proposed layout for the future freeway to freeway interchange at SR-99 and the extension of the West Beltway now referred to as the West Urban Corridor. Please note the KARGO Phase 2 project is now underway and has resulted in a proposed revision to the County, Shafter, and Metropolitan Bakersfield circulation plan maps consistent with the enclosed KARGO Phase I ROW map. The KARGO Project Study is attempting to correct disruptions in this area created by the High Speed Rail project.

Thank you for considering this comment. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at <u>rball@kerncog.org</u> or 661-635-2902.

Sincerely,

nn

Robert Ball Deputy Director/Planning Director

Enclosures:

- Map of SR 99 / North-West Urban Corridor (formerly West Beltway) Future Freeway to Freeway Interchange – Phase I KARGO Study
- Map of KARGO Sustainability Study Phase 2, Map C-3







336 Pacific Avenue • Shafter, California 93263

August 24, 2022

Kern County Planning and Natural Resources Department Attn: Matthew Hall, Supervising Planner 2700 "M" Street, Suite 100 Bakersfield, CA 93301

RE: Malibu Vineyards Industrial Parkway Project, By Malibu Vineyards, L.P. (PP21116) Notice of Preparation of an Environmental Impact Report

Dear Mr. Hall:

The City of Shafter Planning Department has reviewed the above-referenced Notice of Preparation of an Environmental Impact Report (NOP). On page 24 of the NOP, under the heading of "Proposed Discretionary Actions/Required Approvals," the City of Shafter Planning Department is listed as a public agency whose discretionary approval is required for the Malibu Vineyards Industrial Parkway Project (Project). Specifically, the NOP states that the City will need to perform the following:

- Sphere of Influence Amendment
- Municipal Services Review Update
- CEQA EIR
- Annexation w/ GPA

The attached map shows that the Project site is outside both the City limits and Sphere of Influence (SOI) boundary. Therefore, it is the City's belief that there is no need for a SOI Amendment or MSR Update. If the Lead Agency believes otherwise, please inform the City of its reasoning.

The map also shows that the Project site is within the City's General Plan Boundary and that all subject properties within the boundary are designated as A (Agriculture – Open Space) by the Shafter General Plan. However, a general plan is just a road map for development within an area, but it is the related zoning ordinance that provides the force of law. Title 17 (Zoning Ordinance) of the Shafter Municipal Code is limited to parcels within the City limits, and the Project is outside the limits. The Kern County General Plan has also designated areas within the City's General Plan Boundary that are associated with the Project.

Page 48 of the NOP states, "[t]he project is subject to the requirements of the Kern County General Plan, the Metropolitan Bakersfield General Plan, and the Kern County Zoning Ordinance." The City concurs that the Project must adhere to the requirements within these planning documents and does not require a General Plan Amendment from the City. Later, the City will be updating its

Planning/Building/Engineering: (661) 746-5002 / Fax (661) 746-9125 · www.shafter.com

Malibu Vineyards Industrial Parkway Project NOP August 24, 2022 Page 2

General Plan, and clean up of this area for consistency with existing and future uses will occur, or perhaps the City will shrink the General Plan Boundary to not overlap with the County's boundary.

The City is not sure why the NOP states that one of the City's discretionary approvals is a "CEQA EIR." The City would like the Lead Agency to clarify what is meant by including the phrase "CEQA EIR" as part of the required discretionary approvals.

Similarly, it is not clear what the Lead Agency means by "Annexation w/ GPA." The Project site is not within the City limits and the City currently has no intention of annexing the site into its limits. Therefore, an annexation is not needed. And, as discussed above, the GPA of the Kern County General Plan for the Project is the only one required for the Project, and another GPA from the City is not necessary. If the Lead Agency believes otherwise, please inform the City of its reasoning.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment. Please place my contact information on the list to be noticed throughout the environmental process for this Project.

Respectfully,

City of Shafter

Steve Esselman Planning Director

Attachment



CRAIG M. POPE, P.E., DIRECTOR ADMINISTRATION & HUMAN RESOURCES FINANCE & ENGINEERING BUILDING & CODE OPERATIONS



2700 "M" STREET, Suite 400 BAKERSFIELD, CA 93301-2370 Phone: (661) 862-5000 FAX: (661) 862-8051 Toll Free: (800) 552-5376 Option 5 TTY Relay: (800) 735-2929

August 29, 2022

To: Lorelei Oviatt, Director Planning and Natural Resources Department

Janice Mayes, Planner III

From: Brian Blacklock, County Surveyor By: Andres Arias, Engineering Tech III

Phone: 28959

Subject: Notice of Preparation of Draft Environmental Impact Report for Malibu Vineyards Industrial Parkway Project by Malibu Vineyards, LP. (PP21116)

I have reviewed the above noted project Notice of Preparation of DEIR and recommend the following conditions be placed on the Conditional Use Permits:

- Prior to issuance of a building or grading permit: All survey monuments shall be tied out by a Licensed Land Surveyor. A corner record for each monument or record of survey shall be submitted to the County Surveyor for review and processing, per Section 8771 of the Professional Land Surveyor's (PLS) Act.
- 2. <u>Prior to Final Inspection:</u> All survey monuments that were destroyed during construction shall be re-set or have a suitable witness corner set. A post construction corner record for each monument re-set or a record of survey shall be submitted to the County Surveyor for processing, per Section 8771 of the Professional Land Surveyor's Act.
- 3. <u>Upon completion of project</u>: All survey monuments shall be accessible by a Licensed Land Surveyor or their representatives, with prior notice, per Section 8774 of the PLS Act and Civil Code 846.5 (a).

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on this project. Should you have any questions please contact me.



September 1, 2022

VIA EMAIL: HALLMAT@KERNCOUNTY.COM

Matthew Hall Supervising Planner Kern County Planning and Natural Resources Department 2700 M Street Suite 100 Bakersfield, CA 93301

Dear Mr. Hall:

NOTICE OF PREPARATION OF A DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR THE MALIBU VINEYARDS INDUSTRIAL PARKWAY PROJECT, SCH# 2022080056

The Department of Conservation's (Department) Division of Land Resource Protection (Division) has reviewed the Notice of Preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Malibu Vineyards Industrial Parkway Project (Project). The Division monitors farmland conversion on a statewide basis, provides technical assistance regarding the Williamson Act, and administers various agricultural land conservation programs. We offer the following comments and recommendations with respect to the project's potential impacts on agricultural land and resources.

Project Description

The proposed Malibu Vineyards Industrial Parkway Project involves the development of approximately 8,786,734 square feet of industrial use space, comprised of 24 buildings on approximately 739 acres of existing vineyard. The project is proposed by Malibu Vineyards, L.P. (project proponent), and would be developed over two phases.

The project site is located within unincorporated Kern County, north of Imperial Avenue and generally east of State Route 99 (SR 99), with site access from Saco Road and Imperial Avenue. The project site is just east of the City of Shafter, which is on the west side of SR 99, and approximately one mile north of the City of Bakersfield.

Department Comments

The conversion of agricultural land represents a permanent reduction and significant impact to California's agricultural land resources. CEQA requires that all feasible and reasonable mitigation be reviewed and applied to projects. Under CEQA, a lead agency should not approve a project if there are feasible alternatives or feasible mitigation measures available that would lessen the significant effects of the project. All mitigation measures that are potentially feasible should be included in the project's environmental review. A measure brought to the attention of the lead agency should not be left out unless it is infeasible based on its elements.

Consistent with CEQA Guidelines, the Department recommends the County consider agricultural conservation easements, among other measures, as potential mitigation. (See Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 15370 [mitigation includes "compensating for the impact by replacing or providing substitute resources or environments, including through permanent protection of such resources in the form of conservation easements."])

Mitigation through agricultural easements can take at least two forms: the outright purchase of easements or the donation of mitigation fees to a local, regional, or statewide organization or agency whose purpose includes the acquisition and stewardship of agricultural easements. The conversion of agricultural land should be deemed an impact of at least regional significance. Hence, the search for replacement lands should not be limited strictly to lands within the project's surrounding area.

A helpful source for regional and statewide agricultural mitigation banks is the California Council of Land Trusts. They provide helpful insight into farmland mitigation policies and implementation strategies, including a guidebook with model policies and a model local ordinance. The guidebook can be found at:

California Council of Land Trusts

Of course, the use of conservation easements is only one form of mitigation that should be considered. Any other feasible mitigation measures should also be considered. Indeed, the recent judicial opinion in King and Gardiner Farms, LLC v. County of Kern (2020) 45 Cal.App.5th 814 ("KG Farms") holds that agricultural conservation easements on a 1 to 1 ratio are not alone sufficient to adequately mitigate a project's conversion of agricultural land. KG Farms does not stand for the proposition that agricultural conservation easements are irrelevant as mitigation. Rather, the holding suggests that to the extent they are considered, they may need to be applied at a greater than 1 to 1 ratio, or combined with other forms of mitigation (such as restoration of some land not currently used as farmland).

<u>Conclusion</u>

The Department recommends further discussion of the following issues:

- Type, amount, and location of farmland conversion resulting directly and indirectly from implementation of the proposed project.
- Impacts on any current and future agricultural operations in the vicinity; e.g., land-use conflicts, increases in land values and taxes, loss of agricultural support infrastructure such as processing facilities, etc.

- Incremental impacts leading to cumulative impacts on agricultural land. This would include impacts from the proposed project, as well as impacts from past, current, and likely future projects.
- Proposed mitigation measures for all impacted agricultural lands within the proposed project area.

Thank you for giving us the opportunity to comment on the Notice of Preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Malibu Vineyards Industrial Parkway Project. Please provide this Department with notices of any future hearing dates as well as any staff reports pertaining to this project. If you have any questions regarding our comments, please contact Farl Grundy, Associate Environmental Planner via email at Farl.Grundy@conservation.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

Monique Wilber

Monique Wilber Conservation Program Support Supervisor

California Department of Transportation

DISTRICT 6 OFFICE 1352 WEST OLIVE AVENUE | P.O. BOX 12616 | FRESNO, CA 93778-2616 (559) 840-6066 | FAX (559) 488-4195 | TTY 711 www.dot.ca.gov



September 2, 2022

KER-99-32.56 IS/NOP – DEIR MALIBU VINEYARDS INDUSTRIAL COMPLEX GTS #: <u>17739</u>

SENT VIA EMAIL

Mr. Matthew Hall, Supervising Planner Kern County Planning & Natural Resources Dept. 2700 'M' Street, Suite 100 Bakersfield, CA 93301

Dear Mr. Hall:

Caltrans has completed review of an Initial Study/Notice of Preparation for a Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) proposing the construction of an industrial complex consisting of approximately 8,786,734 square feet of industrial use space within approximately 24 buildings on approximately 739 acres.

The 739-acre Project site is located on the eastside of State Route (SR) 99, north of Imperial Avenue, approximately 1 mile north of the 7th Standard Road interchange and approximately 2 ½ miles south of the Lerdo Highway interchange. The project site is approximately 1.5 miles west of the SR 65/Burbank Street intersection, north of the City of Bakersfield, Kern County.

The mission of Caltrans is to provide a safe and reliable transportation network that serves all people and respects the environment. Caltrans reviews land use projects and plans through the lenses of our mission and state planning priorities of infill, conservation, and travel-efficient development. Caltrans provides the following comments consistent with the State's smart mobility goals that support a vibrant economy and sustainable communities:

- 1. The project proposes the extension of Burbank Street, which traverses the middle of the Project site, across SR 99 with a potential new SR 99 interchange at Burbank Street.
- 2. As a point of information, the location of the proposed future interchange at Burbank Street on the Project site plan does not match the City of Shafter's General

Plan. Furthermore, a new freeway agreement would need to be established for the proposed interchange as the existing Caltrans Freeway Agreement does not include an interchange on SR 99 between Lerdo Highway and 7th Standard Road.

- 3. Caltrans anticipates that Project generated vehicle trips will utilize the SR 99/7th Standard Road and SR 99/Lerdo Highway interchanges.
- 4. A Traffic Impact Study (TIS) will be prepared for the Project as part of the DEIR. Caltrans request that a TIS-Scope of Work be developed and be provided to Caltrans for review prior to starting the TIS analysis
- 5. The most current site plan and a detailed operational statement needs to be included in the TIS-Scope of Work and TIS. The operational statement should include but not limited to: trip generation data based on the Institute of Transportation of Engineers (ITE) land uses, peak hour trip generation, trip distribution, truck percentages, passenger car equivalent factor, hours of operation, types of goods processed, primary function of facility, and number of employees. This information will allow for a better assessment of the generated trips created by this project and the impacts on the safety and operations of the nearby state facilities.
- 6. Alternative transportation policies should be applied to the development. An assessment of multi-modal facilities should be conducted to develop an integrated multi-modal transportation system to serve and help alleviate traffic congestion caused by the project and related development in this area of the County. The assessment should include the following:
 - a. Pedestrian walkways should link this proposal to an internal project area walkway, transit facilities, as well as other walkways in the surrounding area.
 - b. The Project might also consider coordinating connections to local and regional bicycle pathways to further encourage the use of bicycles for commuter and recreational purposes.
 - c. If transit is not available within ¹/₄-mile of the site, transit should be extended to provide services to what will be a high activity center.
- 7. Caltrans recommends the Project implement "smart growth" principles regarding parking solutions, providing alternative transportation choices to employees or residents in the vicinity. Alternative transportation choices may include but are not limited to parking for carpools/vanpools, car-share and/or ride-share programs.

Mr. Matthew Hall, Malibu Vineyards Industrial Complex - DEIR September 2, 2022 Page 3

- 8. Active Transportation Plans and Smart Growth efforts support the state's 2050 Climate goals. Caltrans supports reducing Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) and Green House Gas (GHG) emissions in ways that increase the likelihood people will use and benefit from a multimodal transportation network.
- 9. Based on Caltrans VMT-Focused Transportation Impact Study Guide, dated May 20, 2020, and effective as of July 1, 2020, Caltrans seeks to reduce single occupancy vehicle trips, provide a safe transportation system, reduce per capita Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT), increase accessibility to destinations via cycling, walking, carpooling, transit and reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. Caltrans recommends that the project proponent continue to work with the County to further implement improvements to reduce vehicles miles traveled and offer a variety of transportation modes for its employees.
- 10. Caltrans recommends the Project provide charging stations <u>for electric vehicles</u> <u>and for freight trucking</u> as part of the statewide efforts to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, reduce freight parking shortages and maintain the Federal Hours of Service regulations.
- 11. Due to severe truck parking shortages throughout the state and strict Federal Hours of Service regulations that limit the amount of time a truck driver can spend driving per day, many truck drivers cannot find safe and reliable truck parking spaces, and therefore park in unauthorized and/or unsafe areas. Constructing adequate truck parking on-site can alleviate the unauthorized/unsafe truck parking demand on existing facilities. On-site freight parking for trucks will also strive to ensure a secure and reliable area for extended or overnight parking to help maintain adherence to the Federal Hours of Service regulations.
- 12. Therefore, Caltrans recommends that the Project implement on-site freight parking areas and/or spaces within the Project boundaries, that truck drivers can utilize for extending parking periods before loading or after unloading to alleviate freight parking shortages and maintain the Federal Hours of Service regulations. It is also recommended the County consider promoting the leveraging of strategic investments to maintain and modernize a multimodal freight transportation system with innovative approaches, including advanced technology to optimize integrated network efficiency, improve travel time reliability, and achieve sustainable congestion reduction.

Mr. Matthew Hall, Malibu Vineyards Industrial Complex - DEIR September 2, 2022 Page 4

If you have any other questions, please call David Deel, Associate Transportation Planner at (559) 981-1041.

Sincerely,

Lorena Mendibles

Ms. Lorena Mendibles, Branch Chief, Transportation Planning – South

c: Rob Ball, Deputy Director, Kern Council of Governments Josh Champlin, Kern County Public Works



P.O. Box 3357 Bakersfield, CA 93385 September 3, 2022

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

Kern County Planning Department 2700 "M" Street, Suite 100 Bakersfield, CA 93301

Re: Notice of Preparation for Malibu Vineyards Industrial Parkway Project by Malibu Vineyards, L.P.; GPA 9, Map 80; GPA 23, Map 81; ZCC 13, Map 80; ZCC 92, Map 81; PD 2, Map 80; PD 74, Map 81; PD 75, Map 81

Dear Planners:

The proposed Malibu Vineyards Industrial Parkway Project involves the development of approximately 8,786,734 square feet of industrial use space, comprised of 24 buildings on approximately 739 acres of existing vineyard. The project site is located within unincorporated Kern County, north of Imperial Avenue and generally east of State Route 99. The project site is just east of Shafter, which is on the west side of SR 99, and approximately one mile north of Bakersfield.

Considering the potential short term and long-term impacts of this development on the environmental health of Kern County and surroundings, the EIR for this project should address numerous issues including:

GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Global warming is a serious issue, perhaps the most serious issue that we as a species will ever have to face. Dr. James Hansen, Director of the NASA Goddard Institute for Space Studies writes, "The stakes, for all life on the planet, surpass those of any previous crisis. The greatest danger is continued ignorance and denial, which could make tragic consequences unavoidable." Many scientists say that the world is reaching tipping points beyond which global temperature increases will be irreversible (see http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/03/26/climate-thresholds-idUSL6E8EQ4GA20120326?feedType=RSS&feedName=everything&virtualBrandChannel=11563).

California courts have ruled, "the greater the existing environmental problems are, the lower the threshold should be for treating a project's contribution to cumulative impacts as significant."

Given the climate crisis' seriousness, the County must require a GHG study and should be addressing the issue with specific feasible greenhouse gas (GHG) mitigation measures. We list below a number of potential feasible GHG mitigation measures, many of which address criteria pollutant emissions as well; the County should evaluate these mitigation measures and **require this project to adopt a sufficient number of effective climate change measures to offset cumulative impacts**.

The EIR should examine and consider a number of possible potential feasible mitigation measures, including:

- A requirement that structures contain enough solar photovoltaics (PV) and solar water heating to significantly offset energy usage, with a capacity that matches the maximum allowed for distributed solar connections to the grid.
- In order to encourage the use of non-polluting electric vehicles, the County should require this project to include fast charge Level 3 EV charging facilities open and accessible to the public. This project is close to Highway 99, and such fast charge facilities could reduce pollution by encouraging intercity EV travel. See http://www.windworks.org/cms/index.php?id=84&tx ttnews%5Btt news%5D=3401&cHash=ae6068 6195244d8cb5d31cad14e4aa92.
- In order to encourage the use of non-polluting electric vehicles, the County should require parking lots for all facets of this project to include dedicated EV parking and charging, including numerous charging stations for electric trucks. The stalls should be covered with photovoltaic cells both to protect parked vehicles from heating and to generate clean energy for the project.
- A requirement that the project finance solar PV construction over the portion of the Lerdo canal that passes through the project site.
- Green building measures should be used, including passive solar design and a requirement that buildings be at least 25% more energy efficient than Title 24 standards current when permits are pulled.
- Satisfy LEED Silver or higher standards on the commercial buildings.
- Design features to reduce Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT). Such features might include adjacent bus stops and/or other public transportation and should include bicycle-friendly features.
- A requirement that the buildings meet the State goal of Zero Net Energy.
- A requirement that the buildings be all-electric.

- A requirement for partial funding of an area energy efficiency program (perhaps in a nearby environmental justice community) creating equivalent reductions in carbon emissions.
- A requirement that the project partially subsidize public transportation in nearby communities in order to reduce area VMT.
- A condition that parking lots be covered and that parking lot roofs contain solar PV.
- A requirement that the developer retrofit solar PV on existing area buildings. Retrofitting existing area buildings with solar PV would effectively offset emissions associated with this project in much the same way as the SJVAPCD uses ISR funds to fund offsite projects to offset criteria pollutants associated with development projects.
- A requirement that the developer contribute funding for area solar PV incentives. Most solar PV incentive programs use funding rebates to encourage PV construction.
- A requirement that the developer contribute a GHG fee to the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District to be used to fund projects that would reduce GHG emissions elsewhere. This could be built into a criteria pollutant VERA as the Air District has suggested in the past.

For the public and the decision-makers to be able to decide on the efficacy of the measures on climate change and on the energy sector, specific requirements should be presented before the project is approved.

The environmental documents must evaluate these potential mitigation measures in order to require sufficient mitigation to substantially reduce the impact of the project on the climate crisis.

AIR POLLUTION

The southern San Joaquin Valley fights it out every year with Los Angeles for having the worst air pollution in the nation. See the American Lung Association report at http://www.lung.org/our-initiatives/healthy-air/sota/city-rankings/states/california/. Since our extreme air pollution affects the health of many residents, the EIR must thoroughly address the issue.

In a region with arguably the dirtiest air in the nation and where 31% of Kern County children have asthma, any air pollution additions must be considered significant. The EIR must require a thorough Air Study and must adopt specific enforceable mitigation measures. The EIR should examine and consider the following feasible methods to reduce the impact:

- Operational NOx emissions are primarily related to mobile sources. The project should provide employment opportunities and regular bus routes between the project and local low-income and minority communities (for example, Shafter, Wasco, Southeast Bakersfield) to transport workers. The buses should be electric vehicles charged from the project's photovoltaic panels.
- A requirement that the project partially subsidize public transportation in order to reduce area VMT.
- All service equipment should be zero emission.
- The project should encourage workers to drive low-emission vehicles, perhaps furnishing electric vehicles with no emissions whatsoever with onsite charging stations.
- In order to encourage areawide use of non-polluting electric vehicles (EVs), the project should be required to incorporate Level 3 EV fast-charging stations open to the public and accessible to EV drivers on Highway 99.
- Centerpoint Strategies, a warehouse project in North Richmond, has agreed to a rapid electrification of vehicles at the site with 33% of the fleet required to be zeroemission vehicles at start of operations, 65% of the fleet to be zero-emission vehicles by the end of 2023, 80% of the fleet to be zero-emission vehicles by the end of 2025, and 100% of the fleet to be zero-emission vehicles by the end of 2027. Malibu Vineyards should follow this example.
- The developer can reduce project emissions to zero by entering into a Developer Mitigation Contract (DMC) with the SJVAPCD. A DMC should include specific enforceable measures and should not allow the developer to defer the development and implementation of these measures to a later date.
- In its December 20, 2019, letter on the 99 Houghton Industrial Park project, the California Air Resources Board included a list of air pollution reduction measures specific to projects such as this one (attached below). The EIR should examine and address each of these potential mitigation measures as well as updated CARB recommendations.
- Many of the potential feasible GHG mitigation measures listed in a previous section also reduce criteria pollutants, should be considered as air pollution reduction measures, and addressed as such in the EIR.

The EIR must evaluate these and similar mitigation measures to reduce the impact of this project on air pollution.

The EIR must disclose whether trucks and trailers with transport refrigeration units will be allowed on this project site. If so, the EIR must model air pollution emissions from these on-site transport refrigeration units, and the County must prepare a health risk assessment that shows the potential health risk. An enormous body of evidence documents that low-income and/or minority communities are disproportionately exposed to various sources of air pollution such as from heavy-duty trucks heading to industrial warehouse and distribution sites such as this proposed project. Assembly Bill 617 (AB 617) was designed to directly address ongoing issues of local air pollution in disadvantaged communities. The Shafter region, just across SR 99 from this proposed project, is one of the 15 communities in the state's AB 617 environmental justice program. The EIR must address this project's air and climate impact to the AB 617-designated Shafter region.

The Norris Middle School is two miles from the project site; schools in the AB 617designated Shafter region are about 8 miles from the project. The EIR must address the project's air pollution impact on these sensitive receptors.

Dust mitigation as described in most EIRs is not efficient in reducing the threat of Valley fever. The EIR should require soil testing for Valley fever.

Forest preservation is one of the best ways to naturally sequester atmospheric carbon. Trees and other plants in increasing elevation are negatively impacted by mobile and stationary source pollution from motor vehicles and industry. Sequoia National Forest and Sequoia-Kings Canyon National Parks are the most polluted parks and forests in the federal system. This pollution is directly attributed to San Joaquin Valley activities. See, for example, <u>http://www.elsevier.com/books/ozone-air-pollution-in-the-sierra-nevadadistribution-and-effects-on-forests-2/bytnerowicz/978-0-08-044193-1</u> or <u>http://www.fs.fed.us/psw/southernsierrascience/speakers/pdf/cisneros.pdf</u>. The EIR must examine and mitigate the cumulative air pollution effects of this project on forest resources.

The EIR must address the project's cumulative impact to air pollution. While this cumulative impact is certainly significant, it is not unavoidable. We offer the above suggestions as some feasible methods to reduce the cumulative impact. Were project emissions reduced to zero via a DMC or other methods, then the project would have no cumulative air pollution impact since zero project-specific impact could not add to the cumulative impact.

ALTERNATIVES

We note that "[a] potential alternative should not be excluded from consideration merely because it 'would impede to some degree the attainment of the project objectives, or would be more costly" even when that alternative includes Project development on an alternative site. *Save Round Valley Alliance v. County of Inyo*, 157 Cal. App. 4th 1437, 1456-57 (2007).

The EIR must contain an alternative that could significantly reduce total vehicle miles traveled. There may be alternative infill sites that should be considered; for example, the long-defunct East Hills Mall should be considered as an alternative infill site for this project. Moreover, some new development is occurring in downtown urban areas, and there may be large redevelopment areas available in downtown urban areas for an alternate site.

That some of the alternative sites may be located in the City is irrelevant to the alternatives analysis required by CEQA, and certainly the East Hills Mall is in close proximity to both the workforce and backbone infrastructure. There may also be large redevelopment areas close to or within local low-income and minority communities (for example, Shafter, Wasco). The EIR should consider an "Infill Alternative" and perhaps even consider appropriate sites within existing cities.

The EIR should explore a "**Transit-oriented Alternative**" for the proposed project, an alternative in which design is focused on effective public transportation to and from the project. This alternative should include parking management measures that promote transit use and should include consideration of area-wide light rail and its cumulative effect on traffic congestion. The project should provide employment opportunities and regular bus routes between the project and local low-income and minority communities (for example, Shafter, Wasco, Southeast Bakersfield) to transport workers. The buses should be electric vehicles charged from the project's photovoltaic panels.

FARMLAND CONVERSION

This project would convert 739 acres of existing vineyard (314 acres of prime farmland) to urban use. The EIR must address this loss of agricultural land, not only project-specific conversion but also, given numerous other projects on farmland, cumulative farmland loss.

A primary farmland loss mitigation method is a requirement that the developer fund the purchase of agricultural conservation easements. In evaluating the feasibility of farmland loss mitigation, the EIR should consider the following arguments.

In <u>Masonite Corp. v. County of Mendocino</u> (2013) 218 Cal.App.4th 230, the Court of Appeal concluded that agricultural conservation easements (ACEs) "may appropriately mitigate the direct loss of farmland when a project converts agricultural land to a nonagricultural use.... Our conclusion is reinforced by the CEQA Guidelines, case law on offsite mitigation for loss of biological resources, case law on ACEs, prevailing practice, and the public policy of this state. <u>Id</u> "

Masonite also cited California Farm Bureau Federation (CFBF) observation that "The permanent protection of existing resources off-site is effective mitigation for [a project's direct, cumulative, or growth-inducing] impacts because it prevents the consumption of a resource to the point that it no longer exists.... If agricultural land is permanently protected off-site at, for example, a 1:1 replacement ratio, then at least half of the agricultural land in a region would remain after the region has developed its available open space." By thus preserving substitute resources, ACEs compensate for the loss of farmland within the Guidelines' definition of mitigation. (Guidelines, § 15370, subd. (e) [mitigation includes "[c]ompensating for the impact by replacing or providing substitute resources or environments"].) Id.

• The County has argued in the past that it cannot legally require agricultural easements as mitigation for farmland conversion. The decision, <u>San Mateo County</u>

<u>Coastal Landowners' Association, et al. v. County of San Mateo et al (1995)</u> 38 Cal.App.4th 523, 549 held that "Civil Code §815.9 does not restrict the ability of a local governmental entity to require the dedication of an easement under other provisions of the law", such as CEQA. In light of the San Mateo and Masonite cases, the County cannot insist that it is legally precluded from requiring the acquisition of agricultural conservation easements. The County should require easements.

- A recent Superior Court decision in Visalia stated that "our courts have specifically acknowledged that agricultural conservation easements are a *potentially* viable mitigation measure, notwithstanding that they do not reduce farmland loss impacts to a less than significant level." The County should require easements.
- By law and definition, an agricultural conservation easement (ACE) must be a perpetual easement.
- Such easements must be monitored and enforced, and an endowment should be set up to pay for monitoring and enforcement expenses.
- In order to be confident that the ACE will be appropriately enforced, ACEs are normally held be an accredited land trust. The easement holder must be an accredited land trust.
- Qualifying mitigation land must be of equal quality and under somewhat similar development pressure.
- Mitigation land should be local, if not in Kern County at least in the southern San Joaquin Valley.
- In order to reduce this significant and unavoidable impact and to be more certain that the mitigation measure satisfies CEQA requirements for farmland conversion mitigation, the County should require that <u>three acres</u> of equally good, equally atrisk farmland be preserved elsewhere for every acre of agricultural land converted to urban use.

The EIR must address these issues.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

We include a cumulative list of several of the additional current new industrial park and/or proposed commercial or truck stop projects within the area:

- 99 Houghton Industrial Park Project on 314.30 acres adjoining Highway 99 (Kern County) (<u>https://ceqanet.opr.ca.gov/2009051005/3</u>)
- Ware Malcomb Industrial Project in unincorporated Kern County at the intersection of Houghton Road and Wible Road.

- Majestic Gateway Project on ±90.6 acres located east of SR-99, west of South H Street in Bakersfield.
- CUP 20-0379, a truck stop project on 16 acres on Taft Highway west of Highway 99 (City of Bakersfield)
- GPA ZC 19-0158 at South Union and Berkshire Road (City of Bakersfield)
- GPA ZC 19-0009 at Taft Highway and Ashe Road (City of Bakersfield)
- GPA ZC 19-0035 at Hosking and Wible (City of Bakersfield)
- Mettler Station project located at 1841 Mettler Frontage Road (USDA)
- Numerous such projects in the Tejon Industrial Complex
- The EIR for the 99 Houghton Industrial Park Project lists 14 pages of pending projects with 6 miles of that project.

There are likely other such projects of which we are not aware.

The cumulative impacts of this project, of those listed above, and of other area projects on air pollution, traffic, climate change, biological resources, farmland loss, and other issues must be thoroughly addressed.

GROWTH INDUCEMENT

The project would potentially create 5,000 to 6,000 full time equivalent jobs. Given the rural nature of the surrounding communities, the project would potentially require the development of new housing or businesses within the local communities to accommodate the increase in population. With such a large workforce concentrated in the area, the EIR should examine the pressure to expand area housing and other amenities.

The Metropolitan Bakersfield General Plan encourages the orderly outward expansion of new urban development that maintains continuity of existing development and allows incremental expansion of infrastructure and public services. The leapfrog use of this site for industrial uses would set a clear precedent, inducing urban sprawl generating increased traffic congestion and likely leading to premature conversion of other prime farmland. The EIR should fully address the potential for growth inducement.

NEED FOR THE PROJECT

One of the policies of the Metropolitan Bakersfield General Plan requires, among other things, a "demonstrated project need" when converting farmland to urban use. There are numerous other warehouse/industrial park projects either existing or proposed in Kern County, in Shafter, and in Bakersfield. With this existing or proposed capacity as background, the EIR must demonstrate the need for this additional industrial park.

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Many sensitive and special status species have occurred historically in the vicinity of the project site. Many species such as birds of prey and the endangered San Joaquin Valley kit fox make a living along the margins of farmlands.

Special-status species such as San Joaquin kit fox, blunt-nosed leopard lizard, grasshopper sparrow, golden eagle, Tulare grasshopper mouse, burrowing owl, and loggerhead shrike may occur in the proposed project areas. The sharp-shinned hawk, burrowing owl, prairie falcon, and northern harrier were observed during surveys for the proposed 99 Houghton Industrial Park project. Given the special status of these species, the EIR should require pre-construction surveys to observe CDFG protocols and to be extended to a buffer area surrounding the sites.

The EIR should investigate whether the project site contains potential foraging habitat and/or nesting habitat for the Swainson's hawk. Mitigation measures might include requiring the project to plant trees that could serve as Swainson's hawk nesting sites and requiring the project to purchase conservation easements on nearby Swainson's hawk foraging habitat.

Loss of habitat is a major reason for species decline. While many of these species may have been driven out of the project site by mowing and disking operations, the EIR should consider reintroducing some of the native plant species by replanting them in project open space areas. In addition, landscaping should include drought-tolerant and/or native plants.

According to the publication *Conservation Strategies for San Joaquin Kit Foxes in Urban Environments* by Brian Cypher, Christine Van Horn Job, and Scott Phillips at http://esrp.csustan.edu/publications/pdf/cypher_etal_2012_urban_kitfox_conservation_esr p.pdf, "To the extent practical and possible, urban planners could design new developments in a manner that facilitates use by kit foxes." This project should be designed with urban kit fox conservation measures in mind, perhaps including artificial kit fox dens and movement corridors as suggested in the above document.

It is possible that kit fox dens are located on the site. If a den cannot be avoided, will it be excavated and the kit foxes relocated? The publication *Feasibility and Strategies for Translocating San Joaquin Kit Foxes to Vacant or Restored Habitats* by Samantha Bremner-Harrison and Brian Cypher at

<u>http://esrp.csustan.edu/publications/pdf/esrp_2007_kitfoxreloction_w.pdf</u> gives evidence that kit fox relocation is complex and will likely not be successful. The EIR should address this evidence.

TRAFFIC, WATER

The EIR should include a comprehensive traffic study. The traffic study should analyze the project's cumulative traffic impact on Highway 99 and other area roads, including

anticipated traffic from the other proposed or existing area warehouse/industrial park projects.

In particular, the Governor's Office of Planning and Research states, "Lead agencies should not truncate any VMT analysis because of jurisdictional or other boundaries, for example, by failing to count the portion of a trip that falls outside the jurisdiction or by discounting the VMT from a trip that crosses a jurisdictional boundary." (https://opr.ca.gov/docs/20190122-743 Technical Advisory.pdf) In addition, if travel patterns are substantially affected outside of the area of analysis, the area of analysis should be expanded to include the full affected area. When assessing trip based VMT, include the full trip, even if it goes beyond a jurisdictional boundary.

Potable water would be provided to the project site by the Oildale Mutual Water Company (OMWC). While Imperial Road seems to be within the service area of OMWC, the project site itself doesn't seem to be within the service area. Will OMWC require approval from the California Public Utility Commission to expand its service area to include the proposed project? The EIR must address the timeline to assure that the project has an adequate potable water supply.

Please place the Sierra Club on the distribution list for the Malibu Vineyards Industrial Parkway Project to receive any noticing of meetings, hearings, availability of documents, and to receive the environmental documents. We prefer email communications and electronic formatting of documents. Thank you for your consideration and for the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,

Gordon L. Wipp

Gordon L. Nipp, Ph.D. Vice-Chair gnipp@bak.rr.com 661-872-2432

ATTACHMENT A

Recommended Air Pollution Emission Reduction Measures for Warehouses and Distribution Centers

California Air Resources Board (CARB) staff recommends developers and government planners use all existing and emerging zero to near-zero emission technologies during project construction and operation to minimize public exposure to air pollution. Below are some measures, currently recommend by CARB staff, specific to warehouse and distribution center projects. These recommendations are subject to change as new zero-emission technologies become available.

Recommended Construction Measures

- Ensure the cleanest possible construction practices and equipment are used. This includes eliminating the idling of diesel-powered equipment and providing the necessary infrastructure (e.g., electrical hookups) to support zero and near-zero equipment and tools.
- Implement, and plan accordingly for, the necessary infrastructure to support the zero and near-zero emission technology vehicles and equipment that will be operating on site. Necessary infrastructure may include the physical (e.g., needed footprint), energy, and fueling infrastructure for construction equipment, on-site vehicles and equipment, and medium-heavy and heavy-heavy duty trucks.
- 3. In construction contracts, include language that requires all off-road diesel-powered equipment used during construction to be equipped with Tier 4 or cleaner engines, except for specialized construction equipment in which Tier 4 engines are not available. In place of Tier 4 engines, off-road equipment can incorporate retrofits such that emission reductions achieved equal or exceed that of a Tier 4 engine.
- 4. In construction contracts, include language that requires all off-road equipment with a power rating below 19 kilowatts (e.g., plate compactors, pressure washers) used during project construction be battery powered.
- 5. In construction contracts, include language that requires all heavy-duty trucks entering the construction site, during the grading and building construction phases be model year 2014 or later. All heavy-duty haul trucks should also meet CARB's lowest optional low-NO_x standard starting in the year 2022.¹

Attachment - 1

¹ In 2013, CARB adopted optional low-NO_x emission standards for on-road heavy-duty engines. CARB staff encourages engine manufacturers to introduce new technologies to reduce NO_x emissions below the current mandatory on-road heavy-duty diesel engine emission standards for model years 2010 and later. CARB's optional low-NO_x emission standard is available at: https://www.arb.ca.gov/msprog/onroad/optionnox.htm.

6. In construction contracts, include language that requires all construction equipment and fleets to be in compliance with all current air quality regulations. CARB staff is available to assist in implementing this recommendation.

Recommended Operation Measures

- Include contractual language in tenant lease agreements that requires tenants to use the cleanest technologies available, and to provide the necessary infrastructure to support zero-emission vehicles and equipment that will be operating on site.
- 2. Include contractual language in tenant lease agreements that requires all loading/unloading docks and trailer spaces be equipped with electrical hookups for trucks with transport refrigeration units (TRU) or auxiliary power units. This requirement will substantially decrease the amount of time that a TRU powered by a fossil-fueled internal combustion engine can operate at the project site. Use of zero-emission all-electric plug-in TRUs, hydrogen fuel cell transport refrigeration, and cryogenic transport refrigeration are encouraged and can also be included lease agreements.²
- 3. Include contractual language in tenant lease agreements that requires all TRUs entering the project site be plug-in capable.
- Include contractual language in tenant lease agreements that requires future tenants to exclusively use zero-emission light and medium-duty delivery trucks and vans.
- Include contractual language in tenant lease agreements requiring all TRUs, trucks, and cars entering the Project site be zero-emission.
- 6. Include contractual language in tenant lease agreements that requires all service equipment (e.g., yard hostlers, yard equipment, forklifts, and pallet jacks) used within the project site to be zero-emission. This equipment is widely available.
- Include contractual language in tenant lease agreements that requires all heavy-duty trucks entering or on the project site to be model year 2014 or later, expedite a transition to zero-emission vehicles, and be fully zero-emission beginning in 2030.

² CARB's Technology Assessment for Transport Refrigerators provides information on the current and projected development of TRUs, including current and anticipated costs. The assessment is available at: https://www.arb.ca.gov/msprog/tech/techreport/tru_07292015.pdf.

Attachment - 2

- 8. Include contractual language in tenant lease agreements that requires the tenant be in, and monitor compliance with, all current air quality regulations for on-road trucks including CARB's Heavy-Duty (Tractor-Trailer) Greenhouse Gas Regulation,³ Periodic Smoke Inspection Program (PSIP),⁴ and the Statewide Truck and Bus Regulation.5
- 9. Include contractual language in tenant lease agreements restricting trucks and support equipment from idling longer than five minutes while on site.
- 10. Include contractual language in tenant lease agreements that limits on-site TRU diesel engine runtime to no longer than 15 minutes. If no cold storage operations are planned, include contractual language and permit conditions that prohibit cold storage operations unless a health risk assessment is conducted and the health impacts fully mitigated.
- 11. Include rooftop solar panels for each proposed warehouse to the extent feasible, with a capacity that matches the maximum allowed for distributed solar connections to the grid.

Attachment - 3

 ³ In December 2008, CARB adopted a regulation to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by improving the fuel efficiency of heavy-duty tractors that pull 53-foot or longer box-type trailers. The regulation applies primarily to owners of 53-foot or longer box-type trailers, including both dry-van and refrigerated-van trailers, and owners of the heavy-duty tractors that pull them on California highways. CARB's Heavy-Duty (Tractor-Trailer) Greenhouse Gas Regulation is available at: https://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/hdgh/hdgh.htm.
⁴ The PSIP program requires that diesel and bus fleet owners conduct annual smoke opacity inspections of their vehicles and repair those with excessive smoke emissions to ensure compliance. CARB's PSIP program is available at:
⁵ The regulation requires newer heavier trucks and buses must meet particulate matter filter requirements beginning

⁵ The regulation requires newer heavier trucks and buses must meet particulate matter filter requirements beginning January 1, 2012. Lighter and older heavier tracks replaced starting January 1, 2015. By January 1, 2012, Lighter and older heavier tracks replaced starting January 1, 2015. By January 1, 2023, nearly all trucks and buses will need to have 2010 model year engines or equivalent. CARB's Statewide Truck and Bus Regulation is available at: https://www.arb.ca.gov/msprog/onrdiesel/onrdiesel.htm

Office of the Fire Marshal Kern County Fire Department Fire Prevention Unit



2820 M St. • Bakersfield, CA 93301 • www.kerncountyfire.org Telephone 661-391-3310 • FAX 661-636-0466/67 • TTY Relay 800-735-2929

September 5, 2022

Kern County Planning and Natural Resources Department 2800 M St., Bakersfield, CA 93301 Attn: **Matthew Hall, Supervising Planner**

Re: Draft EIR Malibu Vineyards Industrial Parkway Project (PP21116)

To Whom It May Concern:

The Kern County Fire Department (KCFD), as the local fire authority, has received a request for comments regarding Malibu Vineyards Industrial Parkway Project (PP21116). Upon initial review it has been determined,

All new construction will conform to California Fire Code and local ordinance, All new construction will require dedicated fire water flow 1500gpm for 2hrs minimum, with 20psi residual located within 400' of the furthest point of the project,

All new construction of this type requires hydrant spacing at a maximum distance of 330'. All new construction requires adequate emergency vehicle site access.

All new construction shall meet all other fire requirements of the California Fire Code and related local fire ordinance.

In our review of the proposed project, we determined the over 8,000,000 square feet of industrial space, 135' high cube storage, influx of 5 - 6,000 employees, automobile traffic and commercial truck traffic will impact fire service. The closest three fire stations are in north Bakersfield.

Station 61, located at 6400 Fruitvale Avenue is approximately 7 miles from the project site. Station 63, located at 101 Universe Avenue is approximately 7 miles from the project site. Station 64, located at 101 E. Roberts Lane is approximately 9 miles from the project site. The fire stations nearest the project site are currently impacted by high call volume leaving a service area gap for the proposed project.

A more detailed review and project comments will be conducted when the building permit is pulled, and plans are submitted to KCFD.

Please feel free to call our Fire Prevention Office at (661) 391-3310 with any questions.

Respectfully, Kain Linville Fire Marshal klinville@kerncountyfire.org Kern County Fire Department



17207 Industrial Farm Road Bakersfield, CA 93308 Phone: (661) 393-6072 Fax: (661) 393-6073 officeadmin@cawelowd.org

David R. Ansolabehere, General Manager

12 September 2022

Kern County Planning and Natural Resources Department Attn: Matthew Hall, Supervising Planner 2700 "M" Street, Suite 100 Bakersfield, CA 93301

Subject: Notice of Preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Malibu Vineyards Industrial Parkway Project, By Malibu Vineyards, L.P. (PP21116)

Dear Mr. Hall:

Cawelo Water District (Cawelo) appreciates the opportunity to provide comments to the Notice of Preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Malibu Vineyards Industrial Parkway Project. Cawelo has reviewed the Notice of Preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Malibu Vineyards Industrial Parkway Project dated August 3, 2022. Cawelo understands that the Notice of Preparation of a Draft EIR is the initial stage of the environmental documents that will be prepared for this project and Cawelo wanted to provide its initial feedback on the project.

1. Section 1.3, Site Access and Internal Circulation, p.20

Cawelo is concerned with the design of future Burbank Street arterial or Future Expressway. The proposed route of future Burbank Street or Future Expressway would cross over Cawelo's main 60" Reinforced Concrete Pipe (RCP) pipeline that is 50 years old and not designed for traffic loads and would restrict access to Cawelo's facilities. Cawelo must be considered in the design of Future Burbank Street or Future Expressway so Cawelo can continue to operate its facilities now and in the future.

2. Section 1.3, Water and Wastewater, p. 21

Water service for this project would be provided by Oildale Mutual Water Company (OMWC) and it is stated that the project area would need to be annexed into OMWC's

service area. The project area is located in the Cawelo Water District which is an agricultural water district and the water proposed by OMWC for this project would come from Agricultural water allocated to this area.

Cawelo appreciates the opportunity to provide comments to the Notice of Preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Malibu Vineyards Industrial Parkway Project and will continue to work in cooperation with Kern County Planning and Natural Resources Department. If you have any questions, please contact my office.

Sincerely,

David R. Ansolabehere, General Manager Cawelo Water District





September 22, 2022

Matthew Hall County of Kern Planning and Natural Resources Department 2700 "M" Street, Suite 100 Bakersfield, CA 93301

Project: Notice of Preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Report – Malibu Vineyards Industrial Parkway Project (PP21116)

District CEQA Reference No: 20221087

Dear Mr. Hall:

The San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (District) has reviewed the Notice of Preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) from the County of Kern (County) for the Malibu Vineyards Industrial Parkway project. Per the EIR, the project consists of the development of an industrial park with approximately 8,907,446 square feet of industrial warehouse and office use space on approximately 739 acres (Project). The Project is located north of Imperial Avenue and generally east of State Route 99, with site access from Saco Road and Imperial Avenue, in Kern County.

The District offers the following comments regarding the Project:

1) Project Related Emissions

At the federal level under the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS), the District is designated as extreme nonattainment for the 8-hour ozone standards and serious nonattainment for the particulate matter less than 2.5 microns in size (PM2.5) standards. At the state level under California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS), the District is designated as nonattainment for the 8-hour ozone, PM10, PM2.5 standards.

The District's initial review of the Project concludes that emissions resulting from construction and/or operation of the Project may exceed any of the following significance thresholds as identified in the District's Guidance for Assessing and Mitigating Air Quality Impacts: <u>https://www.valleyair.org/transportation/GAMAQI.pdf.</u>

Samir Sheikh Executive Director/Air Pollution Control Officer

Northern Region 4800 Enterprise Way Modeste, CA 95356-8718 Tel: (209) 557-6400 FAX: (209) 557-6475 Contral Region (Main Office) 1990 E. Gettysburg Avenue Fresne, CA 93726-0244 Tel: (559) 230-6000 FAX: (559) 230-6061 Southern Region 34946 Flyover Court Bakersfield, CA 93308-9725 Tel: (661) 392-5500 FAX: (661) 392-5585

www.valleyair.org www.healthyairliving.com

The District recommends that a more detailed preliminary review of the Project be conducted for the Project's construction and operational emissions.

1a) Construction Emissions

The District recommends, to reduce impacts from construction-related diesel exhaust emissions, the Project should utilize the cleanest available off-road construction equipment, including the latest tier equipment.

1b) Operational Emissions

Operational (ongoing) air emissions from mobile sources and stationary sources should be analyzed separately. For reference, the District's significance thresholds are identified in the District's Guidance for Assessing and Mitigating Air Quality Impacts:

https://www.valleyair.org/transportation/GAMAQI.pdf.

Since the Project consists of an industrial park, the Project is expected to generate an increase in Heavy Heavy-Duty (HHD) truck trips. The District recommends the EIR include a project-specific qualitative and/or quantitative discussion to support or justify an appropriate trip length for the HHD truck trips, since they may be traveling relatively longer distances.

Recommended Mitigation Measure: At a minimum, project related impacts on air quality should be reduced to levels of significance through incorporation of design elements such as the use of cleaner HHD trucks and vehicles, measures that reduce Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMTs), and measures that increase energy efficiency. More information on transportation mitigation measures can be found at:

http://www.valleyair.org/transportation/Mitigation-Measures.pdf.

1c) Recommended Model for Quantifying Air Emissions

Project-related criteria pollutant emissions from construction and operational sources should be identified and quantified. Emissions analysis should be performed using the California Emission Estimator Model (CalEEMod), which uses the most recent CARB-approved version of relevant emissions models and emission factors. CalEEMod is available to the public and can be downloaded from the CalEEMod website at: <u>www.caleemod.com</u>.

2) Health Risk Screening/Assessment

The County should evaluate the risk associated with the Project for sensitive receptors (residences, businesses, hospitals, day-care facilities, health care facilities, etc.) in the area and mitigate any potentially significant risk to help limit exposure of sensitive receptors to emissions.

To determine potential health impacts on surrounding receptors (residences, businesses, hospitals, day-care facilities, health care facilities, etc.) a Prioritization and/or a Health Risk Assessment (HRA) should be performed for the Project. These health risk determinations should quantify and characterize potential Toxic Air Contaminants (TACs) identified by the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment/California Air Resources Board (OEHHA/CARB) that pose a present or potential hazard to human health.

Health risk analyses should include all potential air emissions from the project, which include emissions from construction of the project, including multi-year construction, as well as ongoing operational activities of the project. Note, two common sources of TACs can be attributed to diesel exhaust emitted from heavy-duty off-road earth moving equipment during construction, and from ongoing operation of heavy-duty on-road trucks.

Prioritization (Screening Health Risk Assessment):

A "Prioritization" is the recommended method for a conservative screening-level health risk assessment. The Prioritization should be performed using the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association's (CAPCOA) methodology.

The District recommends that a more refined analysis, in the form of an HRA, be performed for any project resulting in a Prioritization score of 10 or greater. This is because the prioritization results are a conservative health risk representation, while the detailed HRA provides a more accurate health risk evaluation.

To assist land use agencies and project proponents with Prioritization analyses, the District has created a prioritization calculator based on the aforementioned CAPCOA guidelines, which can be found here:

http://www.valleyair.org/busind/pto/emission_factors/Criteria/Toxics/Utilities/PRIORI TIZATION-CALCULATOR.xls

Health Risk Assessment:

Prior to performing an HRA, it is strongly recommended that land use agencies/ project proponents develop and submit for District review a health risk modeling protocol that outlines the sources and methodologies that will be used to perform the HRA. This step will ensure all components are addressed when performing the HRA.
A development project would be considered to have a potentially significant health risk if the HRA demonstrates that the project-related health impacts would exceed the District's significance threshold of 20 in a million for carcinogenic risk, or 1.0 for either the Acute or Chronic Hazard Indices.

A project with a significant health risk would trigger all feasible mitigation measures. The District strongly recommends that development projects that result in a significant health risk not be approved by the land use agency.

The District is available to review HRA protocols and analyses. For HRA submittals please provide the following information electronically to the District for review:

- HRA (AERMOD) modeling files
- HARP2 files
- Summary of emissions source locations, emissions rates, and emission factor calculations and methodologies.

For assistance, please contact the District's Technical Services Department by:

- E-Mailing inquiries to: <u>hramodeler@valleyair.org</u>
- Calling (559) 230-5900

Recommended Measure: Development projects resulting in TAC emissions should be located an adequate distance from residential areas and other sensitive receptors in accordance to CARB's Air Quality and Land Use Handbook: A Community Health Perspective located at <u>https://ww3.arb.ca.gov/ch/handbook.pdf</u>.

3) Ambient Air Quality Analysis

An Ambient Air Quality Analysis (AAQA) uses air dispersion modeling to determine if emissions increases from a project will cause or contribute to a violation of State or National Ambient Air Quality Standards. The District recommends an AAQA be performed for the Project if emissions exceed 100 pounds per day of any pollutant.

An acceptable analysis would include emissions from both project-specific permitted and non-permitted equipment and activities. The District recommends consultation with District staff to determine the appropriate model and input data to use in the analysis.

Specific information for assessing significance, including screening tools and modeling guidance, is available online at the District's website: <u>www.valleyair.org/ceqa</u>.

4) Voluntary Emission Reduction Agreement

Criteria pollutant emissions may result in emissions exceeding the District's significance thresholds, potentially resulting in a significant impact on air quality. When a project is expected to have a significant impact, the District recommends the EIR also include a discussion on the feasibility of implementing a Voluntary Emission Reduction Agreement (VERA) for this Project.

A VERA is a mitigation measure by which the project proponent provides pound-forpound mitigation of emissions increases through a process that develops, funds, and implements emission reduction projects, with the District serving a role of administrator of the emissions reduction projects and verifier of the successful mitigation effort. To implement a VERA, the project proponent and the District enter into a contractual agreement in which the project proponent agrees to mitigate project specific emissions by providing funds for the District's incentives programs. The funds are disbursed by the District in the form of grants for projects that achieve emission reductions. Thus, project-related impacts on air quality can be mitigated. Types of emission reduction projects that have been funded in the past include electrification of stationary internal combustion engines (such as agricultural irrigation pumps), replacing old heavy-duty trucks with new, cleaner, more efficient heavy-duty trucks, and replacement of old farm tractors.

In implementing a VERA, the District verifies the actual emission reductions that have been achieved as a result of completed grant contracts, monitors the emission reduction projects, and ensures the enforceability of achieved reductions. After the project is mitigated, the District certifies to the Lead Agency that the mitigation is completed, providing the Lead Agency with an enforceable mitigation measure demonstrating that project-related emissions have been mitigated. To assist the Lead Agency and project proponent in ensuring that the environmental document is compliant with CEQA, the District recommends the environmental document includes an assessment of the feasibility of implementing a VERA.

5) Industrial/Warehouse Emission Reduction Strategies

The District recommends the County consider the feasibility of incorporating emission reduction strategies that can reduce potential harmful health impacts, such as those listed below:

- Ensure solid screen buffering trees, solid decorative walls, and/or other natural ground landscaping techniques are implemented along the property line of adjacent sensitive receptors
- Ensure all landscaping be drought tolerant
- Orient loading docks away from sensitive receptors unless physically impossible

- Locate loading docks a minimum of 300 feet away from the property line of sensitive receptor unless dock is exclusively used for electric trucks
- Incorporate signage and "pavement markings" to clearly identify on-site circulation patterns to minimize unnecessary on-site vehicle travel
- Locate truck entries on streets of a higher commercial classification
- Ensure all building roofs are solar-ready
- Ensure all portions of roof tops that are not covered with solar panels are constructed to have light colored roofing material with a solar reflective index of greater than 78
- Ensure rooftop solar panels are installed and operated to supply 100% of the power needed to operate all non-refrigerated portions of the development project
- Ensure power sources at loading docks for all refrigerated trucks have "plugin" capacity, which will eliminate prolonged idling while loading and unloading goods
- Incorporate bicycle racks and electric bike plug-ins
- Require the use of low volatile organic compounds (VOC) architectural and industrial maintenance coatings
- Designate an area during construction to charge electric powered construction vehicles and equipment, if temporary power is available
- Prohibit the use of non-emergency diesel-powered generators during construction
- Inform the project proponent of the incentive programs (e.g., Carl Moyer Program and Voucher Incentive Program) offered to reduce air emissions from the Project

6) Truck Routing

Truck routing involves the assessment of which roads Heavy Heavy-Duty (HHD) trucks take to and from their destination, and the emissions impact that the HHD trucks may have on residential communities and sensitive receptors. Since the Project consists of the construction of an industrial park, the Project is expected to generate an increase in HHD truck trips.

The District recommends the County evaluate HHD truck routing patterns for the Project, with the aim of limiting exposure of residential communities and sensitive receptors to emissions. This evaluation would consider the current truck routes, the quantity and type of each truck (e.g., Medium Heavy-Duty, HHD, etc.), the destination and origin of each trip, traffic volume correlation with the time of day or the day of the week, overall Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT), and associated exhaust emissions. The truck routing evaluation would also identify alternative truck routes and their impacts on VMT and air quality.

7) Cleanest Available Heavy-Duty Trucks

The San Joaquin Valley will not be able to attain stringent health-based federal air quality standards without significant reductions in emissions from HHD trucks, the single largest source of NOx emissions in the San Joaquin Valley. The District's CARB-approved 2018 PM2.5 Plan includes significant new reductions from HHD trucks, including emissions reductions by 2023 through the implementation of CARB's Statewide Truck and Bus Regulation, which requires truck fleets operating in California to meet the 2010 standard of 0.2 g-NOx/bhp-hr by 2023. Additionally, to meet federal air quality attainment standards, the District's Plan relies on a significant and immediate transition of HHD fleets to zero or near-zero emissions technologies, including the near-zero truck standard of 0.02 g/bhp-hr NOx established by CARB.

The Project consists of an industrial park which is expected to generate an increase in HHD truck trips traveling to-and-from the project location at longer distribution trip length distances. Since the Project may exceed the District significance thresholds, the District recommends that the following measures be considered by the County to reduce Project-related operational emissions:

- *Recommended Measure*: Fleets associated with operational activities utilize the cleanest available HHD trucks, including zero and near-zero (0.02 g/bhp-hr NOx) technologies.
- *Recommended Measure*: All on-site service equipment (cargo handling, yard hostlers, forklifts, pallet jacks, etc.) utilize zero-emissions technologies.

8) Reduce Idling of Heavy-Duty Trucks

The goal of this strategy is to limit the potential for localized PM2.5 and toxic air contaminant impacts associated with the idling of Heavy-Duty trucks. The diesel exhaust from idling has the potential to impose significant adverse health and environmental impacts.

Since the Project is expected to result in HHD truck trips, the District recommends the EIR include measures to ensure compliance of the state anti-idling regulation (13 CCR § 2485 and 13 CCR § 2480) and discuss the importance of limiting the amount of idling, especially near sensitive receptors. In addition, the District recommends the County consider the feasibility of implementing a more stringent 3-minute idling restriction and requiring appropriate signage and enforcement of idling restrictions.

9) Electric On-Site Off-Road and On-Road Equipment

Since the development project is expected to include Heavy Industrial and Light Industrial uses, the Project may have the potential to result in increased use of offroad equipment (e.g., forklifts) and on-road equipment (e.g., mobile yard trucks with the ability to move materials). The District recommends that the EIR include requirements for project proponents to utilize electric or zero emission off-road and on-road equipment.

10)Vegetative Barriers and Urban Greening

There is a residential development located nearby to the west of the Project. The District suggests the County consider the feasibility of incorporating vegetative barriers and urban greening as a measure to further reduce air pollution exposure on sensitive receptors (e.g., residential units).

While various emission control techniques and programs exist to reduce air quality emissions from mobile and stationary sources, vegetative barriers have been shown to be an additional measure to potentially reduce a population's exposure to air pollution through the interception of airborne particles and the update of gaseous pollutants. Examples of vegetative barriers include, but are not limited to the following: trees, bushes, shrubs, or a mix of these. Generally, a higher and thicker vegetative barrier with full coverage will result in greater reductions in downwind pollutant concentrations. In the same manner, urban greening is also a way to help improve air quality and public health in addition to enhancing the overall beautification of a community with drought tolerant, low-maintenance greenery.

11)On-Site Solar Deployment

It is the policy of the State of California that renewable energy resources and zerocarbon resources supply 100% of retail sales of electricity to California end-use customers by December 31, 2045. While various emission control techniques and programs exist to reduce air quality emissions from mobile and stationary sources, the production of solar energy is contributing to improving air quality and public health. The District suggests that the County consider incorporating solar power systems as an emission reduction strategy for the Project.

12)Electric Vehicle Chargers

To support and accelerate the installation of electric vehicle charging equipment and development of required infrastructure, the District offers incentives to public agencies, businesses, and property owners of multi-unit dwellings to install electric charging infrastructure (Level 2 and 3 chargers). The purpose of the District's Charge Up! Incentive program is to promote clean air alternative-fuel technologies and the use of low or zero-emission vehicles. The District recommends that the County and project proponents install electric vehicle chargers at project sites, and at strategic locations.

Please visit <u>www.valleyair.org/grants/chargeup.htm</u> for more information.

13)District Rules and Regulations

The District issues permits for many types of air pollution sources, and regulates some activities that do not require permits. A project subject to District rules and regulations would reduce its impacts on air quality through compliance with the District's regulatory framework. In general, a regulation is a collection of individual rules, each of which deals with a specific topic. As an example, Regulation II (Permits) includes District Rule 2010 (Permits Required), Rule 2201 (New and Modified Stationary Source Review), Rule 2520 (Federally Mandated Operating Permits), and several other rules pertaining to District permitting requirements and processes.

The list of rules below is neither exhaustive nor exclusive. Current District rules can be found online at: <u>www.valleyair.org/rules/1ruleslist.htm</u>. To identify other District rules or regulations that apply to future projects, or to obtain information about District permit requirements, the project proponents are strongly encouraged to contact the District's Small Business Assistance (SBA) Office at (661) 392-5665.

13a) District Rules 2010 and 2201 - Air Quality Permitting for Stationary Sources

Stationary Source emissions include any building, structure, facility, or installation which emits or may emit any affected pollutant directly or as a fugitive emission. District Rule 2010 (Permits Required) requires operators of emission sources to obtain an Authority to Construct (ATC) and Permit to Operate (PTO) from the District. District Rule 2201 (New and Modified Stationary Source Review) requires that new and modified stationary sources of emissions mitigate their emissions using Best Available Control Technology (BACT).

This Project may be subject to District Rule 2010 (Permits Required) and Rule 2201 (New and Modified Stationary Source Review) and may require District permits. Prior to construction, the Project proponent should submit to the District an application for an ATC. For further information or assistance, the project proponent may contact the District's SBA Office at (661) 392-5665.

13b) District Rule 9510 - Indirect Source Review (ISR)

The Project is subject to District Rule 9510 because it will receives a projectlevel discretionary approval from a public agency and will equal or exceed 25,000 square feet of light industrial development.

The purpose of District Rule 9510 is to reduce the growth in both NOx and PM emissions associated with development and transportation projects from mobile and area sources; specifically, the emissions associated with the construction

and subsequent operation of development projects. The ISR Rule requires developers to mitigate their NOx and PM emissions by incorporating clean air design elements into their projects. Should the proposed development project clean air design elements be insufficient to meet the required emission reductions, developers must pay a fee that ultimately funds incentive projects to achieve off-site emissions reductions.

Per Section 5.0 of the ISR Rule, an Air Impact Assessment (AIA) application is required to be submitted no later than applying for project-level approval from a public agency. As of the date of this letter, the District has not received an AIA application for this Project. Please inform the project proponent to immediately submit an AIA application to the District to comply with District Rule 9510. One AIA application should be submitted for the entire Project. It is preferable for the applicant to submit an AIA application as early as possible in the County's approval process so that proper mitigation and clean air design under ISR can be incorporated into the County's analysis.

Information about how to comply with District Rule 9510 can be found online at: <u>http://www.valleyair.org/ISR/ISRHome.htm</u>.

The AIA application form can be found online at: <u>http://www.valleyair.org/ISR/ISRFormsAndApplications.htm</u>.

District staff is available to provide assistance and can be reached by phone at (559) 230-5900 or by email at <u>ISR@valleyair.org</u>.

13c) District Rule 9410 (Employer Based Trip Reduction)

The Project may be subject to District Rule 9410 (Employer Based Trip Reduction) if the project would result in employment of 100 or more "eligible" employees. District Rule 9410 requires employers with 100 or more "eligible" employees at a worksite to establish an Employer Trip Reduction Implementation Plan (eTRIP) that encourages employees to reduce singleoccupancy vehicle trips, thus reducing pollutant emissions associated with work commutes. Under an eTRIP plan, employers have the flexibility to select the options that work best for their worksites and their employees.

Information about District Rule 9410 can be found online at: <u>www.valleyair.org/tripreduction.htm</u>.

For additional information, you can contact the District by phone at 559-230-6000 or by e-mail at <u>etrip@valleyair.org</u>

13d) District Rule 4601 (Architectural Coatings)

The Project may be subject to District Rule 4601 since it may utilize architectural coatings. Architectural coatings are paints, varnishes, sealers, or stains that are applied to structures, portable buildings, pavements or curbs. The purpose of this rule is to limit VOC emissions from architectural coatings. In addition, this rule specifies architectural coatings storage, cleanup and labeling requirements. Additional information on how to comply with District Rule 4601 requirements can be found online at: http://www.valleyair.org/rules/currntrules/r4601.pdf

13e) District Regulation VIII (Fugitive PM10 Prohibitions)

The project proponent may be required to submit a Construction Notification Form or submit and receive approval of a Dust Control Plan prior to commencing any earthmoving activities as described in Regulation VIII, specifically Rule 8021 – Construction, Demolition, Excavation, Extraction, and Other Earthmoving Activities.

Should the project result in at least 1-acre in size, the project proponent shall provide written notification to the District at least 48 hours prior to the project proponents intent to commence any earthmoving activities pursuant to District Rule 8021 (Construction, Demolition, Excavation, Extraction, and Other Earthmoving Activities). Also, should the project result in the disturbance of 5-acres or more, or will include moving, depositing, or relocating more than 2,500 cubic yards per day of bulk materials, the project proponent shall submit to the District a Dust Control Plan pursuant to District Rule 8021 (Construction, Extraction, and Other Earthmoving Activities). For additional information regarding the written notification or Dust Control Plan requirements, please contact District Compliance staff at (559) 230-5950.

The application for both the Construction Notification and Dust Control Plan can be found online at:

https://www.valleyair.org/busind/comply/PM10/forms/DCP-Form.docx

Information about District Regulation VIII can be found online at: <u>http://www.valleyair.org/busind/comply/pm10/compliance_pm10.htm</u>

13f) Other District Rules and Regulations

The Project may also be subject to the following District rules: Rule 4102 (Nuisance) and Rule 4641 (Cutback, Slow Cure, and Emulsified Asphalt, Paving and Maintenance Operations).

District Comment Letter

The District recommends that a copy of the District's comments be provided to the Project proponent.

If you have any questions or require further information, please contact Michael Corder by e-mail at <u>Michael.Corder@valleyair.org</u> or by phone at (559) 230-5818.

Sincerely,

Brian Clements Director of Permit Services

For: Mark Montelongo Program Manager

Lorelei H. Oviatt, AICP, Director 2700 "M" Street, Suite 100 Bakersfield, CA 93301-2323 Phone: (661) 862-8600 Fax: (661) 862-8601 TTY Relay 1-800-735-2929 Email: planning@kerncounty.com Web Address: http://kernplanning.com/



NOTICE OF PREPARATION

DATE: August 3, 2022

TO: See Attached Mailing List

FROM: Kern County Planning and Natural Resources Department Attn: Matthew Hall, Supervising Planner 2700 "M" Street, Suite 100 Bakersfield, CA 93301 (661) 862-8611, hallmat@kerncounty.com

RE: NOTICE OF PREPARATION OF A DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT (EIR) FOR THE Malibu Vineyards Industrial Parkway Project, By Malibu Vineyards, L.P. (PP21116)

The Kern County Planning and Natural Resources Department, as Lead Agency (pursuant to California Environmental Quality Act [CEQA] Guidelines Section 15052) has determined that preparation of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) (pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15161) is necessary for the project identified below. The Planning and Natural Resources Department solicits the views of your agency as to the scope and content of the environmental information which is germane to your agency's statutory responsibilities about the proposed project. Your agency will need to use the EIR prepared by our agency when considering your permit or other approval of projects

Due to limits mandated by State law, your response must be received by <u>September 5, 2022 at 5:00 p.m.</u> In addition, comments can also be submitted at a <u>scoping meeting</u> that will be held at the Kern County Planning and Natural Resources Department on <u>August 24, 2022 at 1:30 p.m.</u> at the address shown above.

PROJECT TITLE: Malibu Vineyards Industrial Parkway Project by Malibu Vineyards, L.P.; GPA 9, Map 80; GPA 23, Map 81; ZCC 13, Map 80; ZCC 92, Map 81; PD 2, Map 80; PD 74, Map 81; PD 75, Map 81

PROJECT LOCATION: The project site is located within unincorporated Kern County, north of Imperial Avenue and generally east of State Route 99 (SR 99), with site access from Saco Road and Imperial Avenue. The project site is just east of the City of Shafter, which is on the west side of SR 99, and approximately one mile north of the City of Bakersfield. The Beardsley/Lerdo Canal trends northwest to southeast though the center of project site. The project site is located within portions of Sections 29 and 30, Township 28 South, Range 27 East in the Mount Diablo Base & Meridian (MDBM), and portions of Sections 24 and 25, Township 28 South, Range 26 East, MDBM, and Section 30 of Township 28 South, Range 27 East, MDBM.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The proposed Malibu Vineyards Industrial Parkway Project (proposed project) involves the development of approximately 8,786,734 square feet of industrial use space, comprised of 24 buildings on approximately 739 acres of existing vineyard. The project is proposed by Malibu Vineyards, L.P. (project proponent), and would be developed over two phases.

Implementation of the project, as proposed, would include:

- 1. General Plan Amendment No. 9, Map No. 80 to change County General Plan Map Code 8.1 (Intensive Agriculture) to 7.2 (Service Industrial).
- 2. General Plan Amendment No. 23, Map No. 81 to change the Metropolitan Bakersfield General Plan Map Code R-IA (Intensive Agriculture) to SI (Service Industrial).
- 3. Zone Change No. 13, Map No. 80 to change zoning from A (Exclusive Agricultural) district to M2-PD (Medium Industrial, Precise Development Plan) district.
- 4. Zone Change No. 92, Map No. 81 (A to M2-PD) to change zoning from A (Exclusive Agricultural) district to M2-PD (Medium Industrial, Precise Development Plan) district.
- 5. Precise Development Plans to for the following maps:
 - a. No. 2, Map No. 80;
 - b. No. 74, Map No. 81; and
 - c. No. 75, Map No. 81.

To allow the construction and operation of an industrial parkway project including storage and office space, pursuant to Section 19.38.020E of the Kern County Zoning Ordinance.

Document can be viewed online at: https://kernplanning.com/planning/notices-of-preparation/

Signature:

Name: Matthew Hall, Supervising Planner

Lorelei H. Oviatt, AICP, Director 2700 "M" Street, Suite 100 Bakersfield, CA 93301-2323 Phone: (661) 862-8600 Fax: (661) 862-8601 TTY Relay 1-800-735-2929 Email: planning@kerncounty.com Web Address: http://kernplanning.com/



DATE: August 3, 2022

TO: Surrounding Property Owners within 1,000 Feet of Project Boundary; and, Interested Parties

FROM: Kern County Planning and Natural Resources Department 2700 "M" Street, Suite 100 Bakersfield, CA 93301

RE: Notice of Preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) – Malibu Vineyards Industrial Parkway Project, By Malibu Vineyards, L.P. (PP21116)

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Kern County Planning and Natural Resources Department has determined that preparation of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is necessary for the project identified below. The purpose of this letter is to notify surrounding property owners within 1,000 feet of the project boundaries of this determination. A copy of the Notice of Preparation (NOP) prepared for this project is available for viewing at the following Kern County website: <u>https://kernplanning.com/planning/notices-of-preparation/</u>. The NOP is also available for review at the Planning and Natural Resources Department, located at 2700 "M" Street, Suite 100, Bakersfield, CA 93301.

The purpose of the NOP is to describe the proposed project, specify the project location, and to identify the potential environmental impacts of the project so that Responsible Agencies and interested persons can provide a meaningful response related to potential environmental concerns that should be analyzed in the EIR.

You are invited to view the NOP and submit written comments regarding this project should you wish to do so. Due to the limits mandated by State law, your response must be received by <u>September 05, 2022 at 5:00 p.m.</u> Your comments can also be submitted at a <u>scoping meeting</u> that will be held at the Kern County Planning and Natural Resources Department on <u>August 24, 2022 at 1:30 p.m.</u> at the address shown above.

Please be advised that any comments received after the dates listed above will still be included in the public record for this project and made available to decision makers when this project is scheduled for consideration at a public hearing. Please also be advised that you will receive an additional notice in the mail once a public hearing date is scheduled for this project. You will also be provided additional opportunities to submit comments at that time.

PROJECT TITLE: Malibu Vineyards Industrial Parkway Project by Malibu Vineyards, L.P.; GPA 9, Map 80; GPA 23, Map 81; ZCC 13, Map 80; ZCC 92, Map 81; PD 2, Map 80; PD 74, Map 81; PD 75, Map 81.

PROJECT LOCATION: The project site is located within unincorporated Kern County, north of Imperial Avenue and generally east of State Route 99 (SR 99), with site access from Saco Road and Imperial Avenue. The project site is just east of the City of Shafter, which is on the west side of SR 99, and approximately one mile north of the City of Bakersfield. The Beardsley/Lerdo Canal trends northwest to southeast though the center of project site. The project site is located within portions of Sections 29 and 30, Township 28 South, Range 27 East in the Mount Diablo Base & Meridian (MDBM), and portions of Sections 24 and 25, Township 28 South, Range 26 East, MDBM, and Section 30 of Township 28 South, Range 27 East, MDBM.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The proposed Malibu Vineyards Industrial Parkway Project (proposed project) involves the development of approximately 8,786,734 square feet of industrial use space, comprised of 24 buildings on approximately 739 acres of existing vineyard. The project is proposed by Malibu Vineyards, L.P. (project proponent), and would be developed over two phases.

The Beardsley/Lerdo Canal trends northwest to southeast though the center of project site, dividing the two phases of the project. Phase 1 would include seven existing parcels on approximately 534 acres, and is located between Burbank Street to the north, and Imperial Avenue to the south, with the western boundary being the Beardsley/Lerdo Canal. Phase 1 is in Kern County Zone Map 81, as portions of Sections 29 and 30, Township 28 South, Range 27 East in the MDBM.

Phase 2 would include 14 existing parcels on approximately 205 acres, with the western boundary SR 99, and the eastern boundary the Beardsley/Lerdo Canal. The site is located generally south of Lerdo Highway, and north of Imperial Avenue. Phase 2 is in Zone Maps 80 and 81, as portions of Sections 24 and 25, Township 28 South, Range 26 East, MDBM, and Section 30 of Township 28 South, Range 27 East, MDBM.

The project is located solely within the jurisdiction of Kern County, in two Zone Maps (Zone Map 80, and Zone Map 81). The project site is zoned Exclusive Agriculture (A). A portion of the project site is within the Kern County General Plan, designated as Map Code 8.1 (Intensive Agriculture), and a portion of the project site is within the Metropolitan Bakersfield General Plan, designated R-IA (Intensive Agriculture).

To allow the construction and operation of an industrial parkway project including storage and office space, pursuant to Section 19.38.020E of the Kern County Zoning Ordinance, implementation of the project, as proposed, would include:

- 6. General Plan Amendment No. 9, Map No. 80 to change County General Plan Map Code 8.1 (Intensive Agriculture) to 7.2 (Service Industrial).
- 7. General Plan Amendment No. 23, Map No. 81 to change the Metropolitan Bakersfield General Plan Map Code R-IA (Intensive Agriculture) to SI (Service Industrial).
- 8. Zone Change No. 13, Map No. 80 to change zoning from A (Exclusive Agricultural) district to M2-PD (Medium Industrial, Precise Development Plan) district.
- 9. Zone Change No. 92, Map No. 81 (A to M2-PD) to change zoning from A (Exclusive Agricultural) district to M2-PD (Medium Industrial, Precise Development Plan) district.
- 10. Precise Development Plans for the following maps:
 - a. No. 2, Map No. 80;
 - b. No. 74, Map No. 81; and
 - c. No. 75, Map No. 81.

Should you have any questions regarding this project, or the Notice of Preparation, please feel free to contact the Project Manager assigned to this case, Matthew Hall, Supervising Planner, at (661) 862-8611 or hallmat@kerncounty.com.

Sincerely,

Matthew Hall, Supervising Planner Advanced Planning Division

Attachment: Site Vicinity Map showing project boundary



Malibu Industrial Parkway Attachment: Site Vicinity Map showing project boundary

This page intentionally left blank.

NOP Agency Distribution List

I:\Planning\WORKGRPS\WP\LA BELS\Malibu Vineyards Industrial Parkway Project Agencies 05-17- 22.docx cp05-17-22	City of Arvin P.O. Box 548 Arvin, CA 93203	Bakersfield City Planning Dept 1715 Chester Avenue Bakersfield, CA 93301
Bakersfield City Public Works Dept 1501 Truxtun Avenue Bakersfield, CA 93301	California City Planning Dept 21000 Hacienda Blvd. California City, CA 93515	Delano City Planning Dept P.O. Box 3010 Delano, CA 93216
City of Maricopa P.O. Box 548 Maricopa, CA 93252	City of McFarland 401 West Kern Avenue McFarland, CA 93250	City of Ridgecrest 100 West California Avenue Ridgecrest, CA 93555
City of Shafter 336 Pacific Avenue Shafter, CA 93263	City of Taft Planning & Building 209 East Kern Street Taft, CA 93268	City of Tehachapi Attn: John Schlosser 115 South Robinson Street Tehachapi, CA 93561-1722
City of Wasco 764 E Street Wasco, CA 93280	Inyo County Planning Dept P.O. Drawer "L" Independence, CA 93526	Kings County Planning Agency 1400 West Lacey Blvd, Bldg 6 Hanford, CA 93230
Los Angeles Co Reg Planning Dept 320 West Temple Street Los Angeles, CA 90012	San Bernardino Co Planning Dept 385 North Arrowhead Avenue, 1st Floor San Bernardino, CA 92415-0182	San Luis Obispo Co Planning Dept Planning and Building 976 Osos Street San Luis Obispo, CA 93408
Santa Barbara Co Resource Mgt Dept 123 East Anapamu Street Santa Barbara, CA 93101	Tulare County Planning & Dev Dept 5961 South Mooney Boulevard Visalia, CA 93291	Ventura County RMA Planning Div 800 South Victoria Avenue, L1740 Ventura, CA 93009-1740
U.S. Bureau of Land Management Caliente/Bakersfield 3801 Pegasus Drive Bakersfield, CA 93308-6837	Federal Aviation Administration Western Reg Office/ 777 South Aviation Boulevard Suite 150 El Segundo, CA 90245	Federal Communications Comm 18000 Studebaker Road, #660 Cerritos, CA 90701

U. S. Fish & Wildlife Service Division of Ecological Services 2800 Cottage Way #W-2605 Sacramento, CA 95825-1846

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Regulatory Division 1325 "J" Street, #1350 Sacramento, CA 95814-2920

So. San Joaquin Valley Arch Info Ctr California State University of Bkfd 9001 Stockdale Highway Bakersfield, CA 93311

State Clearinghouse Office of Planning and Research 1400 - 10th Street, Room 222 Sacramento, CA 95814

Office of the State Geologist Headquarters 801 "K" Street, MS 12-30 Sacramento, CA 95814

State Dept of Conservation Div Recycling Cert. Sec. 801 "K" Street, MS 19-01 Sacramento, CA 95814

California Energy Commission James W. Reed, Jr. 1516 Ninth Street Mail Stop 17 Sacramento, CA 95814

California Highway Patrol Planning & Analysis Division P.O. Box 942898 Sacramento, CA 94298-0001

State Water Resources Control Board Division of Drinking Water Attn: Jesse Dhaliwal, Sr. Sanitary Eng 4925 Commerce Drive, Suite 120 Bakersfield, CA 93309 Environmental Protection Agency Region IX Office 75 Hawthorn Street San Francisco, CA 94105

U.S. Postal Service Address Management Systems 28201 Franklin Parkway Santa Clarita, CA 91383-9321

Caltrans/Dist 6 Planning/Land Bank Bldg. P.O. Box 12616 Fresno, CA 93778

State Dept of Conservation Director's Office 801 "K" Street, MS 24-01 Sacramento, CA 95814-3528

State Dept of Conservation Office of Land Conservation 801 "K" Street, MS 18-01 Sacramento, CA 95814

State Mining and Geology Board 801 K Street, MS 20-15 Sacramento, CA 95814

California Fish & Wildlife 1234 East Shaw Avenue Fresno, CA 93710

State Office of Historical Pres Attention Susan Stratton P.O. Box 942896 Sacramento, CA 95296-0001

Public Utilities Comm Energy Div 505 Van Ness Avenue San Francisco, CA 94102 U.S. Dept of Agriculture/NRCS 5080 California Avenue, Ste 150 Bakersfield, CA 93309-0711

State Air Resources Board Stationary Resource Division P.O. Box 2815 Sacramento, CA 95812

Caltrans/ Division of Aeronautics, MS #40 P.O. Box 942873 Sacramento, CA 94273-0001

State Dept of Conservation Geologic Energy Management Division 11000 River Run Boulevard Bakersfield, CA 93311

State Dept of Conservation Office of Mine Reclamation 801 "K" Street MS 09-06 Sacramento, CA 95814-3529

California State University Bakersfield - Library 9001 Stockdale Highway Bakersfield, CA 93309

State Dept of Food & Agriculture 1220 "N" Street Sacramento, CA 95814

Integrated Waste Management P.O. Box 4025, MS #15 Sacramento, CA 95812-4025

California Regional Water Quality Control Board/Central Valley Region 1685 E Street Fresno, CA 93706-2020

Cal Environmental Protection Agency/ State Lands Commission State Dept of Toxic Substance Dept of Toxic Substances Control, Reg 1 100 Howe Avenue, Ste 100-South Control Sacramento, CA 95825-8202 Environmental Protection Agency Attn: Dave Kereazis, Permit Div - CEQA 1515 Tollhouse Road 8800 Cal Center Drive, 2nd Floor Clovis, CA 93612 Sacramento, CA 95826 State Dept of Water Resources Kern County Kern County Airports Department/SOI San Joaquin Dist. Agriculture Department 3374 East Shields Avenue, Room A-7 Fresno, CA 93726 Tejon Indian Tribe Kern County Administrative Kern County Officer Kathy Morgan, Chairperson Env Health Services Department 1731 Hasti-acres Drive, Suite 108

Kern County Fire Dept Aaron Duncan, Fire Chief

Kern County Library/Beale

Andie Sullivan

Wasco Rec & Parks Dist

1280 Poplar Street

Wasco, CA 93280

Cary Wright, Fire Marshall

Bakersfield, CA 93309

Kern County Fire Dept

Kern County Museum 3801 Chester Avenue Bakersfield, CA 93301

Kern County Library/Beale

Local History Room

Kern County Sheriff's Dept Administration

Rosedale Union School Dist 2553 Old Farm Road Bakersfield, CA 93312

Kern County Superintendent of

Attention School District Facility

Schools

Services

1300 - 17th Street Bakersfield, CA 93301 Kern County Public Works Department/ Building & Development/Development Review

Wasco Union High School Dist P.O. Box 250 Wasco, CA 93280

KernCOG 1401 19th Street - Suite 300 Bakersfield, CA 93301

North of the River Muni Water Dist P.O. Box 5638 Bakersfield, CA 93388-5638

Cawelo Water Dist 17207 Industrial Farm Road Bakersfield, CA 93308-9801 Kern County Public Works Department/Operations & Maintenance/Regulatory Monitoring & Reporting

Kern High School Dist 5801 Sundale Avenue Bakersfield, CA 93309

Local Agency Formation Comm/LAFCO 5300 Lennox Avenue, Suite 303 Bakersfield, CA 93309

Oildale Mutual Water Co P.O. Box 5638 Bakersfield, CA 93388 Shafter Rec & Parks Dist 700 East Tulare Avenue Shafter, CA 93263

Kern County Water Agency 3200 Rio Mirada Drive Bakersfield, CA 93308

Bakersfield Municipal Airport 4101 Truxtun Avenue Bakersfield, CA 93309

Inyokern Airport P.O. Box 634 Inyokern, CA 93527

East Kern Airport Dist Attention Stuart Witt 1434 Flightline

Mojave, CA 93501

Mountain Valley Airport P.O. Box 100 Tehachapi, CA 93581

Tehachapi City Hall/Airport 115 South Robinson Street Tehachapi, CA 93561

Kern Audubon Society Attn: Frank Bedard, Chairman 4124 Chardonnay Drive Bakersfield, CA 93306

Center on Race, Poverty & the Environmental/ CA Rural Legal Assistance Foundation 1012 Jefferson Street Delano, CA 93215 North of the River Rec & Parks Dist 405 Galaxy Avenue Bakersfield, CA 93308

San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District 1990 East Gettysburg Avenue Fresno, CA 93726

California City Airport 22636 Airport Way, #8 California City, CA 93505

Minter Field Airport District 201 Aviation Street Shafter, CA 93263

East Kern Airport Dist Engineer 3900 Ridgemoor Avenue Bakersfield, CA 93306

Aero Sports Skypark Corporation P.O. Box 2567 Rosamond, CA 93560

Adams, Broadwell, Joseph & Cardozo Attention: Janet M. Laurain 601 Gateway Boulevard, Suite 1000 South San Francisco, CA 94080

Los Angeles Audubon 926 Citrus Avenue Los Angeles, CA 90036-4929

Construction Materials Assoc of CA 1029 "J" Street, Suite 420 Sacramento, CA 95814 Rosedale-Rio Bravo Water Dist P.O. Box 20820 Bakersfield, CA 93390-0820

Kern Mosquito Abatement Dist 4705 Allen Road Bakersfield, CA 93314

Delano City Planning Dept P.O. Box 3010 Delano, CA 93216

Mojave Airport 1434 Flightline Mojave, CA 93501

Northcutt and Associates 4220 Poplar Street Lake Isabella, CA 93240-9536

Rosamond Skypark/Airport 4000 Knox Avenue Rosamond, CA 93560

AT&T California OSP Engineering/Right-of-Way 4901 Ashe Road Bakersfield, CA 93313

Center on Race, Poverty & the Environment Attn: Marissa Alexander 1999 Harrison Street – Suite 650 San Francisco, CA 94612

Defenders of Wildlife/ Kim Delfino, California Dir 980 - 9th Street, Suite 1730 Sacramento, CA 95814 California Farm Bureau 2300 River Plaza Drive, NRED Sacramento, CA 95833

Pacific Gas & Electric Co Land Projects 650 "O" Street, First Floor Fresno, CA 93760-0001

Southern California Gas Co Transportation Dept 9400 Oakdale Avenue Chatsworth, CA 91313-6511

Kern Valley Indian Council Attn: Robert Robinson, Chairperson P.O. Box 401 Weldon, CA 93283

Tejon Indian Tribe Kathy Morgan, Chairperson 1731 Hasti-acres Drive, Suite 108 Bakersfield, CA 93309

Tule River Indian Tribe Neal Peyron, Chairperson P.O. Box 589 Porterville, CA 93258

LIUNA Attn: Danny Zaragoza 2201 "H" Street Bakersfield, CA 93301

Thomas Roads Improvement Program PARSONS 1600 Truxtun Avenue, 3rd Floor Bakersfield, CA 93301 Native American Heritage Council of Kern County Attn: Gene Albitre 3401 Aslin Street Bakersfield, CA 93312

Sierra Club/Kern Kaweah Chapter Beyond Coal Campaign Attn: Sarah Friedman P.O. Box 3357 Bakersfield, CA 93385

Chumash Council of Bakersfield 2421 "O" Street Bakersfield, CA 93301-2441

California Resources Corp Attn: Michael D. Gooding 11109 River Run Boulevard Bakersfield, CA 93311

Kitanemuk & Yowlumne Tejon Indians Chairperson 115 Radio Street Bakersfield, CA 93305

Joyce LoBasso P.O. Box 6003 Bakersfield, CA 93386

Mojave Foundation Attn: Todd Quelet 16922 Airport Boulevard Mojave, CA 93501

A E Corporation Planning Department 901 Via Piemonte, 5th Floor Ontario, CA 91764 Pacific Gas & Electric Co Matt Coleman, Land Mgt 1918 "H" Street Bakersfield, CA 93301-4319

Southern California Gas Co 35118 McMurtrey Avenue Bakersfield, CA 93308-9477

David Laughing Horse Robinson P.O. Box 20849 Bakersfield, CA 93390

Santa Rosa Rancheria Ruben Barrios, Chairperson P.O. Box 8 Lemoore, CA 93245

Tubatulabals of Kern County Attn: Robert Gomez, Chairperson P.O. Box 226 Lake Isabella, CA 93240

Leadership Counsel for Justice & Accountability 1527 - 19th Street, Suite 212 Bakersfield, CA 93301

Northcutt and Associates 4220 Poplar Street Lake Isabella, CA 93240-9536

Lozeau Drury LLP 1939 Harrison Street, Suite 150 Oakland, CA 94612

NOP Surrounding APN Distribution List

I:\Planning\WORKGRPS\WP\LABE LS\Malibu Vineyards PLN-01885 NOP.05-17-22docx.docx Cp05/17/22

091 160 10 01 9 GIUMARRA VINEYARDS CORP PO BOX 1969 BAKERSFIELD CA 93303-1969

482 040 15 00 0 **DUP** LENNAR HOMES OF CAL INC 8080 PALM AV # 110 FRESNO CA 93711

091 130 04 01 3 MZIRP INC 31381 POND RD MC FARLAND CA 93250

482 010 05 00 2 **DUP** NORTH KERN WATER STORAGE DIST P O BOX 81435 BAKERSFIELD CA 93380-1435

482 010 07 00 8 UNION PACIFIC R/R CO 1400 DOUGLAS ST # 1610 OMAHA NE 68179-1610

091 150 01 00 1 WONDERFUL NUT ORCHARDS LLC 6801 E LERDO HW SHAFTER CA 93263-9610 091 160 22 00 5 CAWELO WATER DIST 17207 INDUSTRIAL FARM RD RR 1 BAKERSFIELD CA 93308

482 050 02 01 4 HALLIBURTON ENERGY SERV INC P O DRAWER 1431 DUNCAN OK 73536-0222

091 200 13 01 9 MALIBU VINEYARDS 9777 WILSHIRE BL STE 900 BEVERLY HILLS CA 90212-1902

482 010 56 00 0 NO KERN WATER STORAGE DIST P O BOX 81435 BAKERSFIELD CA 93380-1435

481 060 10 01 3 PARAMOUNT RANCH CO ET AL 33374 LERDO HW BAKERSFIELD CA 93308

482 010 08 00 1 DUP UNION PACIFIC R/R CO 1400 DOUGLAS ST OMAHA NE 68179

091 130 14 00 3 BIDART BROS 4813 CALLOWAY DR BAKERSFIELD CA 93312-9702 482 050 04 00 1 DOWNS GORDON L & JOYCE M 7500 CALLE NOBLEZA BAKERSFIELD CA 93309

091 210 08 00 9 LENNAR HOMES OF CAL INC 8080 N PALM AV STE 110 FRESNO CA 93711

091 150 03 00 7 **DUP** MALIBU VINEYARDS L P 9777 WILSHIRE BL STE 900 BEVERLY HILLS CA 90212-1902

091 060 08 00 6 NORTH KERN WATER STORAGE DIST 33380 CAWELO AV BAKERSFIELD CA 93308-9575

481 060 11 00 7 S & JV PROP LLC PO BOX 1270 SHAFTER CA 93263-1270

481 060 12 01 9 VIGNOLO FAMILY L P PO BOX 1270 SHAFTER CA 93263-1270

Appendix C

Notice of Completion & Environmental Document Transmittal

Mail to: State Clearinghouse, P.O. Box 3044, Sacramento, CA 95812-3044 (916) 445-0613 *For Hand Delivery/Street Address:* 1400 Tenth Street, Sacramento, CA 95814

SCH #

Project Title:				
Lead Agency:		Contact Person:		
Mailing Address:		Phone:		
City:	Zip:	County:		
Project Location: County:	City/Nearest Con	nmunity:		
Cross Streets:			Zip Code:	
Longitude/Latitude (degrees, minutes and seconds):°	′″N/	°′″ W Tota	l Acres:	
Assessor's Parcel No.:	Section:	Twp.: Rang	ge: Base:	
Within 2 Miles: State Hwy #:	Waterways:			
Airports:	Railways:	Scho	Schools:	
Document Type: CEQA: NOP Draft EIR Early Cons Supplement/Subsequent EIF Neg Dec (Prior SCH No.) Mit Neg Dec Other:	NEPA:	NOI Other: EA Draft EIS FONSI	 Joint Document Final Document Other:	
Local Action Type:				
General Plan Update Specific Plan General Plan Amendment Master Plan General Plan Element Planned Unit Development Community Plan Site Plan	Rezone Prezone Use Perm Land Division	it ision (Subdivision, etc.)	 Annexation Redevelopment Coastal Permit Other: 	
Development Type: Residential: Units Acres Office: Sq.ft. Acres Commercial:Sq.ft. Acres Employees Industrial: Sq.ft. Acres Educational: Educational: MGD		ortation: Type Mineral Type Freatment: Type ous Waste: Type	MW MGD	
Project Issues Discussed in Document:				
Aesthetic/Visual Fiscal Agricultural Land Flood Plain/Flooding Air Quality Forest Land/Fire Hazard Archeological/Historical Geologic/Seismic Biological Resources Minerals Coastal Zone Noise Drainage/Absorption Population/Housing Balan Economic/Jobs Public Services/Facilities	Recreation/P Schools/Univ Septic System Soil Erosion/ Solid Waste Toxic/Hazard Traffic/Circu	Parks versities ms sity /Compaction/Grading dous ılation	 Vegetation Water Quality Water Supply/Groundwater Wetland/Riparian Growth Inducement Land Use Cumulative Effects Other: 	

Present Land Use/Zoning/General Plan Designation:

Project Description: (please use a separate page if necessary)

Reviewing Agencies Checklist

Air Resources Board	Office of Historic Preservation	
Boating & Waterways, Department of	Office of Public School Construction	
California Emergency Management Agency	Parks & Recreation, Department of	
California Highway Patrol	Pesticide Regulation, Department of	
Caltrans District #	Public Utilities Commission	
Caltrans Division of Aeronautics	Regional WQCB #	
Caltrans Planning	Resources Agency	
Central Valley Flood Protection Board	Resources Recycling and Recovery, Department of	
Coachella Valley Mtns. Conservancy	S.F. Bay Conservation & Development Comm.	
Coastal Commission	San Gabriel & Lower L.A. Rivers & Mtns. Conservance	
Colorado River Board	San Joaquin River Conservancy	
Conservation, Department of	Santa Monica Mtns. Conservancy	
Corrections, Department of	State Lands Commission	
Delta Protection Commission	SWRCB: Clean Water Grants	
Education, Department of	SWRCB: Water Quality	
Energy Commission	SWRCB: Water Rights	
Fish & Game Region #	Tahoe Regional Planning Agency	
Food & Agriculture, Department of	Toxic Substances Control, Department of	
Forestry and Fire Protection, Department of	Water Resources, Department of	
General Services, Department of		
Health Services, Department of	Other:	
Housing & Community Development	Other:	
Native American Heritage Commission		
cal Public Review Period (to be filled in by lead age	ency)	
ed Ageney (Complete if applicable):		
ad Agency (Complete il applicable):		
onsulting Firm:	Applicant:	
dress:	Address:	
y/State/Zip:	City/State/Zip: Phone:	
ntact:		
one:		

Authority cited: Section 21083, Public Resources Code. Reference: Section 21161, Public Resources Code.

INITIAL STUDY/NOTICE OF PREPARATION

Malibu Vineyards Industrial Parkway Project by Malibu Vineyards, L.P.

General Plan Amendment No. 9, Map No. 80 General Plan Amendment No. 23, Map No. 81 Zone Change No. 13, Map No. 80 Zone Change No. 92, Map No. 81 Precise Development Plan No. 2, Map 80 Precise Development Plan No. 74, Map 81 Precise Development Plan No. 75, Map 81

PLN - 19-01885 (PP21116)

LEAD AGENCY:



Kern County Planning and Natural Resources Department 2700 "M" Street, Suite 100 Bakersfield, CA 93301-2370 Contact: Matthew Hall (661) 862-8611 HallMat@kerncounty.com

August 2022

This page is intentionally left blank.



Table of Contents

Ini	itial Stu	dy Checklist	_
1.	Projec	t Description	1
	1.1.	Project Location	1
	1.2.	Environmental Setting	7
	1.3.	Proposed Project Description	13
		Project Overview	19
		Site Access and Internal Circulation	20
		Landscaping and Irrigation	20
		Stormwater Management and Drainage Design	20
		Utilities	21
		Operational Water Requirements	21
		Construction Activities	21
	1.4.	Project Objectives	22
	1.5.	Proposed Discretionary Actions/Required Approvals	23
		Federal	23
		State	23
		Local	23
2.	Kern (County Environmental Checklist Form	25
	2.1.	Environmental Factors Potentially Affected	25
	2.2.	Determination	25
3.	Evalua	ation of Environmental Impacts	26
	I.	Aesthetics	27
	II.	Agriculture and Forest Resources	29
	III.	Air Quality	31
	IV.	Biological Resources	33
	V.	Cultural Resources	35
	VI.	Energy	36
	VII.	Geology and Soils	37
	VIII.	Greenhouse Gas Emissions	40
	IX.	Hazards and Hazardous Materials	41
	X.	Hydrology and Water Quality	45
	XI.	Land Use and Planning	48
	XII.	Mineral Resources	49
	XIII.	Noise	50
	XIV.	Population and Housing	52
	XV.	Public Services	53
	XVI.	Recreation	55
	XVII.	Transportation and Traffic	56



4. References		64	
	XXI.	Mandatory Findings of Significance	62
	XX.	Wildfire	61
	XIX.	Utilities and Service Systems	59
	XVIII.	Tribal Cultural Resources	58

List of Figures

Figure 1, Regional Vicinity Map	.3
Figure 2, Project Location Map	.4
Figure 3, Project Vicinity Map	.5
Figure 4, Assessor's Parcelization Map	.6
Figure 5, Existing General Plan Map	.8
Figure 6, Existing Zoning Map	.9
Figure 7, Airport Land Use Compatiblity Plan Map	12
Figure 8, Proposed General Plan Map	14
Figure 9, Proposed Zoning Map	15
Figure 10, Phase 1 Site Plan 74, Map No. 81	16
Figure 11, Phase 2 Site Plan 2, Map No. 80	17
Figure 12, Phase 2 Site Plan 75, Map No. 81	18

List of Tables

Table 1	Acres, Map Code Designations and Zoning by Existing Parcel for Phase 1 and Phase 2	2
Table 2	Existing Land Use and Zoning Summary	. 10
Table 3	Summary for Phase 1 and Phase 2	. 19



1. Project Description

1.1. Project Location

The proposed Malibu Vineyards Industrial Parkway Project (proposed project) is located within unincorporated Kern County, north of Imperial Avenue and generally east of State Route 99 (SR 99), with site access from Saco Road and Imperial Avenue. The project site would be comprised of 21 Assessor's Parcel Numbers (APN) totaling 746 acres according to the County's existing parcel data. The project site is just east of the City of Shafter, which is on the west side of SR 99, and approximately one mile north of the City of Bakersfield. See **Figure 1**, *Regional Vicinity Map*; **Figure 2**, *Project Location Map*; and **Figure 3**, *Project Vicinity Map*, below, for further detail.

The project is proposed by Malibu Vineyards, L.P. (project proponent) and would be developed over two phases. The Lerdo Canal trends northwest to southeast though the center of project site, dividing the two phases of the project. Phase 1 would include 7 parcels on approximately 534 acres of the total acreage, and is located between Burbank Street to the north, and Imperial Avenue to the south, with the western boundary being the Lerdo Canal. Phase 1 is in Kern County Zone Map 81, as portions of Sections 29 and 30, Township 28 South, Range 27 East in the Mount Diablo Base & Meridian (MDBM).

Phase 2 would include 14 parcels on approximately 205 acres of the total acreage, with the western boundary SR 99, and the eastern boundary the Lerdo Canal. The site is located generally south of Lerdo Highway, and north of Imperial Avenue. Phase 2 is in Zone Maps 80 and 81, as portions of Sections 24 and 25, Township 28 South, Range 26 East, MDBM, and Section 30 of Township 28 South, Range 27 East, MDBM. **Table 1**, *Acres, Map Code Designations and Zoning by Existing Parcel for Phase 1 and Phase 2*, below, identifies the acreage, applicable map code and zoning existing parcel data whereas **Figure 4**, *Assessor's Parcelization Map*, below, illustrates the existing parcel layout within the project site.



APN	Мар	Size (acres)	Metropolitan Bakersfield General Plan Map Code Designation	Existing County Zoning
Phase 1				
482-010-01	81	240.00	Intensive Agriculture (R-IA)	Exclusive Agriculture (A)
482-010-02	81	79.09	Intensive Agriculture (R-IA)	Exclusive Agriculture (A)
482-010-03	81	96.75	Intensive Agriculture (R-IA)	Exclusive Agriculture (A)
482-010-11	81	80.19	Intensive Agriculture (R-IA)	Exclusive Agriculture (A)
482-040-01	81	15.85	Intensive Agriculture (R-IA)	Exclusive Agriculture (A)
482-040-02	81	11.55	Intensive Agriculture (R-IA)	Exclusive Agriculture (A)
482-040-03	81	13.80	Intensive Agriculture (R-IA)	Exclusive Agriculture (A)
Total: 7		537		
Phase 2				
APN	Мар	Size (acres)	Kern County General Plan Map Code Designation	Existing County Zoning
091-150-03	80	9.44	Intensive Agriculture (8.1)	Exclusive Agriculture (A)
091-160-01	80	11.08	Intensive Agriculture (8.1)	Exclusive Agriculture (A)
091-160-02	80	40.60	Intensive Agriculture (8.1)	Exclusive Agriculture (A)
091-160-03	80	18.22	Intensive Agriculture (8.1)	Exclusive Agriculture (A)
091-160-09	80	28.99	Intensive Agriculture (8.1)	Exclusive Agriculture (A)
091-160-13	80	10.50	Intensive Agriculture (8.1)	Exclusive Agriculture (A)
091-160-16	80	29.45	Intensive Agriculture (8.1)	Exclusive Agriculture (A)
091-200-04	80	7.41	Intensive Agriculture (8.1)	Exclusive Agriculture (A)
091-200-05	80	17.01	Intensive Agriculture (8.1)	Exclusive Agriculture (A)
091-200-07	80	5.56	Intensive Agriculture (8.1)	Exclusive Agriculture (A)
091-200-14	80	16.03	Intensive Agriculture (8.1)	Exclusive Agriculture (A)
APN	Map	Size (acres)	Metropolitan Bakersfield General Plan Map Code Designation	Existing County Zoning
091-200-13	81	2.43	Intensive Agriculture (R-1A)	Exclusive Agriculture (A)
482-040-04	81	11.48	Intensive Agriculture (R-IA)	Exclusive Agriculture (A)
482-040-05	81	0.67	Intensive Agriculture (R-IA)	Exclusive Agriculture (A)
Total: 14		209		

Table 1 Acres, Map Code Designations and Zoning by Existing Parcel for Phase 1 and Phase 2

APN=Assessor's Parcel Number





Basemap provided by Esri and its licensors © 2021. Additiional sources provided by City of Shafter, 2019.

A





Figure 1, Regional Vicinity Map





Imagery provided by Microsoft Bing and its licensors © 2022. Additional sources provided by City of Shafter, 2019.

Figure 2, Project Location Map





Figure 3, Project Vicinity Map





Figure 4, Assessor's Parcelization Map



1.2. Environmental Setting

The project site is located on agricultural land within unincorporated Kern County. The parcels are currently owned by Malibu Vineyards, L.P., with a portion of the property being utilized for growing table grapes. A review of historic aerial maps indicates the site has been used for grape vineyards since at least 2003. There exists a structure located on the eastern portion of the site that appears to be used as an agricultural storage building. The site includes outdoor storage of various farm related operational equipment, along with a fenced and secured concrete floor storage shed for pesticides. Agricultural uses are adjacent north of the project site. The project site can be accessed from Saco Road, Burbank Street and Imperial Avenue.

Approximately 314 acres of the project site are designated Prime Farmland (California Department of Conservation [DOC] 2019). There are no Williamson Act contracts associated with the project site.

The proposed project is located solely within the jurisdiction of Kern County, in two Zone Maps (Zone Map 80, and Zone Map 81). The project site is zoned Exclusive Agriculture (A). A portion of the project site is within the Kern County General Plan, designated as Map Code 8.1 (Intensive Agriculture), and a portion of the project site is within the Metropolitan Bakersfield General Plan, designated R-IA (Intensive Agriculture). For further detail see Figure 5, *Existing General Plan Map*, Figure 6, Existing Zoning Map, and Table 2, *Existing Land Use and Zoning Summary*, below.





Figure 5, Existing General Plan Map





Figure 6, Existing Zoning Map


Location	Existing Land Use	Jurisdiction	Zoning	Map Code Designation
Project Site Phase 1	Agriculture	Kern County	Exclusive Agriculture (A)	Intensive Agriculture (R-IA)
Phase 2	Agriculture	Kern County Exclusive Agriculture (A)		Intensive Agriculture (R-IA) Intensive Agriculture (8.1)
North	Agriculture	Kern County	Exclusive Agriculture (A)	Intensive Agriculture (8.1)
East	Agriculture, vacant, residential, industrial	Kern County	Exclusive Agriculture (A)	Intensive Agriculture (8.1) Intensive Agriculture (R-IA)
South	Agriculture, industrial	Kern County	Exclusive Agriculture (A) Medium Industrial, Precise Development Combining (M-2 PD)	Service Industrial (SI) Heavy Industrial (H1)
South	Agriculture, Industrial	City of Shafter	General Commercial (GC)	Incorporated Cities (1.2)
West	Agriculture	City of Shafter	Exclusive Agriculture (A) Industrial (I) General Commercial (GC)	Incorporated Cities (1.2)

Table 2 Existing Land Use and Zoning Summary

The Lerdo Canal flows southeast to northwest along the eastern boundary of the Phase 2 portion of the project, and the western boundary of the Phase 1 portion of the project, effectively dividing the two phases of the project. SR 99 is along the west side of the proposed project site. Surrounding roads are mostly dirt roads used for access to agricultural areas. The project site can be accessed from Saco Road, Burbank Street and Imperial Avenue.

The project site is located in a relatively flat-lying plain at approximately 440 feet above sea level. Within the project limits, heavy road compaction, along the perimeter and throughout the site, is evident. The project site is located in Federal Emergency Management Flood Zone X, indicating an area with a 0.2 percent annual chance of flooding (Federal Emergency Management Agency [FEMA] 2008).

There are no mapped fault zones associated with the project site (McIntosh & Associates 2020). No known surface or subsurface faults have been mapped transecting any of the properties comprising the proposed project. The nearest fault zone is the Premier Fault Zone located approximately 1.3 miles east of the northeast corner of the project site, on James Road 150 feet east of State Route 65 (SR 65). The largest fault in the area, the Kern Front Fault, is located approximately 3.7 miles east of the eastern project boundary. The nearest active major fault is the Helendale-South Lockhart fault, located approximately 9.2 miles northeast of the project site.

The project site is not within a mineral recovery area or within a designated mineral and petroleum resource site designated by the Kern County General Plan. The project site is not located within the County's Natural Resources (NR) zone or Tier 1 Oil and Gas Conformity Tier.



The closest area with NR zoning and Tier 1 Oil and Gas Conformity Tier is approximately two miles from the site. The closest active well is 3,650 feet south of the project site in the city of Shafter.

Kern County is relatively dry, receiving approximately nine inches of rain annually, with the 52 percentile of annual rain fall occurring in spring. The project vicinity experiences high temperatures (85 degrees and up) for at least two months out of the year (July and August), with an average temperature of 86 degrees Fahrenheit during these months. The area experiences moderate average temperatures (65 to 85 degrees Fahrenheit) from April to June and September to October, and cooler average temperatures (below 65 degrees Fahrenheit) from November through March.

The project area is served by the Kern County Sheriff's Department for law enforcement and public safety services (Kern County Sheriff's Office, 1350 Norris Road), Kern County Fire Department for fire protection services (Fire Station #62, 1652 Sunnyside Court), and Kern County Medical Emergency Services for medical care and emergency services.

Southern portions of the project site are within the Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP) for the Meadows Field Airport located approximately 3.5 miles southeast. These portions of the project are in ALUCP Zone B2, which may require a dedication of avigation easement and Zone C, which limits high-rise office buildings to no more than four stories. See **Figure 7**, *Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan Map*, below.

The closest schools to the project site are Norris Middle School two miles south and Norris Elementary School is 2.6 miles southwest.





Figure 7, Airport Land Use Compatiblity Plan Map





1.3. Proposed Project Description

The site has the potential to provide approximately 30 million square feet that would support warehouse, light industrial and high-cube warehouse, with supporting office space. The proposed project involves the development of an industrial park with approximately 8,907,446 square feet of industrial warehouse and office use space on approximately 739 acres of existing vineyards and fallow land.

The proposed project includes applications for General Plan Amendments, Zone Changes, and Precise Development Plans to allow for the construction and operation of an industrial park with warehousing, offices, and distribution facilities. Amendments to the Kern County General Plan parcel designations of Intensive Agriculture (8.1) to Service Industrial (7.2), and amendments to the Metropolitan Bakersfield General Plan parcels from Intensive Agriculture (R-IA) to Service Industrial (SI), are illustrated in **Figure 8**, *Proposed General Plan Map*, below. The project would also require a Zone Change from Exclusive Agriculture (A) to Medium Industrial, Precise Development (M-2 PD) pursuant to Chapter 19.38 of the Kern County Zoning Ordinance. The proposed zoning is illustrated in **Figure 9**, *Proposed Zoning Map*, below.

The industrial park would consist of 22 industrial (warehouse) buildings and additional mini warehouses, with associated office space and truck docks, parking, and access roads, on approximately 739 acres in unincorporated Kern County. The buildings would be located among 21 parcels developed over two phases and would total 8,907,446 square feet of industrial warehouse and office use space. See project site plans in **Figure 10**, *Phase 1 PD Plan 74*, *Map No. 81*; **Figure 11**, *Phase 2 PD Plan 2*, *Map No. 80* and **Figure 12**, *Phase 2 Site Plan 75*, *Map No. 80*, below. A summary of the building area square feet for the two phases is provided in **Table 3**, *Summary for Phase 1 and Phase 2*, below.

Phase 1 involves development of 14 buildings totaling up to 7,242,106 square feet of warehouse and office space on approximately 534 acres. Phase 1 would also include 6,439,657 square feet of landscape area. Parking would include 4,796 standard spaces, and 3,568 truck parking spaces, for a total of 8,364 spaces.

Phase 2 involves development of 8 buildings and additional mini warehouses totaling up to 1,665,340square feet of warehouse and office space, on approximately 205 acres. Phase 2 would also include 1,969,669 square feet of landscape area. Parking would include 2,157 standard parking spaces, and 924 truck parking spaces for a total of 3,081 spaces. Of the total 8,907,446 square feet of industrial warehouse and office use space, up to 25 percent, or approximately 2,226,862 square feet, would consist of refrigerated warehouse space.

Most of the buildings would be up to 52 to 100 feet in height except for 20 percent of the buildings to be "high cube" and possibly up to 135 feet in height. With respect to building setbacks, all buildings over 75 feet in height would be setback an additional foot from the centerline of the street for each three feet in height above 75 feet. Furthermore, all 100-foot-tall buildings would be setback a minimum of 49 feet from the centerline of the street, and all 135-foot-tall buildings would be setback a minimum of 60 feet from the centerline of the street.





Figure 8, Proposed General Plan Map





Figure 9, Proposed Zoning Map





Figure 10, Phase 1 Site Plan 74, Map No. 81





Figure 11, Phase 2 Site Plan 2, Map No. 80





Figure 12, Phase 2 Site Plan 75, Map No. 81



Parcel	Building Area (sq ft)	Parking Stalls (cars)	Parking Stalls (trucks)
Phase 1			
1	646,800	556	174
2	646,800	556	174
3	771,600	486	424
4	738,000	346	406
5	571,200	276	300
6	248,640	212	162
7	147,000	160	300
8	771,600	416	424
9	771,600	416	424
10	174,720	260	52
11	174,720	270	52
12	231,826	166	100
13	576,000	260	152
14	771,600	416	424
Total	7,242,106	4,796	3,568
Parcel	Building Area (sq ft)	Parking Stalls (cars)	Parking Stalls (trucks)
Phase 2			
1	150,000	354	90
2	262,500	352	158
3	220,000	273	244
4	100,000	154	54
5	74,725	21	-
6	123,750	192	100
7	231,826	166	92
8	231,826	324	92
9	150,000	294	94
10	120,713	27	-
Total	1,665,340	2,157	924

Table 3Summary for Phase 1 and Phase 2

Project Overview

The proposed project would be fully built out over a period of 10 to 20 years depending on market demand and beginning as early as 2023, if approved. It would expand the global e-commerce fulfillment services market in Kern County, which is dependent upon warehousing and shipping capabilities to get products transported in the shortest amount of time. The project would provide 5,000 to 6,000 full-time equivalent jobs upon full buildout of both Phases 1 and 2.

The Malibu Vineyards Industrial Parkway Project requests approval of the following applications by the County:

1. General Plan Amendment No. 9, Map No. 80 to change County General Plan Map Code 8.1 (Intensive Agriculture) to 7.2 (Service Industrial); (193.33 Acres)

- 2. General Plan Amendment No. 23, Map No. 81 to change the Metropolitan Bakersfield General Plan Map Code R-IA (Intensive Agriculture) to SI (Service Industrial); (545.15 Acres)
- 3. Zone Change No. 13, Map No. 80 to change zoning from A (Exclusive Agriculture) district to M-2 PD (Medium Industrial, Precise Development) district; (193.33 Acres)
- 4. Zone Change No. 92, Map No. 81 to change zoning from A (Exclusive Agriculture) district to M-2 PD (Medium Industrial, Precise Development) district; (545.15 Acres)
- 5. Precise Development Plans for the following maps:
 - a. No. 2, Map 80; (193.33 Acres)
 - b. No. 74, Map 81; (533.84 Acres)
 - c. No. 75, Map 81; (11.31 Acres)

Site Access and Internal Circulation

Access to Phase 1 of the project site would include Imperial Avenue and Burbank Street. The Phase 2 location is currently isolated between the SR 99 and the Lerdo Canal and would require development of a future Burbank Street arterial or future expressway across one or both of these features to facilitate access. See attached Precise Development Plans, Figure 10, Figure 11, and Figure 12, above, for detail about the proposed location and size of rights-of-way for future development of transportation corridors.

The Project Proponent would develop roads adjacent to, and through the project site, in accordance with Kern County standards for project access including development of future arterial segment of Burbank Street, local streets, expressway, and interchange. Adjacent roads would be developed to half-width standards and roads through the site would be developed to full-width standards. In addition, the project would develop local roads internal to the project to facilitate project access and internal circulation. Local roads would provide access to truck drive aisles and parking areas associated with each building. The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) will be consulted to provide input on any State highway upgrades needed for the project.

Site Security

As part of the project, temporary construction lighting may be required, and permanent lighting at the proposed industrial park and warehouse facility would include interior lighting, signage, and exterior security and safety lighting. Project lighting would meet Kern County dark sky requirements in Zoning Ordinance Chapter 19.81 - Outdoor Lighting Dark Skies and conform to lighting and glare-reducing measures required by County development standards. In addition, six-foot masonry and/or six-foot chain link fencing would be installed per the lessee's request at build out of the project phases.

Landscaping and Irrigation

Each building parcel would feature associated landscaping, generally along road frontages, driveway entries, and parking areas. Landscaping would conform to Kern County standards. See Figure 10, *Phase 1 PD Plan 74, Map No. 81* and Figure 11, *Phase 2 PD Plan 2, Map No. 80*, above, for illustrations.

Stormwater Management and Drainage Design

Stormwater would be collected via on-site retention basins and conveyed through an onsite drainage system to facilitate stormwater infiltration, retention, and metered discharge, emulating pre-development conditions. The sump drainage system would be constructed under Phase 2 and would comprise 11.31 acres of the project site.



Utilities

The project site is generally lacking in domestic utilities, which would need to be developed in conjunction with the proposed project. The project proponent is planning on the installation of solar panels on buildings and parking areas for power and installation of on-site Tiered vehicle chargers for project and employee vehicles.

Water and Wastewater

Water service would be provided by Oildale Mutual Water Company (OMWC). Off-site improvements would include extension of OMWC's six-inch domestic water line and 12-inch non-potable water line from Quinn Road along Imperial Avenue to the southeast corner of the proposed project. To facilitate water service, OMWC would need to annex the project area into its service area. The proposed annexation would involve approximately 739 acres. The annexation would need to be considered and approved by OMWC and the Kern County Local Agency Formation Commission in order to serve the project.

Wastewater collection would be provided by North of River Sanitary District No. 1. The nearest sewer trunk is a 36-inch line in Norris Road approximately three miles southeast from the project site. A new sewer trunk would be installed from the existing 36-inch line to the future intersection of Imperial Avenue at Endes Street via Coffee Road and 7th Standard Road. In addition, Phase 1 would require installation of a sewer lift station to reach the new sewer trunk.

Other Utilities

Electric services would be provided by Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E). The proposed project would involve construction of a PG&E electrical substation and distribution system along with solar panels and Tiered vehicle chargers.

Gas services would be provided by Southern California Gas Company (SoCal Gas). The project would include a connection to the existing facilities in Petrol Road, 0.5 mile south of the project, a new natural gas pressure reducing station, as well as gas main extension and distribution laterals within the project site.

Telephone services would be provided by AT&T and cable would be provided by Spectrum.

Operational Water Requirements

The proposed project's operational water consumption is expected to be approximately 0.5-acre-foot per year to be used for toilets and hand washing facilities and fire protection.

Construction Activities

A specific construction schedule has not been identified for the project; and the schedule is likely to be driven by market demand. Project construction is anticipated to begin as early as 2023, with initial grading and infrastructure for the development of Phases 1 and 2 (estimated 18 years of site construction with a 46-year buildout maximum). Each parcel has the potential to be individually developed with buildout of Phase 1 anticipated by 2068. Phase 2 is expected to be developed concurrently beginning as early as 2023 (estimated 8 years of site construction with 23-year buildout maximum), with buildout by 2045.

The on-site construction workforce will consist of laborers, craftsmen, supervisory personnel, support personnel, and construction management personnel. The on-site construction workforce for the project is expected to peak at 300 individuals, however, the average daily workforce is expected to be 200 individuals on-site during construction.



Construction activities would be conducted consistent with Kern County Code of Ordinances, Title 8, Chapter 8.36.020 (Noise Control) regarding hours of construction or as approved by Kern County. Construction of the proposed project would include the following activities:

- Site preparation
- Access and internal circulation roads
- Grading and earthwork
- Concrete foundations

- Structural steel work
- Electrical/instrumentation work
- Stormwater management facilities
- Architecture and landscaping

Site Preparation, Earthwork and Construction Control Measures

Construction would involve grading and excavation for the building foundations, building construction, architectural coating, and paving activities. Approximately 3000 cubic yards per acre would be graded.

Construction Water Use

Water would be required during the construction phase for such activities as dust suppression, soil compaction, and grading. Water may also be used at points of ingress/egress to minimize the tracking of dirt off-site onto local roadways from construction vehicles. Water used for construction purposes would be from on-site wells. Bottled water would be provided to workers during construction.

Additionally, on-site restroom facilities for the construction workers would be provided by portable units to be serviced by licensed providers; no connection to a public sewer system is required for project construction, and therefore, water for such purposes is not required.

Orderly development would commence from the southerly portions of the site to the northerly due to accessibility from existing infrastructure. Improved circulation would follow with the progression of development.

Construction activities for the proposed project are anticipated to require approximately six acre-feet of water. During the construction phase, and operations water for the project will be supplied by OMWC.

1.4. Project Objectives

The project proponent has identified the following objectives for the project:

- Reduce the current unemployment rate in Kern County of 10.8 percent by increasing the amount of square footage for new businesses and increase job opportunities. Distribution and fulfillment centers maintain a high rate of employment.
- Support local budgets by replacing lost tax revenue from closed traditional brick and mortar retail locations with new tax revenues generated by industrial buildings.
- Meet the continued and expanding demand of the global e-commerce fulfillment services market that depend on warehousing and shipping capabilities to get products transported in the shortest amount of time. This market was valued at \$69.68 billion in 2019.
- Generate large and dependable financial benefits to the County of Kern through annual property taxes upon full buildout.
- Generate tax revenue and boost the allocation of resources to improve infrastructure, utilities and public services throughout the county.



1.5. Proposed Discretionary Actions/Required Approvals

Construction and operation of the project may require the following discretionary actions and approvals. These actions/approvals are potentially required and do not necessarily represent a comprehensive list of all possible discretionary permits/approvals required. Other additional permits or approvals from responsible agencies may be required for the proposed project.

Federal

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)

United States Army Corps of Engineers

- Jurisdictional delineation
- Section 404 Permit, if necessary

State

California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW)

- Section 1600 et seq. permits (Streambed Alteration Agreements), if required
- Section 2081 Permit (state-listed endangered species)

California Department of Transportation (Caltrans)

- Right-of-Way Encroachment Permit
- Oversized Loads Permit

State Water Resources Control Board

National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Construction General Permit

Local

County of Kern

- Certification of Final Environmental Impact Report
- Adoption of 15091 Findings of Fact and 15093 Statement of Overriding Considerations
- Adoption of Mitigation Measures Monitoring and Program
- Approval of proposed Zone Change Cases
- Approval of proposed General Plan Amendments
- Approval of proposed Precise Development Plans
- Approval of Grading Permits
- Approval of Building Permits
- Fire Safety Plan



Kern County Local Agencies Formation Commission

• Annexation of approximately 740 acres, inclusive of the project site, into OMWC's service area.

Oildale Mutual Water District

- Annexation of approximately 740 acres, inclusive of the project site, into OMWC's service area.
- Approval of a Water Supply Assessment

San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District

- Authority to Construct
- Fugitive Dust Control Plan

City of Shafter Planning Department

- Sphere of Influence Amendment
- Municipal Services Review Update
- CEQA EIR
- Annexation w/ GPA





2. Kern County Environmental Checklist Form

2.1. 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 Kern County Environmental Checklist on the following pages.

\square	Aesthetics	\square	Agricultural and Forestry Resources	\square	Air Quality
\boxtimes	Biological Resources	\boxtimes	Cultural Resources	\bowtie	Energy
\square	Geology and Soils	\square	Greenhouse Gas Emissions	\boxtimes	Hazards and Hazardous Materials
\square	Hydrology and Water Quality	\square	Land Use and Planning		Mineral Resources
\boxtimes	Noise	\boxtimes	Population and Housing	\square	Public Services
\boxtimes	Recreation	\boxtimes	Transportation and Traffic	\boxtimes	Tribal Cultural Resources
\boxtimes	Utilities/Service Systems		Wildfire	\square	Mandatory Findings of Significance

2.2. 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 (a) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and (b) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENT 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.

Signature:

/s/

Date: August 3, 2022

Matthew Hall, Supervising Planner

Malibu Vineyards Industrial Parkway Project



3. 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 measure 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 where 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 Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures that 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 a less than significant level.



		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. Wo	Aesthetics uld the project:				
a.	Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?				\boxtimes
b.	Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?				
c.	In nonurbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from public accessible vantage points) If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?				
d.	Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?				

- (a) The project site consists of agricultural land, with a portion of the project site currently being utilized for growing table grapes. The aesthetic features of the existing visual environment in the project area are relatively uniform, flat landscapes with various agricultural fields consisting of vineyards, orchards, and cover crops. Lerdo Canal runs through the project site, however, due to an earthen berm, is not visible from SR 99, which is the prominent road nearest the project site, except where the canal passes under SR 99. The project site is generally surrounded by agricultural land and rural residential dwellings. The unincorporated community of Cawelo is located north of the project site and consists predominantly of intensive agricultural and industrial uses in addition to some suburban residential uses. Agricultural, industrial, and suburban residential uses in the unincorporated community of Saco, a census-designated place in Kern County, are also located south of the project site. No scenic vistas are associated with the project site or its vicinity. Therefore, the project would have no impact on scenic vistas and further analysis in an EIR is not required.
- (b) The nearest highway to the project site SR 99, immediately adjacent to the western boundary, is not classified as a National Scenic Byway or Designated State Scenic Highway, nor considered a sensitive corridor regarding visual resource issues. In addition, the Caltrans California Scenic Highway Mapping System further confirms there are no designated or eligible state scenic highways within the vicinity of the project site (Caltrans 2021). In addition, the project site is substantially lacking in scenic resources, and does not feature any trees, rock outcroppings, or historic buildings.



Therefore, there are no designated or eligible state scenic highways within the vicinity of the project site, and the project would have no impact to scenic resources, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway. No impact is anticipated and further analysis in an EIR is not required.

- (c) Refer to Response (a), above, for a description of the existing landscape character. There is a potential that the proposed project would substantially change views from adjacent SR 99, and other public roads located in the surrounding area. Placement of the light-medium industrial structures and warehouses on the project site would alter the existing character of the area by interrupting the expansive agricultural viewshed from SR 99 with increased development and massing. Residents and travelers on adjacent roads would observe alterations to the existing landscape. Changes to the visual quality and character of the project site would be potentially significant and will be further evaluated in an EIR.
- (d) The existing project site is composed of vineyards and related agricultural features and is not a source of light or glare. The unincorporated community of Cawelo is located north of the project site and consists predominantly of intensive agricultural and industrial uses in addition to some residential uses. Agricultural, industrial, and residential uses in the unincorporated community of Saco, a census-designated place in Kern County, are also located south of the project site. The existing agricultural land and residences in the project vicinity generate a minimal amount of light and glare, primarily from building interior and exterior lighting. As part of the project, temporary construction lighting may be required, and permanent lighting at the proposed industrial park and warehouse facility would include interior lighting, signage, and exterior security and safety lighting. Project lighting would meet Kern County dark sky requirements in Zoning Ordinance Chapter 19.81 Outdoor Lighting Dark Skies and conform to lighting and glare-reducing measures required by County development standards. Due to the change in land use, impacts related to light and glare from the proposed project would be potentially significant, however, light and glare will be further evaluated in an EIR.



		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than Significant Impact	No Impact
II. Woi	Agriculture and Forest Reso ald the project:	ources			
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 nonagricul- tural use?				
b.	Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act Contract?	\boxtimes			
c.	Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g))?				
d.	Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				\boxtimes
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?	\boxtimes			
f.	Result in the cancellation of an open space contract made pursuant to the California Land Conservation Act of 1965 or Farmland Security Zone Contract for any parcel of 100 or more acres (Section 15205(b)(3) Public Resources Code)?				

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 Department 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 the forest carbon



measurement methodology provided in the Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board (CARB).

- (a) The project site consists of agricultural land, with a portion of the project site currently being utilized for growing table grapes. There is no land that meets the requirements for Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance located within the project site. However, approximately 314.31 acres in the proposed project area would meet the requirements for prime farmland if undeveloped and water for irrigation is available (McIntosh & Associates 2020; DOC 2019). In addition, project conversion of agriculture to developed uses may indirectly impact other designated farmland. Project impacts associated with the conversion of designated farmland would be potentially significant and will be further evaluated in an EIR.
- (b) Implementation of the project would require all project parcels to have their existing zoning changed from A (Exclusive Agriculture) to M-2 PD (Medium Industrial, Precise Development), thereby converting an agricultural zone to a non-agricultural zone. The project site does not contain lands that are under Williamson Act Contracts. The area to the northeast of Phase 2 of the project is under a Williamson Act Contract. As such, there would be no direct impacts to Williamson Act Contract lands; however, project conversion of agriculture to developed uses may indirectly impact Williamson Act Contract lands. Project impacts associated with conflicts with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act Contract would be potentially significant and will be further evaluated in an EIR.
- (c) No lands affected by the proposed project are zoned or used as forest land, timberland, or timberland production. Therefore, the project would not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause the rezoning of, forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned for timberland production. Therefore, there would be no impact and further analysis in an EIR is not required.
- (d) The project site is not situated on forest or timberland and is not located near any such areas that are currently under production. There is no land in the vicinity of the project site that is zoned as forest land, timberland, or lands zoned for timberland production. Therefore, there would be no impact related to the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use, and further analysis in an EIR is not required.
- (e) The project site is not designated as forest land and forest land or timberlands do not occur in the project vicinity. The project would directly convert land currently cultivated, zoned, and classified as Prime Farmland to non-agricultural uses. Project impacts associated with the conversion of farmland, to non-agricultural would be potentially significant and use will be further evaluated in an EIR.
- (f) The project site is not subject to an open space contract made pursuant to the California Land Conservation Act of 1965 or the Farmland Security Zone Contract. As stated above, the project site is not under a Williamson Act Contract. Therefore, the project would not result in the cancellation of an open space contract made pursuant to the California Land Conservation Act of 1965 or Farmland Security Zone Contract. No impact would occur, and no further evaluation is required in an EIR.



	Less than Significant		
Potentially Significant Impact	with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than Significant Impact	No Impact

III. Air Quality

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

a.	Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?			
b.	Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard? Specifically, would implementation of the project exceed any of the following adopted thresholds:			
	i. San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District:			
	Operational and Area Sources			
	Reactive organic gases (ROG): 10 tons per year.	\boxtimes		
	Oxides of nitrogen (NO _X): 10 tons per year. Particulate matter (PM_{10}): 15 tons per year.	\boxtimes		
	<u>Stationary Sources - as Determined by</u> District Rules			
	Severe nonattainment: 25 tons per year. Extreme nonattainment: 10 tons per year.	\boxtimes		
	ii. Eastern Kern Air Pollution Control District.			
	Operational and Area Sources Reactive organic gases (ROG): 25 tons per year			\boxtimes
	Oxides of nitrogen (NO _X): 25 tons per year. Particulate matter (PM ₁₀): 15 tons per year.			\boxtimes
	<u>Stationary Sources – as Determined by</u> District Rules			
	25 tons per year.			\boxtimes
c.	Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	\boxtimes		
d.	Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?	\boxtimes		



- (a) The project site is subject to air quality management plans promulgated by the San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD). The project would generate air emissions during both project construction and ongoing operations. Based on preliminary air quality analysis, short term construction-related emissions would be less than the SJVAPCD threshold levels for CO, SO_X, and PM_{2.5}, but would exceed thresholds for ROG, NO_X, and PM₁₀. In addition, long term operational emissions would exceed the SJVAPCD threshold levels for ROG and NO_X (McIntosh & Associates, Inc. 2021). Further analysis of the project's air quality impacts is warranted to confirm impacts and determine the feasible mitigation measures that could be imposed. Therefore, air quality impacts would be potentially significant and this issue will be further evaluated in an EIR.
- (b) The project site is subject to emission thresholds established by SJVAPCD and is outside the area regulated by the Eastern Kern Air Pollution Control District. The proposed project would generate air emissions during both project construction and ongoing operations. As discussed above in response (a), short term construction-related emissions would exceed SJVAPCD significance thresholds for ROG, NO_X, and PM₁₀, and thus potentially contribute to cumulative air quality emissions.

Similarly, long term operations-related emissions would exceed SJVAPCD significance thresholds for ROG, and NOX. Further analysis of the project's air quality impacts is warranted to confirm the project's contribution to cumulative impacts, and to determine feasible mitigation measures that could be imposed. SJAVPCD ROG and NOX criteria pollutants would be potentially significant. and this issue will be further evaluated in an EIR.

- (c) The proposed project is located in an area that is sparsely populated. The nearest sensitive receptor is a rural residential dwelling located approximately 0.07 mile to the west of the project site. The project site is surrounded by agricultural uses or undeveloped land on all sides in the proximate vicinity and no known non-residential sensitive receptors are located within two miles of the project site. However, the project site is located immediately adjacent to SR 99. Operation of the proposed project has the potential to expose employees at the future warehouse distribution facility to pollution generated by traffic on surrounding roadways. Impacts to sensitive receptors require additional analysis; therefore, impacts to sensitive receptors via exposure to substantial pollutant concentrations would be potentially significant and will be further evaluated in an EIR.
- (d) The SJVAPCD has identified some common types of facilities that have been known to produce odors in the San Joaquin Valley Air Basin. These are presented in Table 6 (Screening Levels for Potential Odor Sources) of SJVAPCD's Guidance for Assessing and Mitigating Air Quality Impacts (GAMAQI). A preliminary review of the criteria indicate that the proposed uses/activities are not generally associated with sources of nuisance according to SJVAPCD criteria (SJVAPCD 2015). Possible other emissions, including odors would be potentially significant and will be further evaluated in an EIR.



		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than Significant Impact	No Impact
IV. Woi	Biological Resources				
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?				
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 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				
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?				
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?				
e.	Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?				
f.	Conflict with the provisions of an adopted habitat conservation plan, natural community conservation plan, or other approved local,				

A preliminary biological report was prepared for the project site by MESA Biological LLC (2020). The analysis herein is based substantially on the information from that report.

RESPONSES:

regional, or state habitat conservation plan?

(a) The project site consists of agricultural land, with a portion of the project site currently being utilized for growing table grapes. The biological field surveys indicate no sign of occupation of candidate, sensitive, or special-status plant and animal species on-site. Furthermore, due to the isolated nature



of the site, historical land use and active disturbance, lack of nearby source populations of native special status species, and proximity to development/activity, the potential for occurrence of many of the state or federal listed or special-status species is considered unlikely (MESA 2020). However, potential impacts to candidate, sensitive, or special-status species will be further evaluated in an EIR.

- (b) The project site is in active agricultural production (table grapes/vineyard) and based on biological field surveys no undisturbed habitat exists within the site. No sign of any bed, bank, channel, or constituent elements were present at the project site that would indicate wetlands or wetland features present. No evidence of potential wetland habitat was present on-site near the Lerdo Canal, which divides the project site. However, impacts related to riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community, including those identified in local or regional plans, or policies would be potentially significant and will be further analyzed in an EIR.
- (c) Potential federal or state-protected water-based resources such as streams and washes could be present on the project site and might be impacted by project construction activities. No sign of any bed, bank, channel, or constituent elements were present at the project site that would indicate wetlands or wetland features present at the site. As stated above in response (b), the Lerdo Canal divides the project site. No evidence of potential wetland habitat was present on-site near the canal. However, impacts will be further evaluated in an EIR.
- (d) No source of refuge or nursery site for wildlife or fish are on or adjacent to the project site. Given the project location, proximity to urban development and predominantly developed lands or land in active agriculture in the vicinity, the area is not known to support migratory or natural wildlife movement. In addition, the Lerdo Canal through the project site and adjacent SR 99 are substantial barriers to terrestrial wildlife movement. However, project construction and operation may remove foraging habitat and impacts would be potentially significant. Impacts to wildlife movement will be further evaluated in an EIR.
- (e) There are no known local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources located within the project site and vicinity. The County tree protection requirements focus on street trees, which are not on the project site. Nonetheless, the EIR will further evaluate the project's consistency with local policies in the County General Plan regarding protection of biological resources.
- (f) The proposed project site is not located within an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan Area; however, it is located within the Kern County Valley Floor Habitat Conservation Plan, which is still in First Public Draft form. Should this Habitat Conservation Plan be adopted prior to project approval, it would apply to the project site. Therefore, impacts would be potentially significant and will be evaluated further in an EIR.



		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than Significant Impact	No Impact
V. Wo	Cultural Resources uld the project:				
a.	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5?	\boxtimes			
b.	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5?				
c.	Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	\boxtimes			

- (a) and (b) Development of the proposed project would require demolition of existing structures, and ground disturbance for site grading and installation of the proposed industrial park structures, and all necessary underground utilities. The proposed project could potentially have a significant impact on historical or cultural resources, including resources that are undiscovered or that may be buried underground. A site-specific cultural resources survey will be conducted, to determine presence or potential presence of archaeological and historical resources and identify potential impacts to historical and/or archaeological cultural resources and to formulate avoidance or mitigation measures, if applicable. Potentially significant impacts to historical and archaeological resources will be further evaluated in an EIR.
- (c) The project site has been heavily disturbed by previous agricultural activity and is not known to be associated with human remains. The project has the potential to disturb human remains during construction if present. Therefore, this issue will be further evaluated in an EIR.



		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than Significant Impact	No Impact
VI. Woi	Energy ald the project:				
a.	Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?				
b.	Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	\boxtimes			

(a) Construction of the project would involve on-site energy demand and consumption related to use of oil in the form of gasoline and diesel fuel for construction worker vehicle trips, hauling and materials delivery truck trips, and operation of off-road construction equipment. In addition, diesel-fueled portable generators may be necessary to provide additional electricity demands for temporary on-site lighting, welding, and for supplying energy to areas of the sites where energy supply cannot be met via a hookup to the existing electricity grid.

The project would be served by PG&E for electricity SoCal Gas for natural gas and would also be required to include solar rooftop and/or common field arrays consistent with the Kern County General Plan. Operation and maintenance facilities associated with the project would require electricity for interior and exterior building lighting, heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC), electronic equipment, machinery, appliances, security systems, etc. Site maintenance activities during operations could involve the use of electric or gas-powered equipment. In addition to on-site energy use, the project would also result in transportation energy use associated with employee vehicle trips. The proposed project could have potentially significant impacts due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources. Therefore, this topic will be further discussed and analyzed in an EIR.

(b) The proposed project would be required to comply with the Kern County General Plan and Energy Element therein. As required by the State of California, the proposed project would also be required to comply with the State's plans and policies regarding energy efficiency. Further analysis is warranted to provide a broader assessment of the project's potential significance in terms of obstructing implementation of important State and County objectives for renewable energy of energy efficiency. Therefore, this topic will be discussed and analyzed in an EIR.



		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than Significant Impact	No Impact
VI _{Wo}	I. Geology and Soils				
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.				
	ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?	\boxtimes			
	iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	\boxtimes			
	iv. Landslides?				\boxtimes
b.	Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	\boxtimes			
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?				
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?				
e.	Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems in areas where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?				
f.	Directly or indirectly destroy a unique	\boxtimes			

f. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?



- (a)(i) According to the Hazardous Materials Evaluation Report prepared by McIntosh & Associates, Inc. (2020), there are no mapped areas that have Fault Zones on the proposed project site. In addition, no known surface or subsurface faults have been mapped transecting any of the parcels comprising the proposed project. The nearest fault zone is the Premier Fault Zone and it is located approximately 6,770 feet east of the northeast corner or the proposed project (on James Road 150 feet east of SR 65). The largest fault in the area, the Kern Front fault, is located approximately 3.7 miles east of the east boundary of the proposed project. The nearest active major fault is the Helendale-South Lockhart fault, located approximately 9.2 miles northeast of the project site (McIntosh 2020a). Impacts related to surface fault ruptures, therefore, are not anticipated. In addition, construction of the project would be subject to all applicable ordinances of the Kern County Building Code (Chapter 17.08), include standards related to seismic hazards. Kern County has adopted the California Building Standards Code (CBC), which imposes substantially the same requirements as the International Building Code (IBC). Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.
- (a)(ii) 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 both above and below ground structures and other site improvements, if not properly designed to withstand strong ground shaking. Construction of the proposed project would be subject to all applicable ordinances of the Kern County Building Code (Chapter 17.08). Kern County has adopted the CBC which imposes substantially the same requirements for design to resist strong ground motions as the IBC. Adherence to applicable regulations would minimize the potential impacts associated with the proposed project. Nonetheless, impacts will be further evaluated in an EIR.
- (a)(iii) Seismically induced liquefaction occurs when loose, water-saturated sediments of relatively low density are subjected to cyclic shaking that causes soils to lose strength or stiffness because of increased pore water pressure. Liquefaction generally occurs when the depth to groundwater is less than 50 feet. Based on review of available groundwater data in the site vicinity, groundwater in the site vicinity is expected to be more than 50 feet below ground surface (Krazan 2020). Thus, the potential for liquefaction at the surface is low. Structures constructed as part of the project would be required by State law to be constructed in accordance with all applicable IBC and CBC earthquake construction standards, including those relating to soil characteristics. Nonetheless, the potential for substantial adverse effects to the project due to seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction, will be examined in an EIR.
- (a)(iv) The project site is located in a relatively flat-lying plain, where landslides are not likely. Impacts related to landslides are not anticipated to occur or pose a hazard to the project or surrounding area, and are considered to have no impact, therefore, further analysis in an EIR is not required.
- (b) Implementation of the proposed project would result in the development of approximately 740 acres that are currently active grape vineyards. Therefore, impacts associated with soil erosion and loss of topsoil during or following construction would be potentially significant. This issue will be further evaluated in an EIR.
- (c) Lateral spreading is the horizontal movement or spreading of soil toward an open face. Lateral spreading may occur when soils liquefy during an earthquake event, and the liquefied soils with overlying soils move laterally to unconfined spaces. Subsidence is the sudden sinking or gradual downward settling of the earth's surface with little or no horizontal movement. Subsidence is caused



by a variety of activities, which include, but are not limited to, withdrawal of groundwater, pumping of oil and gas from underground, the collapse of underground mines, liquefaction, and hydrocompaction. Based on the subsurface conditions encountered at the boring locations including the lack of a static ground water table, liquefaction potential at the project site is low. However, within the vicinity of the canal, shallow groundwater levels may be encountered (Krazan 2020).

- The project would be required to adherence to applicable policies and recommendations outlined in applicable ordinances of the Kern County Building Code (Chapter 17.08). Structures constructed as part of the project would be required by state law to be constructed in accordance with all applicable IBC and CBC earthquake construction standards, including those relating to soil characteristics. However, impacts would be potentially significant and the potential for substantial adverse effects to the project due to on- or off-site lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse, will be examined further in an EIR.
- (d) 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. The proposed project would be designed to comply with applicable building codes and structural improvement requirements to withstand the effects of expansive soils; however, this impact would be potentially significant and will be further evaluated in an EIR.
- (e) The project would be connected to the sewer system for wastewater disposal and would not require a septic system or alternative wastewater system. Therefore, the project would not result in impacts associated with soils that are incapable of supporting septic tanks and alternative wastewater disposal systems. Further analysis in an EIR is not required.
- (f) Kern County is rich in paleontological resources. If sensitive paleontological formations are located underground on the project site, ground disturbance could result in impacts to paleontological resources. A paleontological study will be conducted to determine the underlying formations and potential for fossil discoveries throughout the project site due to the consideration that impacts may be potentially significant. This issue will be further evaluated in an EIR.



		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than Significant Impact	No Impact
	II. Greenhouse Gas Emissions				
a.	Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	\boxtimes			
b.	Conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	\boxtimes			

- (a) Greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions emitted by human activity are implicated in global climate change or global warming. The principal GHGs are CO₂, methane (CH₄), NO_x, ozone, water vapor, and fluorinated gases. The temporary construction activities associated with the proposed project, which would involve operation of heavy off-road equipment, on-road trucks (for deliveries and hauling), and construction worker commute trips, would generate GHG through exhaust emissions. The nature of the proposed project as an industrial park with truck loading docks and warehouses would also generate further GHGs through its use as a hub for diesel trucks and equipment. The project's GHG emissions generated during construction and operation of the project will be quantified and further evaluated in an EIR. Potential for significant environmental impacts will be examined through the project's consistency with GHG reduction plans, programs or regulations, as outlined in the next response.
- (b) There are numerous state plans, policies, and regulations adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions. Statewide plans and regulations such as GHG emissions standards for vehicles (Assembly Bill 1493), the Low Carbon Fuel Standard, and regulations requiring an increasing fraction of electricity to be generated from renewable sources are being implemented at the statewide level; as such, these do not apply to individual development projects. Mandated by Senate Bill (SB) 32, CARB adopted the 2017 Update to its 2008 Scoping Plan, which is the State's plan to achieve the 40 percent reduction in GHG emissions from 1990 levels by 2030. Guided by legislative direction, the Scoping Plan identifies actions identified to reduce overall GHG emissions in California. It notes that transportation, primarily on-road travel, is the single largest source of CO₂ emissions in the State (CARB 2017).

As discussed above, project buildout would generate GHG emissions through the burning of fossil fuels or other emissions of GHGs, thus potentially contributing to cumulative impacts related to climate change. Heavy equipment operation, truck deliveries, and construction worker commute trips associated with construction and operation of the proposed project would generate GHGs. The project's potential GHG impacts would be potentially significant and the potential GHG offsets and impacts resulting from operation of the project will be examined in an EIR, with respect to the objectives of statewide programs to reduce GHGs associated with energy generation.



		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than Significant Impact	No Impact
IX. Wo	Hazards and Hazardous Ma	terials			
a.	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?				
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?				
c.	Emit hazardous emissions or involve handling hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				
d.	Be located on a site that 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?				
e.	For a project located within the adopted Kern County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?				
f.	Impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	\boxtimes			
g.	Expose people or structures, directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires?			\boxtimes	
h.	Would implementation of the project generate vectors (flies, mosquitoes, rodents, etc.) or have a component that includes agricultural waste?				
	Specifically, would the project exceed the following qualitative threshold:				
	The presence of domestic flies, mosquitoes,				

cockroaches, rodents, and/or any other vectors associated with the project is significant when the applicable enforcement agency determines that any of the vectors:



		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than Significant Impact	No Impact
i. (r i	Occur as immature stages and adults in numbers considerably in excess of those found in the surrounding environment; and	\boxtimes			
ii. 1 1	Are associated with design, layout, and management of project operations; and	\boxtimes			
iii. I	Disseminate widely from the property; and	\boxtimes			
iv. (Cause detrimental effects on the public health or well-being of the majority of the surrounding population.	\boxtimes			

(a) Although field equipment used during construction activities could contain various hazardous materials (i.e., hydraulic oil, diesel fuel, grease, lubricants, solvents, adhesives, paints, etc.), these materials are not considered to be acutely hazardous and would be used in accordance with the manufacturer's specifications and all applicable regulations. In addition, hazardous fuels and lubricants used on field equipment would be subject to a Construction Waste Management Plan and, if required, a Spill Prevention, Containment and Countermeasure Plan.

The proposed project would be subject to all local, State, and federal laws pertaining to the use of hazardous materials on-site and would be subject to review by the Kern County Environmental Health Services Division. Through the review process, the project would be required to submit a complete list of all materials used on-site, how the materials would be transported and stored, and in what form they would be used to maintain safety and prevent possible environmental Contamination or worker exposure. During construction of the proposed project, Material Safety Data Sheets (MSDS) for all applicable materials present at the site would be made readily available to on-site personnel. During construction of the facilities, non-hazardous construction debris would be generated and disposed of in approved facilities. During construction of the facility, human waste would be managed using portable toilets located at reasonably accessible on-site locations. However, impacts would be potentially significant and the impacts will be further addressed in an EIR.

(b) Construction activities would be temporary and are not are not anticipated to release hazardous materials or present significant hazards to construction workers, the general public, or the environment. Since the final uses for the site are currently unknown, the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials during operations activities is unknown. However, the proposed project would be subject to all local, State, and federal laws pertaining to the use of hazardous materials on-site and would be subject to review by the Kern County Environmental Health Services Division. Through the review process, the project proponent would be required to submit a complete list of all materials used on-site, how the materials would be transported and stored, and in what form they would be used. This would be recorded to maintain safety and prevent possible environmental contamination or worker exposure. This would include submission of MSDS for all applicable materials present at the site, and the MSDS would be made readily available to on-site personnel.



Impacts for the project would be potentially significant and potential impacts will be further evaluated in an EIR.

- (c) The project site is not located within 0.25 mile of an existing or proposed school. The nearest schools include Norris Middle School, located approximately two miles south, and Norris Elementary School, located approximately 2.6 miles southwest of the project site. Therefore, no impact would occur as a result of the project, and further analysis in an EIR is not required.
- (d) Based on a preliminary review of the Cortese List Data Resources, the proposed project is not located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 (McIntosh & Associates, Inc. 2020). In addition, based on review of the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) EnviroStor and the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) GeoTracker databases, there are no hazardous materials sites located within 1,000 feet of the project site (DTSC 2021, SWRCB 2021). There would be no impacts due to the property not being listed on the Cortese List Data Resources database and project impacts will not be further evaluated in an EIR.
- (e) The Kern County ALUCP covers operations at the Meadows Field Airport, which is located approximately 1.5 miles southeast of the project site. As shown in **Figure 7**, *Airport Land Use Compatibility Map*, a portion of the proposed project is located within the Extended Approach/Departure Zone and Adjacent to Runway (Area B-2) and Common Traffic Pattern (Area-C) of the Meadows Field Airport. Area B-2 is categorized as having significant noise and risk impacts, as aircrafts are commonly below 800 feet, and Area C is categorized as limited risk with frequent noise intrusion. Therefore, aircraft noise from the Meadows Field Airport has the potential to generate significant impacts due to excessive noise if the workforce on-site is partially located within Areas B-2 or -C of the Kern County ALUCP. Therefore, this impact is potentially significant and will be further evaluated in an EIR.
- (f) As required by routine and standard construction specifications administered by Kern County, emergency access would be maintained throughout construction, and appropriate detours would be provided in the event of potential road closures. Therefore, no significant impacts related to impairment of the implementation of or physical interference with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan would occur during construction.

During operation, the proposed project would generate between 5,000 and 6,000 jobs. The size of the project's operational work force has the potential to generate significant traffic volumes during an emergency evacuation scenario that could complicate area-wide emergency evacuation efforts. Additionally, the size of the project's operational work force could impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. Impacts on emergency response or evacuation plans would be potentially significant and will therefore be further assessed in an EIR.

(g) According to the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection's (CalFire) California Fire Hazard Severity Zone Viewer, the project site and vicinity are not located within a Fire Hazard Severity Zone (CalFire 2020). The proposed project would be subject to design review and comply with applicable wildland fire management plans and policies established by the Kern County Fire Department. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant and do not require further evaluation in an EIR.



(h)(i. through iv.) The proposed project includes a request for land use entitlements necessary to allow the construction and operation of an industrial park. Vectors such as mosquitos and rodents may be associated with existing agricultural uses. Construction activities may result in the removal, or displacement of vectors (i.e., rodents disseminating from the site during project construction). As the project would convert the site from agricultural use to industrial uses, the project would reduce overall vector potential in the long-term. Most operational activity would be conducted indoors limiting substantially limiting vector potential. On-site landscape areas associated with the project may provide refuge for mosquitos and other vectors and would be potentially significant. Impacts will be further evaluated in an EIR.



		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than Significant Impact	No Impact	
X. Wor	Hydrology and Water Quality ald the project:	ty				
a.	Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality?					
b.	Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?					
c.	Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:					
	i. result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;	\boxtimes				
	ii. substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site;					
	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					
	iv. impede or redirect flood flows?	\boxtimes				
d.	In flood hazard, tsunami, seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	\boxtimes				
e.	Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	\boxtimes				

(a) Project construction activities have the potential to result in erosion, sedimentation, and discharge of construction debris, and could result in the discharge of wastewater and runoff at the project site.
Project construction would encompass an area greater than one acre and would be subject to a General Construction Permit under the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit


program of the federal Clean Water Act. A Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) would be implemented consistent with General Construction Permit requirements. The NPDES permit would require submittal of a Notice of Intent to the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) prior to commencement of construction activities. Implementation of the SWPPP would begin with the commencement of construction and continue through the completion of the project. The objectives of a SWPPP are to identify pollution sources (such as sediment) that may affect the quality of stormwater discharge and to implement best management practices (BMPs) to reduce pollutants in stormwater during project construction until the site is stabilized.

Project design would also be guided by a Water Quality Management Plan to address the management of stormwater and related pollutants throughout the life of the project. Impacts would be potentially significant and will be further evaluated in an EIR.

- (b) The project would use groundwater from on-site wells during construction. Potable water for project operation would be provided by the OMWC. A State Bill 610 Water Supply Assessment is being prepared for the proposed project to further evaluate water supply requirements for the proposed project. The project is anticipated to decrease water use when compared to existing agriculture operations; however, this impact will be further evaluated in an EIR.
- (c)(i) Implementation of the proposed project would include the development of approximately 740 acres of new impervious surfaces, which could impact the existing drainage pattern of the area, increase the volume or rate of runoff thereby resulting in erosion or saltation on- or off-site. Impacts would be potentially significant and will be further evaluated in an EIR.
- (c)(ii) Construction and operational activities associated with the proposed project would alter existing drainage conditions and create impervious surfaces that would have the potential to result in an increase in the rate or amount of surface runoff during storm events A hydrologic study will be prepared for the project in accordance with Kern County requirements, and impacts will be analyzed in an EIR.
- (c)(iii) As proposed, the project would result in an overall increase in impervious surfaces on-site, which could substantially increase the rate or amount of storm water runoff. The project would also alter the drainage pattern on the site, which could impede or redirect existing drainage patterns or obstruct the carrying capacity of the flow patterns crossing the project site. These impacts could result in substantial on- and off-site flooding. The project would be required to prepare a drainage plan to address storm water runoff impacts.

The EIR will assess changes to the drainage patterns, including but not limited to, exceeding the capacity of the project area's existing drainage system or result in new storm water drainage facilities that could create potentially significant environmental impacts The SWPPP and Water Quality Management Plan would provide the appropriate control and treatment, of storm water prior to discharge during project construction and operation, respectively. Potential impacts will be further evaluated in an EIR.

(c)(iv) The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) delineates flood hazard areas on its Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRMs). According to the FIRMs for the project area, portions of the project site are located in a Zone X, an area with a 0.2 percent annual chance of flooding (FEMA 2008). The project would be reviewed by the Kern County Public Works Department-Floodplain for adherence to applicable floodplain management standards; however, impacts would be potentially significant and will be further evaluated in an EIR.



(d) The project is not located near an ocean or large enclosed body of water, and therefore would not be subject to inundation by seiche or tsunami. Mudflows are a type of mass wasting or landslide, where earth and surface materials are rapidly transported downhill under the force of gravity and are often triggered by heavy rainfall and soil that is not able to sufficiently drain or absorb water and the supersaturation results in soil and rock materials to become unstable and slide away. Due to the relatively flat topography of the project and surrounding area, the potential to be inundated by mudflow is considered remote.

As discussed above, portions of the project site are located in Zone X with only a 0.2 percent annual chance of flooding (FEMA 2008). The project would be reviewed by the Kern County Public Works Department for adherence to all applicable floodplain management standards. In the event of inundate, there would be a related risk of release of pollutants. Potential impacts will be further evaluated in an EIR.

(e) The project site is located within the Tulare Lake Basin, which consists of approximately 17,000 square miles, and includes all of Tulare and Kings Counties, and most of Fresno and Kern Counties. Ongoing management of this basin is governed by the Tulare Lake Basin Portion of Kern County Integrated Regional Water Management Plan (IRWMP) and serves as a sustainable groundwater management plan (Kern Region Water Management Group 2020). A water supply assessment will be completed for the project to analyze potential impacts to groundwater resources, including any potential conflicts with the IRWMP. The project impact would be potentially significant and will be further analyzed in an EIR.



		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than Significant Impact	No Impact
XI. _{Wo}	Land Use and Planning				
a.	Physically divide an established community?				\boxtimes
b.	Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	\boxtimes			

- (a) The project site is located in a portion of Kern County consisting of commercial and agricultural uses, approximately one mile north of the Bakersfield City limits. The nearest residential community is Gossamer Grove, located approximately 0.6 mile southwest of the project site, and consists of single-family residences. The proposed project would not physically encroach into or physically divide or restrict access to the Gossamer Grove residential community. No new roadways or other linear elements that would have the potential to restrict existing access or movement within the local community are proposed. Therefore, no impacts relating to physically dividing an established community would occur as a result of the project, and further analysis in an EIR is not required.
- (b) The project is subject to the requirements of the Kern County General Plan, the Metropolitan Bakersfield General Plan, and the Kern County Zoning Ordinance. The proposed project includes a request for land use entitlements necessary to allow the construction and operation of an industrial park, including:
 - An amendment to the Metropolitan Bakersfield General Plan from R-IA (Intensive Agriculture, minimum 20-acre parcel size) to SI (Service Industrial);
 - An amendment to the Kern County General Plan from 8.1 (Intensive Agriculture, minimum 20-acre parcel size) to 7.2 (Service Industrial); and
 - A change in zone classification from A (Exclusive Agriculture) to M-2 (Medium Industrial) with a PD (Precise Development) Combining District.

Impacts related to land use planning, policies, or regulations would be potentially significant and will be further analyzed in an EIR.



		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than Significant Impact	No Impact
XI Wa	I. Mineral Resources				
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?				
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?				

- (a) The project site was classified as a California Surface Mining and Reclamation Act (SMARA) study area in 1988 (DOC 2018). However, the project site is not within a mineral recovery area or a designated mineral and petroleum resource site established by the Kern County General Plan. The project site is not located within an area zoned NR (Natural Resources) or a Tier 1 Oil and Gas Conformity Tier. The closest area with a NR zoning is approximately 8,437 feet to the northeast and the closest Tier 1 Oil and Gas Conformity Tier is located 9,618 feet to the northeast. The closest active well is 3,650 feet south of the project site in the city of Shafter (CalGEM 2018). Additionally, according to the Kern GIS online resource Attribute Preview, the project site does not contain any parcels with mineral value. Further, the project site is not located near any wells or mineral extraction sites according to the Geologic Energy Management Division (CalGEM) well finder map (CalGEM 2018). Construction and operation of the project would have no impact on future mineral extraction and further analysis in an EIR is not required.
- (b) As mentioned previously, the project site is not located within a designated mineral and petroleum resource site within the Kern County General Plan, or other land use plan. Therefore, the development of proposed project would not preclude future mineral resource development, nor would it result in the loss of a locally important mineral resource recover site. There would be no impact, and further analysis in an EIR is not required.



		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than Significant Impact	No Impact
XI Wo	II. Noise uld 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 a local general plan or noise ordinance or applicable standards of other agencies?				
b.	Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	\boxtimes			
c.	A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project	\boxtimes			
d.	For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or Kern County Airport Land Use	\boxtimes			

excessive noise levels?

Compatibility Plan, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to

(a) The project would generate noise during construction and operation and could therefore cause potentially significant impacts to sensitive receivers within a 0.5-mile radius of the project site. Land uses determined to be "sensitive" to noise as defined by the Kern County General Plan include residential areas, schools, convalescent and acute care hospitals, parks, and recreational areas, and churches. The Kern County General Plan Noise Element sets a 65 dBA (A-weighted decibels) Day Night noise level (Ldn) limit on exterior noise levels for stationary sources (i.e., non-transportation) at sensitive receivers The nearest sensitive receivers are a single-family residence located approximately 350 feet west of the project site, south of SR 99, and a single-family residence located approximately 2,100 feet from the project site (Bollard Acoustical Consultants, Inc. 2020).

Based on the noise assessment prepared for the project, the increase in traffic noise levels due to the proposed project would not exceed the standards of significance at existing sensitive receivers located along the project roadway network (Bollard Acoustical Consultants, Inc. 2020). Additionally, project industrial and construction noise levels at the project site would be masked by traffic on SR 99 for the residence located approximately 350 feet west, and would be below the ambient noise level environment at the residence located approximately 2,100 feet from the project site. However, future traffic noise from SR 99 has the potential to exceed applicable Metropolitan Bakersfield General Plan exterior noise levels at the project site if outdoor break areas are proposed within 300 feet from the



centerline of SR 99 (Bollard Acoustical Consultants, Inc. 2020). This issue will be further evaluated in an EIR.

(b) During project construction, heavy equipment would be used for grading, excavation, paving, and building construction, which could generate groundborne noise that could be audible to sensitive receivers in the area.

Given that predicted vibration levels at the residence located approximately 350 feet away from the project site during construction and operation are well below the strictest Caltrans thresholds for damage to residential structures and for severe human response (Bollard Acoustical Consultants, Inc. 2020), groundborne vibration impacts during construction and operation are not anticipated. Nonetheless, further analysis of groundborne vibration and groundborne noise resulting from project construction and operations will be further evaluated in an EIR.

- (c) Operation of the proposed project would potentially result in a permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity in the form of employee commuting traffic as well as truck trips associated with the transport of goods to and from the industrial park, thus the impact would be potentially significant. This impact will be further assessed in an EIR.
- (d) The nearest public airport to the project site is the Meadows Field Airport located approximately 1.5 miles to the southeast. As shown in **Figure 7**, *Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan Map*, a portion of the project is located within the Extended Approach/Departure Zone and Adjacent to Runway (Area B-2) and Common Traffic Pattern (Area C) of the Meadows Field Airport. Area B-2 is categorized as having significant noise and risk impacts, as aircrafts are commonly below 800 feet, and Area C is categorized as limited risk with frequent noise intrusion. Therefore, aircraft noise from the Meadows Field Airport has the potential to generate excessive and significant noise levels at the project site and expose workers, if present within Areas B-2 or C of the Kern County ALUCP. Therefore, this impact will be further assessed in an EIR.



		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than Significant Impact	No Impact
	V. Population and Housing uld 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)?				
b.	Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				\boxtimes

(a) The proposed project would generate temporary work throughout the construction process for both Phase 1 and 2 of development. Construction workers would likely be expected to travel to the site from various local communities and locations throughout area, and few, if any workers expected to relocate to the surrounding area because of these temporary jobs. If temporary housing should be necessary, accommodations (i.e., extended stay hotels, apartments, RV parks, homes for rent or sale) could be available in the nearby cities and communities of Saco, Oildale, Bakersfield, and Shafter.

The proposed project would develop over six million square-feet for distribution/fulfillment center needs and warehouse space which would potentially create 5,000 to 6,000 full time equivalent jobs. Given the rural nature of the surrounding communities, the project would potentially require the development of new housing or businesses within the local communities to accommodate the increase in population. Given that the site is not currently designated or zoned consistent with planned industrials use, the project may induce substantial, unplanned growth in the project area. Therefore, this impact will be further analyzed in an EIR.

(b) The project site is currently utilized for vineyard/agricultural operations and does not contain any existing housing units. The proposed project would therefore not displace any existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere and is considered to have no impact. No further evaluation of this issue is required in an EIR.



	Less than Significant		
Potentially Significant Impact	with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than Significant Impact	No Impact

XV. Public Services

Would the project:

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

i.	Fire protection?	\boxtimes		
ii.	Police protection?	\boxtimes		
iii.	Schools?	\boxtimes		
iv.	Parks?	\boxtimes		
v.	Other public facilities?	\boxtimes		

RESPONSES:

- (a)(i) **Fire Protection.** The Kern County Fire Department (KCFD) provides fire suppression and emergency medical services to the project area. The fire station closest to the project site is Kern County Fire Station No. 62, located approximately 4.6 miles southeast of the project site at 1652 Sunnyside Court in Bakersfield. The proposed project would add over six million square-feet of structures to KCFD's service area, resulting in a related potential increase in service demand. Further, as discussed in XIV.(a), *Population and Housing*, the project has the potential to induce population growth in the area, including additional housing and service-oriented commercial uses. The increase in growth is likely to create an in-kind demand on fire service within the KCFD, Shafter Fire Department, and other nearby fire service areas. New development would be subject to design review consistent with current Fire Code and local fire department requirements aimed at reducing fire-related risk and loss. However, due to potential increase in service demand, impacts on fire protection would be potentially significant and will be further evaluated in an EIR.
- (a)(ii) Police Protection. Law enforcement and public safety services in the project area are provided by the Kern County Sheriff's Department (KCSD). The closest station to the project site is the Kern County Sheriff's Office, located approximately five miles to the southeast at 1350 Norris Road, Bakersfield. The proposed project would add over six million square-feet of structures to KCFD's service area, resulting in a related potential increase in service demand. On-site security may reduce the need for police protection. Further, as discussed in XIV.(a), *Population and Housing*, the project



has the potential to induce population growth in the area, including additional housing and serviceoriented commercial uses. The increase in growth is likely to create an in-kind demand on police protection demand for the area and impacts would be potentially significant. This issue will be evaluated in an EIR.

- (a)(iii) Schools. During project construction, construction workers would be required. It is expected that most of these workers would live in the broader region and commute to the project site from surrounding communities where their children are already enrolled in school and where their contribution to local taxes, including funds for schools, is assessed locally. Therefore, substantial temporary increases in population during project construction would not adversely affect local school populations.
- Long-term operation would result in up to 5,000 to 6,000 new jobs. The jobs may attract new residents from outside the area, and result in a related increase in the student population. The project also has the potential to induce population growth including an increased demand for service-oriented uses. Also see discussion in XIV.(a), Population and Housing. New industrial, residential, and commercial development, including the proposed project, would be required to pay development impact fees, which are considered to be complete mitigation under CEQA. Although school impact fees for new development would be required, the impacts to Schools would be potentially significant. Impacts to schools will be further evaluated in an EIR.
- (a)(iv) Parks. During project construction, construction workers would be required. It is expected that most of these workers would live in the broader region and commute to the project site from surrounding communities where the families already use area parks.

However, as discussed in XIV. (a), *Population and Housing*, project operation has the potential to induce population growth in the area, including additional housing and service-oriented commercial uses. The project is anticipated to employ 5,000-6,000 people, some of whom may relocate to the area. In the Kern County General plan, Implementation Measure GG establishes a parkland/recreational space standard of service as 2.5 acres of park area per 1,000 residents. The project has the potential to increase the local population and related demand for public parkland. Impacts would be potentially significant and will be further analyzed in an EIR.

(a)(v) **Other Public Facilities.** During project construction, construction workers would be required. It is expected that most of these workers would live in the broader region and commute to the project site from surrounding communities where the families already use public facilities.

However, as discussed in XIV. (a), *Population and Housing*, project operation has the potential to induce population growth in the area, including additional housing and service-oriented commercial uses, resulting in an increase in demand for area public services. Therefore, impacts to public facilities would be potentially significant and will be further analyzed in an EIR.



		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than Significant Impact	No Impact
XV Wo	I. Recreation build 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?				
b.	Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	\boxtimes			

(a) The nearest park facilities to the project site include Madison Grove Park, located approximately three miles to the southeast at 10115 Norris Road, Bakersfield and Almondale Park, located approximately four miles to the south at 5501 Verdugo Lane, Bakersfield. During project construction, construction workers would be required. It is expected that most of these workers would live in the broader region and commute to the project site from surrounding communities where the families already use area parks.

However, as discussed in XIV. (a), *Population and Housing*, project operation has the potential to induce population growth in the area, including additional housing and service-oriented commercial uses. The project is anticipated to employ 5,000-6,000 people, some of whom may relocate to the area. Therefore, the project has the potential to increase the local population and related demand for public park and recreation land. Therefore, impacts to parks and recreation facilities would be potentially significant and will be further analyzed in an EIR.

(b) The proposed project does not directly include or require the construction of new or expansion of existing recreational facilities, and there are no recreational facilities on the project site that would be affected. However, as discussed in a) above, the project has the potential to induce growth, which may increase the demand for new or expanded recreational facilities, the development of which might have adverse impacts on the environment. Therefore, impacts to recreational facilities would be potentially significant and will be further evaluated in an EIR.



		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than Significant Impact	No Impact
XV Wor	II. Transportation and Tr uld the project:	affic			
a.	Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities?				
b.	Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3 subdivision (b)?	\boxtimes			
c.	Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				
d.	Result in inadequate emergency access?	\boxtimes			

- (a) The proposed project would generate short-term traffic during construction, and long-term traffic during the operational life of the project. A comprehensive traffic study will be prepared for the project; however, capacity impacts/level of service of are no longer a consideration under CEQA but may still be considered by the County as part of the project review process outside of CEQA. Conflicts with programs, plans, ordinances or policies addressing the circulation system would be potentially significant and will be further evaluated in an EIR.
- (b) CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b) was adopted in December 2018 by the California Natural Resources Agency. These revisions to the CEQA Guidelines criteria for determining the significance of transportation impacts shifts the focus from driver delay to reduction of vehicular GHG emissions through creation of multimodal networks, and creation of a mix of land uses that can facilitate fewer and shorter vehicle trips. Vehicle miles traveled (VMT) is a measure of the total number of miles driven for various purposes and is sometimes expressed as an average per trip or per person. Construction traffic would be temporary and would not permanently affect VMT characteristics in this part of Kern County or elsewhere. The project's VMT characteristics would be potentially significant and will be further evaluated in an EIR.
- (c) Impacts associated with increased hazards due to a design feature are considered potentially significant. The project would create an intensive (over six million square-feet) industrial complex, adjacent to a substantially agricultural setting. Public roads may be shared by large, slow moving farm equipment and faster, project generated traffic, may be a hazard consideration, and would be potentially significant. This impact will be further evaluated in an EIR.



(d) The project would implement roadway improvements which could affect emergency access during construction activities. The project would also require/develop emergency access for the project site and its employees and would, therefore, result in potentially significant impacts. Further analysis of this issue will be provided in an EIR.



	Less than Significant		
Potentially Significant	with Mitigation	Less-than Significant	No
Impact	Incorporated	Impact	Impact

XVIII. Tribal Cultural Resources

Would the project:

- a. 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 terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:
 - i. Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register or historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or
 - 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 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.

RESPONSES:

(ai,aii) The proposed project has the potential to impact tribal cultural resources, if present, during site clearance and earthmoving activities. Tribes with possible cultural affiliation and interest within the project area have been notified pursuant to the requirements of Assembly Bill 52, and SB 18 and consultation with the potentially affected tribes will occur, as appropriate, between the County and the tribes. Impacts would be potentially significant and will be further evaluated in an EIR.



	Less than Significant		
Potentially Significan Impact	y with t Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than Significant Impact	No Impact

 \square

 \square

 \square

 \boxtimes

 \boxtimes

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?
- b. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?
- c. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that 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?
- 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?
- e. Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

\boxtimes		
\boxtimes		
\boxtimes		

RESPONSES:

(a) **Water Facilities.** The proposed project would include the extensions of the OMWC's six-inch domestic water line and 12-inch non-potable water line from approximately one mile west of Quinn Road along Imperial Street to the southeast corner of the proposed project. Impacts from the extension of these facilities would be potentially significant and may to result in adverse environmental impacts. Therefore, impacts will be further evaluated in an EIR.

Wastewater Facilities. The project involves installation of a new sewer trunk from the future intersection of Imperial Street at Endes Street, via Coffee Road and 7th Standard Road. Additionally, Phase 1 of the proposed project would require a sewer lift station to reach the new sewer trunk. Therefore, impacts associated with installation of a new sewer trunk and sewer lift station would be potentially significant and will be further evaluated in an EIR.



Storm Water Facilities. The proposed project may require expanded or new storm drainage facilities as the proposed industrial park would increase the impervious surface area, leading to an increase in runoff during storm events. Therefore, associated impacts relating to storm water facilities would be potentially significant and will be further evaluated in an EIR.

Power, Natural Gas, and Telecommunication Facilities. The proposed project would involve construction of a new SoCal Gas natural gas pressure reducing station, gas main and laterals, and a new PG&E electrical substation and distribution. Therefore, associated impacts from the construction of the natural gas pressure reducing station, gas main and laterals, and electrical substation and distribution would be potentially significant and will be further evaluated in an EIR.

- (b) The project would create an overall increase in the demand for water service for employee use, industrial activity, and landscaping. A Water Supply Assessment will be completed for the project to analyze potential water sources and potential impacts to water supplies. This impact would be potentially significant and will be further evaluated in an EIR.
- (c) Portable toilets would provide for wastewater disposal during project construction and no connection to a public system for wastewater treatment would be required. The proposed project would include installation of a new sewer trunk and sewer lift station. The project would create an overall increase in the demand for wastewater collection and treatment, commensurate with the 5,000 to 6,000 new employees that would be associated with the new industrial park. Therefore, the project may have potentially significant impacts on existing wastewater treatment facilities, which will be further evaluated in an EIR.
- (d) Materials brought to the project site would be used to construct facilities, and few residual waste materials are expected. Non-hazardous construction refuse and solid waste would be either collected and recycled per the Construction Waste Management Plan or disposed of at a local Class III landfill, while any hazardous waste generated during construction would be disposed of at an approved off-site location. The Kern County Public Works Department operates seven landfills throughout the county located in Bakersfield (Bena Landfill), Boron, Mojave-Rosamond, Ridgecrest, Shafter-Wasco, Taft, and Tehachapi. Implementation of the proposed project is not expected to generate quantities of solid waste in excess of existing landfill capacity. Nonetheless, potential impacts will be further evaluated in an EIR.
- (e) The proposed project would generate solid waste during construction and operation, thus requiring the consideration of waste reduction and recycling measures. The 1989 California Integrated Waste Management Act (AB 939) requires Kern County to attain specific waste diversion goals. In addition, the California Solid Waste Reuse and Recycling Access Act of 1991, as amended, requires expanded or new development projects to incorporate storage areas for recycling bins into the proposed project design. The proposed project would be required to comply with the 1989 California Integrated Waste Management Act and the 1991 California Solid Waste Reuse and Recycling Access Act of 1991. Nonetheless, further analysis of the pertinent solid waste reduction and management regulations applicable to this project will be included in an EIR.



		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than Significant Impact	No Impact
XX If lo clas wou	Wildfire becated in or near state responsibility areas or lands sified as very high fire hazard severity zones, and the project:				
a.	Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?			\boxtimes	
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?			\boxtimes	
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?				
d.	Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope			\boxtimes	

instability, or drainage changes?

(a) through (d) According to the Fire Hazard Severity Zones map published by CalFire, the project site is not located within or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones (VHFHSZ); (CalFire 2020). The project site is classified as Local Responsibility Area (LRA) Moderate; thus, the potential for wildfire on the project site exists, but is not considered high. Furthermore, the proposed project would be subject to design review, and comply with applicable wildland fire management plans and policies established by the Kern County Fire Department. Therefore, the project does not have the potential to result in fire-related impacts associated with or being near a very high fire hazard severity zone. Impacts would be less than significant.



	Less than Significant		
Potentially Significant Impact	with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than Significant Impact	No Impact

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?
- b. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are significant when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)
- c. Does the project have environmental effects that would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

RESPONSES:

- (a) The proposed project has the potential to change the quality of the environment, including fish and wildlife habitat and populations. The EIR's biological, cultural, and tribal cultural resources sections will discuss specific project impacts on plants and wildlife including avian species and impacts to cultural and tribal cultural resources. The change in quality of environment is considered significant and an EIR will evaluate the project's contribution to cumulative biological, cultural and tribal cultural resources.
- (b) The proposed project has the potential to cumulatively contribute to significant aesthetics, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, tribal cultural resources, GHG emissions, and traffic impacts. Such impacts could occur during the construction phases and/or as a result of project operation. An EIR will evaluate the project's contribution to cumulative impacts.
- (c) The proposed project could result in long-term air pollutant emissions or noise sources that would adversely affect nearby sensitive receptors. The proposed project could include industrial processes or equipment that would generate hazardous substances or wastes that would threaten the well-being of people on- or off-site. In addition, short-term construction activities could result in temporary



increases in pollutant concentrations and potentially significant off-site noise impacts. Pollutants of primary concern commonly associated with construction-related activities include toxic air contaminants gaseous emissions of criteria pollutants, and fugitive dust. Within the project area, the potential for increased occurrences of Valley Fever and is also of concern. Human health impacts from the short-term and long-term cumulative contribution to air quality impacts from project construction will be further evaluated in an EIR.





4. References

- Bollard Acoustical Consultants, Inc. 2020. Environmental Noise & Vibration Assessment: Malibu Vineyards Rezone Project Phases 1 & 2.
- California Air Resources Board (CARB). 2017. California's 2017 Climate Change Scoping Plan. Available at:

https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/sites/default/files/classic//cc/scopingplan/scoping_plan_2017.pdf

California Department of Conservation (DOC). 2018. CGS Information Warehouse: Mineral Land Classification. https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/informationwarehouse/index.html?map=mlc

___. 2019. California Important Farmland Finder Map. Accessed April 2021. https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/dlrp/ciff/app/

- California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CalFire). 2020. Fire Hazard Severity Zone Maps. https://gis.data.ca.gov/datasets/789d5286736248f69c4515c04f58f414.
- California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CalFire). 2020. FHSZ Viewer. https://egis.fire.ca.gov/FHSZ/
- California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). Scenic Highways List of Officially Designated State Scenic Highways. 2021. Available at: https://caltrans.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=2e921695c43643b1aaf7000d fcc19983
- California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC). 2021. EnviroStor. https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/map/?global_id=15340023.
- California State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB). 2021. GeoTracker. https://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/map/?global_id=T0607302824.
- Geologic Energy Management Division (CalGEM). 2021. Well Fnder CalGEM GIS. https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/doggr/#dataviewer
- Kern, County of. 2009. Kern County General Plan Noise Element. https://psbweb.co.kern.ca.us/planning/pdfs/kcgp/KCGPChapter3.pdf.
- _____. 2012. Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan. https://psbweb.co.kern.ca.us/planning/pdfs/ALUCP2012.pdf
- _____. 2009. Kern County General Plan (KCGP). https://psbweb.co.kern.ca.us/planning/pdfs/kcgp/KCGP_Complete.pdf
 - ____. 2021a. Kern County GIS. https://maps.kerncounty.com/H5/index.html?viewer=KCPublic
- _____. 2021b. Visual Impact Assessment.
- _____. 2021c. Zoning Ordinance. Available at: https://library.municode.com/ca/kern_county/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=TIT19ZO_CH1 9.81OULIDASKOR_19.81.010PUAP
- Krazan & Associates, Inc. 2020. Geotechnical Feasibility Study Proposed Malibu Vineyards Development NE of Highway 99 and Imperial Street, Kern County California



- MESA Biological LLC. 2020. Biological Assessment of 746 Acres +/- at Northeast of Hwy 99 & Imperial Avenue Portions of Sections 24 & 25, T.28S., R.26E,; and a portion of Sections 29 & 30, T.28S., R.27E. County of Kern, CA.
- McIntosh & Associates 2020a. *Hazardous Materials Evaluation Report Malibu Vineyards Industrial Park.*
- _____. 2020b. Master PD Plan No. 2, Map No. 80 and 81, Malibu Vineyards Industrial Park.
- _____. 2020e. Energy Study Report for Malibu Vineyards Industrial Park.
 - . 2020d. Traffic Study General Plan Amendment and Zone Change Northeast of Highway 99 and Imperial Avenue, Kern County, California
- San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD). 2015. Guidance for Assessing and Mitigating Air Quality Impacts (GAMAQI). March 19, 2015. https://www.valleyair.org/transportation/GAMAQI_12-26-19.pdf
- Southern Kern Unified School District. 2020. Resolution #19-20-12 Resolution of the Governing Board of the Southern Kern Unified School District Regarding School Facilities Frees. https://www.skusd.k12.ca.us/site/handlers/filedownload.ashx?moduleinstanceid=2400&dataid=3 859&FileName=Reso%2019-20-12%20Increase%20Dev%20Fees.pdf



This page intentionally left blank.

Appendix B Malibu Vineyards Industrial Parkway Specific Plan

Malibu Vineyards Industrial Parkway Specific Plan

Sections 24, 25, 29, 30, Township 28 South, Ranges 26 and 27 East, M.D.B. M.

County of Kern, State of California



Kern County Planning and Natural Resources Department

2024

Prepared For:

Malibu Vineyards, LP 9777 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 900 Beverly Hills, CA 90212

and

Kern County Planning & Natural Resources Department 2700 M Street, Suite 100 Bakersfield, CA 93301 (661) 862-8600

Prepared By:

McIntosh & Associates 10800 Stockdale Highway, Suite 103 Bakersfield, CA 93311 Contact: Whitney Jackson (661) 834-4814

Table of Contents

1.0 Introduction	1
1.1 Authority and Scope	1
1.2 Administrative Compliance	1
1.3 Relationship to Kern County General Plan	2
1.4 Relationship to Metropolitan Bakersfield General Plan	2
1.5 Regional Overview	3
1.5.1 Site Description	3
1.5.2 Legal Description	4
1.5.3 Surrounding Land Use	4
1.6 Project Description	7
1.6.1 Proposed Uses	8
1.6.2 Visual Impact Assessment	8
1.6.3 Access and Circulation	9
2.0 Land Use, Open Space and Conservation Element Kern County General Plan	13
2.1 Special Treatment Areas	13
2.2 Industrial Land Use	14
3.0 Land Use Element Metropolitan Bakersfield General Plan	18
4.0 General Provisions	21
4.1 Public Services and Facilities	23
4.1.1 Air Quality	23
4.1.2 Archaeological, Paleontological, Cultural, and Historic Preservation	24
4.1.3 Threatened and Endangered Species	25
4.1.4 Surface Water and Groundwater	26
4.1.5 Sewage Disposal System	27
4.1.6 Drainage Disposal System	28
4.1.7 Emergency Response	29
4.1.8 Light and Glare	

4.1.9 Economic Development and Smart Growth	
4.1.10 Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan	31
4.1.11 General Plan and Zoning Compatibility Matrix	32
5.0 Noise Element	35
6.0 Specific Plan Administration	37
6.1 Approval Authority	37
6.1.1 Required Findings	37
6.1.2 Implementation	37

List of Exhibits

Figures

Figure 1 Existing Zoning	5
Figure 2 Proposed Zoning	6
Figure 3 Existing Land Use Designation	6
Figure 4 Proposed Land Use Designation	7
Figure 5 Phase One Site Plan (PD Plan No. 74, Map 81)	10
Figure 6 Phase Two Site Plan (PD Plan No. 2, Map 80)	. 11
Figure 7 Phase Two Site Plan (PD Plan No. 75, Map 81)	. 12
Figure 8 Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan	. 32

Tables

Table 1 Surrounding Land Use Setting	5
Table 2 General Plan and Zoning Compatibility Matrix	33
Table 3 Metropolitan Bakersfield General Plan and Zoning Compatibility Matrix	34

1.0 Introduction

This Specific Plan is intended to provide sufficient direction to accommodate the development of the Malibu Vineyards Industrial Parkway. California State Government Code Section 65450 et seq. is the enabling statute for Specific Plan preparation and adoption. Emphasis is placed on planning and financing of infrastructure for the Plan area. A specific plan acts as a versatile tool for implementing planning policy by providing a detailed plan for the development of a specific area. It addresses issues of importance in the area with policies and implementation measures that will protect the natural environment, provide adequate public facilities and services and promote a quality environment enhancing the character of the area. The Plan was prepared in accordance with the Industrial Policies presented in the Land Use, Open Space and Conservation Element of the Kern County General Plan.

1.1 Authority and Scope

The Specific Plan is adopted by ordinance making it a regulatory document. The Specific Plan is an integral component of the Kern County General Plan. Preparation of the Specific Plan if for the systematic implementation of the general plan for the area covered by the general plan and the relationship between the specific plan to the general plan. This document provides a comprehensive and tailored guide for development of the project area. Consistent with State and County requirements, the documents sets forth a definitive land use development plan, development regulations, design guidelines, and implementation plans and programs designed to ensure a successful project development consistent with the goals and policies of the County's General Plan.

The purpose of the Malibu Vineyards Industrial Parkway Specific Plan is to establish the following:

- Facilitate development in response to market demands which is supportive of the County's economic base;
- Implement existing General Plan goals and/or policies by presenting more detailed direction for future development of the Specific Plan area, and;
- Set forth sufficient regulations for development of property within the Specific Plan, that by complying with all standards and regulations, the end user/developer will be able to go through a streamlined process to obtain permits.

The policies of the Kern County General Plan are hereby incorporated by reference. When discrepancies exist between the General Plan and the Malibu Vineyards Industrial Parkway Specific Plan, the more restrictive requirements shall apply. The California Government Code allows specific plans to be adopted either by resolution to establish a policy document or by ordinance to establish a regulatory document. Subsequent project related development plans and any other actions requiring discretionary or ministerial approval must comply with this plan. Any development proposal that is inconsistent with the Specific Plan shall require a Specific Plan Amendment, and if required, a General Plan Amendment for compliance.

1.2 Administrative Compliance

The project is within compliance of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). An Environmental Impact Report (EIR) has been prepared for the Specific Plan and project area. The EIR was prepared in conformance with the most recently adopted State of California CEQA Guidelines. Numerous technical studies were prepared to analyze environmental conditions and assess the potential impacts of the project. The EIR used these studies to address the proposed project and its impact upon the environment and provides mitigation measures to

minimize or eliminate the identified project impacts. The EIR serves as the required environmental documentation for the Specific Plan and for proposed projects processed within the Specific Plan area. Future projects which are consistent with and implement the Specific Plan (such as subdivision maps) and which fall "within the scope" of the project analyzed in the EIR, should require no further environmental action under CEQA.

1.3 Relationship to Kern County General Plan

A portion of the project site, the majority of phase two, is within the Kern County General Plan, designated as Map Code 8.1 (Intensive Agriculture). In 2004, the Kern County Board of Supervisor's adopted the Kern County General Plan and later approved amendments, including the Land Use, Conservation, and Open Space Element. This serves as the authority for the element and provides a variety of land uses for future economic growth in Kern County. Preparation of the 2040 Kern County General Plan update is currently being processed with an unknown target adoption date. The General Plan also establishes a mechanism for specific, individualized treatment of "Special Treatment Areas" for development. The Malibu Vineyards Industrial Parkway special treatment area will be governed by this Specific Plan to address project related issues and opportunities in more detail than the broad scope of the Kern County General Plan.

This Specific Plan has been prepared to address and establish overall design and development standards for the approximate 739-acre industrial project. Accordingly, it has direct relationships to the Land Use, Conservation, and Open Space Element of the Kern County General Plan. The text of this Specific Plan includes sections discussing these relationships and it is not the purpose of this plan to expand upon the specificity of the Circulation, Safety, Energy, Housing, and Military Readiness Elements included within the Kern County General Plan since no dwellings are proposed, and there is no seismic faulting in this area. Those elements adequately address their respective concerns to this type of project, and further review in this regard is not required.

If any section, subsection, paragraph, sentence, clause or phrase of this text is for any reason held to be invalid or unconstitutional by the decision of any court or competent jurisdiction, such decision shall not affect the validity of the remaining portions of this text. The Board of Supervisor's hereby declares that it would have approved this plan, and each section, subsection, sentence, clause, and phrase thereof, irrespective of the fact that any one or more sections, subsections, sentences, clauses, and phrases be declared invalid or unconstitutional.

1.4 Relationship to Metropolitan Bakersfield General Plan (Unincorporated Planning Area)

A portion of the project site, all of phase one with a portion of phase two, is within the Metropolitan Bakersfield General Plan (Unincorporated Planning Area), designated R-IA (Intensive Agriculture). In 2002, the Metropolitan Bakersfield General Plan was adopted defining elements for Land Use, Circulation, Housing, Conservation, Open Space, Noise, Safety, Downtown Redevelopment, Public Services and Facilities, Parks, Kern River Plan, and Historical Resources. The City of Bakersfield General Plan and plans to adopt the document late next year in 2024. This General Plan articulates the economic, social and environmental goals for the future character and development of the Metropolitan Bakersfield planning area.

It is the intent of the Metropolitan Bakersfield General Plan to incorporate specific plans for properties within the general plan boundaries. Specific plans are intended to amplify the goals and policies of the general plan and determine exact land use designations within the plan area.

The intent of this Specific Plan is to accommodate new industrial development to capture the economic demands generated by the current dynamic marketplace.

This Specific Plan has been prepared to address and establish overall design and development standards for the approximate 739 acre industrial project. Accordingly, it has direct relationships to the Land Use, Circulation, Conservation, Open Space, and Noise Elements of the Metropolitan Bakersfield General Plan. The text of this Specific Plan includes sections discussing these relationships and it is not the purpose of this plan to expand upon the specificity of the Housing, Safety, Downtown Redevelopment, Public Services and Facilities, Parks, Kern River Plan, and Historical Resources Elements included within the Metropolitan Bakersfield General Plan since no dwellings are proposed, there is no seismic faulting in this area, it is not a historic site or located near the Kern River or downtown Bakersfield. Those elements adequately address their respective concerns to this type of project, and further review in this regard is not required.

If any section, subsection, paragraph, sentence, clause or phrase of this text is for any reason held to be invalid or unconstitutional by the decision of any court or competent jurisdiction, such decision shall not affect the validity of the remaining portions of this text. The City Council and Board of Supervisor's hereby declare that it would have approved this plan, and each section, subsection, sentence, clause, and phrase thereof, irrespective of the fact that any one or more sections, subsections, sentences, clauses, and phrases be declared invalid or unconstitutional.

1.5 Regional Overview

1.5.1 Site Description

The Specific Plan area consists of approximately 739 acres of an existing vineyard and fallow agricultural land and will be developed over two phases. Phase 1 is bordered by Burbank Street to the north, generally Imperial Road to the east, Imperial Avenue to the South, and State Route 99 and the Lerdo Canal to the west. Phase 2 is just south of Kyte Avenue to the north, bordered by the Lerdo Canal to the east and south, and State Route 99 to the west. Access to Phase 1 of the project site is by way of Saco Road, Imperial Avenue and Burbank Street. The Phase 2 location is currently isolated between State Route 99 and the Lerdo Canal and would require development of a future expanded Burbank Street crossing the canal to facilitate access. This future transportation corridor will be constructed in compliance with California Department of Transportation and the County of Kern standards.

The site has been in agricultural production of table grapes for more than twenty years. A portion of the site is currently being utilized for growing table grapes and historic aerial maps indicate the site has been used for grape vineyards since the 1980's. The site has an existing structure that is used as an agricultural storage building for various farm and agricultural related operation equipment. There are no Williamson Act land use contracts associated with the project site. There are no trees or dwelling units located on the site.

The topography of the site is located within a relatively flat-lying plain at approximately 440 feet above sea level. The project site is located in Federal Emergency Management Flood Zone 'X', indicating an area with a 0.2 percent chance of annual flooding. There are no mapped fault zones associates with the project site and no known surface or subsurface faults transecting any of the site area. Mineral recovery and petroleum resource areas have not been designated by the Kern County General Plan on the project site. Due to historic agricultural activities, cultural resources, wildfire and unique vegetation and special species impacts are low and/or nonexistent.

Southern portions of the site are within the Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP) for the Meadows Field Airport located approximately 1.5 miles to the southeast. These portions are in the ALUCP Zone B2, which may require dedication of avigation easements and Zone C, which limits high-rise office buildings to no more than four stories. The Specific Plan will require compliance with the ALUCP for future development of the site.

1.5.2 Legal Description

The project site is divided into three precise development plan map areas with the following legal descriptions:

PD Plan No. 74, Map 81

The west half of the northwest quarter of Section 29, Township 28 South, Range 27 East, Mount Diablo Meridian.

That portion of the east half and the east half of the west half of Section 30, Township 28 South, Range 27 East, Mount Diablo Meridian, lying northeasterly of the northeasterly lines of State Highway VI-KER-99 and the Lerdo Canal.

That portion of the west half of the northwest quarter of Section 30, Township 28 South, Range 27 East, Mount Diablo Meridian, lying northeasterly of the northeasterly line of the Lerdo Canal.

<u>PD Plan No. 2, Map 80</u>

That portion of Section 25, Township 28 South, Range 26 East, Mount Diablo Meridian, lying between the northeasterly line of State Highway VI-KER-99 and the southwesterly line of the Lerdo Canal.

That portion of the south half of Section 24, Township 28 South, Range 26 East, Mount Diablo Meridian, lying between the northeasterly line of State Highway VI-KER-99 and the southwesterly line of the Lerdo Canal.

The south 712 feet of lot 25 in Section 24, Township 28 South, Range 26 East, Mount Diablo Meridian, as measured from the centerline of Road G adjoining said lot on the south all as shown on map of Lerdo subdivision "a" filed for record in Map Book 2 at page 54 in the office of the Kern County recorder.

PD Plan No. 75, Map 81

That portion of the west half of the west half of Section 30, Township 28 South, Range 27 East, Mount Diablo Meridian, lying between the northeasterly line of State Highway VI-KER-99 and the southwesterly line of the Lerdo Canal.

1.5.3 Surrounding Land Use

The project site is located on agricultural land within unincorporated Kern County, California. Existing land uses in the area surrounding the project site are primarily industrial and agricultural with vineyards to the north and east, and industrial developments to the south and west side of State Route 99. Land use designation and zoning of the surrounding areas is summarized in Table 1 and Figures 1 through 4 below.

Location	Land Use Designation	Zoning	Existing Land Use
North	Intensive Agriculture (8.1)	Exclusive	Agriculture
		Agriculture (A)	-
East	Intensive Agriculture (R-	Exclusive	Agriculture, Industrial
	IA); Intensive Agriculture	Agriculture (A)	-
	(8.1)		
South	Service Industrial (SI);	Exclusive	Agriculture, Industrial,
	Heavy Industrial (HI);	Agriculture (A)	Airport
	Incorporated Cities –	Medium Industrial,	
	City of Shafter (1.2)	Precise Development	
		Combining (M-2 PD);	
West	Incorporated Cities –	Exclusive	Agriculture, Industrial
	City of Shafter (1.2)	Agriculture (A);	-
	, , , ,	Industrial (Ì);	
		General	
		Commercial (GC)	

Table 1 Surrounding Land Use

Figure 1 Existing Zoning





Figure 2 Proposed Zoning

Figure 3 Existing Land Use Designation





Figure 4 Proposed Land Use Designation

1.6 Project Description

The Specific Plan allows for the development of approximately 8.8 million square feet of industrial use space, comprised of twenty-four buildings on a 739-acre site located east of State Route 99 and north of Imperial Avenue in the unincorporated County of Kern. As existing, the site consists of several parcels and the proposed development would require new mapping to create new legal parcels consistent with development. As proposed, the site will allow for development of an approximate 8.8 million square foot industrial park with warehousing and distribution facilities defined by the Malibu Vineyards Industrial Parkway Specific Plan. See Figures 5 and 6 below.

Approval of the Specific Plan requires the following actions by the County of Kern:

- 1. Adoption of the Malibu Vineyards Industrial Parkway Specific Plan and amendments to the Kern County General Plan and Metropolitan Bakersfield General Plan boundaries to exclude the project site;
- Amendment to the Kern County General Plan Land Use, Open Space and Conservation Element from Map Code 8.1 (Intensive Agriculture Minimum 20-Acre Parcel Size) to Map Code 4.1 (Accepted County Plan Area); upon approval of the Malibu Vineyards Industrial Parkway Specific Plan, the underlying Map Code 7.2 (Service Industrial) would be established;
- 3. Amendment to the Kern County Metropolitan Bakersfield General Plan Land Use Element from Map Code R-IA (Resource-Intensive Agriculture) to Map

Code SI (Service Industrial) ; upon approval of the Malibu Vineyards Industrial Parkway Specific Plan, the underlying Map Code SI (Service Industrial) would be established;

- 4. Change in zone classification from A (Exclusive Agriculture) to M-2 PD (Medium Industrial, Precise Development);
- 5. Approval of Precise Development Plans:
 - Precise Development Plan No. 2, Map 80;
 - Precise Development Plan No. 74, Map No. 81; and
 - Precise Development Plan No. 75, Map No. 81;
- 6. Certification of an Environmental Impact Report.

1.6.1 Proposed Uses

The proposed uses within this Specific Plan will accommodate a maximum of 8,800,000 square feet of Medium Industrial development on approximately 739 gross acres. Zoning for the Specific Plan area will be M-2 PD (Medium Industrial, Precise Development) and the land use designation will be SI (Service Industrial) to support the industrial development of all parcels in this plan area, after the entitlements and Environment Impact Report are approved. The subsequent division of land into smaller parcels would be additionally governed by Precise Development overlay, Subdivision and Parcel Map Ordinance, Zoning Ordinance, and Health Department Standards, and requirements of other Kern County Departments. A parcel map will follow the adoption of the entitlements and this Plan.

A Precise Development Plan was prepared for the proposed site development. Any future changes to the site will be processed through Precise Development Plan Modifications in compliance with Kern County standards. As currently planned, the project will be comprised of twenty-four industrial buildings and associated office space developed over two phases. Warehousing, distribution, high-cube transloading, and short-term storage will represent the probable combination of businesses that will operate within the development. Approximately twenty-five percent of the proposed square footage would include refrigerated warehouse space. See Figures 5 and 6 below.

1.6.2 Visual Impact Assessment

Visual appearance of the development will be maintained to enhance the site to potential users and customers. State Route 99 is not classified as a National Scenic Byway or Designated State Scenic Highway, nor considered a sensitive corridor regarding visual resource issues. Review of the project site and future plans indicate that the project would introduce industrial features that do not currently dominate the primarily agricultural landscape resulting in substantial adverse impacts to the visual environment. All development in the Specific Plan area will require incorporation of construction standards and Specific Plan criteria in the design of the plans in accordance with Kern County standards. This includes but is not limited to customer and employee parking, truck and trailer parking, truck docks, access roads, and on-site drainage. Market trends and customer needs will guide the demand for innovative design within the development.

1.6.3 Access and Circulation

Both the Kern County General Plan and Metropolitan Bakersfield General Plan provide for the development of the area and ensure circulation and additional infrastructure is planned to meet the needs of the areas designated within the Specific Plan. Market demands and expansion of preceding development will determine the phasing of development. Major infrastructure improvements and improved circulation throughout the site and surrounding areas will be required. New connectivity will feature an expansion of a future arterial segment of Burbank Street, local streets, expressway, and interchange with phase two of development. Adjacent roads would be developed to half-width standards and roads through the site would be developed to full width standards.

The project would develop local roads internal to the project to facilitate project access and internal circulation. Local roads would provide access to truck drive aisles and parking areas associated with each building. The California Transportation Department will be consulted to provide input on any State highway upgrades needed for the project. Street improvements, paving, curb, gutter, sidewalk, street lighting, utilities, and drainage facilities will also be required with site development in accordance with Kern County standards. All infrastructure improvements will be paid for by the developer with appropriate Building permits. A Community Service District may be established upon recordation of a final parcel map to maintain the streets, lighting and drainage facilities of the Specific Plan Area. See Figures 5 through 6 site plans below.

Figure 5 Phase One Site Plan (PD Plan No 74, Map 81)








2.0 Land Use, Open Space and Conservation Element Kern County General Plan

2.1 Special Treatment Areas

Assumptions: Special Treatment Areas

Per the Kern County General Plan, localized issues, problems, and opportunities will continue to require specific, individualized treatment to ensure that a solution to problems or realization of opportunities is reflective of the needs of local residents. The size and complexity of Kern County forces recognition of localized needs. Use of area and specific plans will continue as basic tools under State law for addressing local needs.

The Kern County General Plan defines a "Land Project" as the following:

- 1. The subdivision contains 50 or more parcels of which any 50 are both (a) not improved with residential, industrial, commercial, or institutional buildings; and (b) offered for sale, lease, or financing for purposes other than industrial commercial, institutional, or commercial agricultural uses; and
- 2. The subdivision is located in an area in which less than 1,500 registered voters reside within the subdivision or within two miles of the proposed project boundary; and
- 3. The subdivision does not constitute a community apartment project as defined in Business and Professions Code Section 11004, a project consisting of condominiums as defined in Section 783 of the Civil Code, or a stock cooperative as defined in Business and Professions Code Section 11003.2.

Issues: Special Treatment Areas

Specific Plans and Rural Community Plans have been prepared in past years for a number of locations in the County. There are also small rural communities located throughout the County which would be impractical to address at a General Plan level of detail. The identity and character of these communities could easily be damaged by inappropriate treatment in a General Plan. Finally, areas have been identified through analysis of data and by identification during public involvement in the plan preparation process which has the potential for intensified, yet localized, development in the future.

Goals: Special Treatment Areas

1. To recognize the validity of existing Specific Plan and Rural Community Plan decisions and to identify areas for which similar detailed planning efforts should be undertaken in the future so as to best meet the needs and concerns of local residents.

Map Provisions: Special Treatment Areas

Map Code 4.1 (Accepted County Plan Areas) - A designation of areas for which specific land use plans have already been prepared and approved. These plans are accepted and incorporated by this reference and the respective land use map associated with each such plan is hereby adopted as the General Plan diagram for each such area. Each plan area is indicated on the General Plan map.

Policies: Special Treatment Areas

- 1. The land use map diagrams adopted for special treatment areas establish the land use patterns for these areas.
- 2. Applicant-initiated adopted Specific Plans that have not been implemented through the application of zoning and/or land division (where applicable) within five years of County approval or within five years of the adoption of the 2004 General Plan Update shall be viewed as inactive. The County utilizing a County-initiated General Plan Amendment process shall consider inactive application-initiated Specific Plans for recission.
- 3. Specific Plan Areas guidelines shall be used to ensure adequate consideration of the General Plan goals and policies governing development and resource management. (These guidelines are present in Kern County General Plan Appendix C).

Implementation Measures: Special Treatment Areas

- A. Where particular policies or standards are not addressed within a Special Treatment Area, the provisions of the Kern County General Plan shall govern.
- B. As each special treatment area, Map Code 4.3 (Specific Plan Required) or Map Code 4.2 (Interim Rural Community Plan), has a Specific Plan adopted pursuant to Government Code Section 65450 et seq., the map provision shall concurrently be changed to Map Code 4.1 (Accepted County Plan Area).
- C. Zone the accepted plan areas in a manner which is consistent with their equivalent General Plan designation.
- D. The County shall continually review adopted Specific Plans. Inactive Specific Plans, as noted in Policy No. 2, may be considered for County initiated recission.

2.2 Industrial Land Use

Assumptions: Industrial

Because Kern County exports the bulk of its agricultural and mineral products in a raw form, manufacturing will continue to be a relatively small sector of the economy. The future of the manufacturing sector appears promising. Some reasons for anticipating growth in the future include convenient access to the Los Angeles and southern California markets, availability of industrial land with adequate transportation and public services, a stable labor force, an affordable housing market, and proximity to sources of raw materials and products. The growth of the manufacturing sector can add greatly to economic activity and wealth. The value added by the processing of raw products could be captured in Kern County and could provide new jobs in the basic (exporting) sector of the economy which, in turn, could support increased demand in the service sector.

Issues: Industrial

Of primary concern to industrial development is a location relative to resources, labor

supplies, transportation, and energy sources. Conflicts can occur when industrial development takes place in areas that are then precluded from resource production or which cause problems of incompatibility with adjacent land uses.

Infrastructure for industrial projects, while well established in the urban areas of Kern County, should be carefully analyzed for any future development. Appropriate siting of industrial development in consideration of the available water and sewer connections, proper access, and road level of service must be determined to prevent any undue burden on established industries or other established developments.

Goals: Industrial

- 1. Ensure that an adequate and geographically balanced supply of land is designated for a range of industrial purposes.
- 2. Promote the future economic strength and well being of Kern County and its residents without detriment to its environmental quality.
- 3. Ensure compatibility with land use designations such as residential, commercial, or other land uses that may be affected by such activities.

Map Provisions: Industrial

<u>Service Industrial (Map Code 7.2)</u> - Commercial or industrial activities which involve outdoor storage or use of heavy equipment. Such uses produce significant air or noise pollution and are visually obtrusive.

Uses shall include, but are not limited to, the following:

Automobile and truck parking, storage and repair shops, freighting or trucking yards, bottling plants, breweries, welding shops, cleaning plants, and other manufacturing and processing activities.

Policies: Industrial

- 1. Locations for new industrial activities shall be provided with adequate infrastructure (water, sewage disposal systems, roads, drainage, etc.) to minimize effects on County services.
- 2. The land areas best suited for industrial activity by virtue of their location and other criteria will be protected from residential and other incompatible development.
- 3. Protect existing industrial designations from incompatible land use intrusion.
- 4. Provide for the clustering of new industrial development adjacent to existing industrial uses and along major transportation corridors.
- 5. Encourage upgrading the visual character of existing industrial areas through the use of landscaping, screening, or buffering.
- 6. Require that industrial uses provide design features such as screen walls, landscaping, increased height and/or setbacks, and lighting restrictions between the boundaries of adjacent residential land use designations so as to reduce impacts on residences due to light, noise, sound, and vibration.

- 7. The County shall give priority to proposed industrial developments where:
 - a. Specific uses are proposed in conjunction with submittal of a concurrent precise development plan; and
 - b. Where multiple phases, tenants, or lots are proposed through the adoption of a master precise development plan in conjunction with a General Plan Amendment.
- 8. Any proposed development within the Specific Plan area shall require a Precise Development Plan be prepared and approved prior to disturbance of the site.
- 9. Prior to approval, all new discretionary industrial projects in the Airport Influence Areas will be reviewed for compatibility with the Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan.
- 10. Where feasible, locate future industrial activities in close proximity to railroad facilities and inter- and intra-State transportation corridors to minimize extensive travel through urban areas and to promote alternative transportation of goods.

Implementation Measures: Industrial

- 1. Evaluation of applications for any General or Specific Plan Amendment to an industrial designation will include sufficient data for review to facilitate desirable new industrial development proposals consistent with General Plan policies, using the following criteria and guidelines:
 - a. Location suitability with respect to market demand area.
 - b. Provision of adequate access, ingress and egress facilities and services, and the mitigation of traffic impacts.
 - c. Provision of adequate water, sewer, and other public services to be used.
 - d. Provision of adequate on-site, nonpublic water supply and sewage disposal if no public systems are available or used.
 - e. Compatibility with adjacent uses (scale, noise, emissions, or other nuisances, etc.) and methods for buffering.
 - f. Design, layout, and visual appearance coordinated with existing adjacent industrial uses.
 - g. Overall consistency with the General Plan.
- 2. Develop information and data on industrial land use, trends, employment, and production. Monitor changes in location of industrial land supply and demand. Identify opportunities and constraints for new industrial development.
- 3. All General Plan Amendments, zone changes, conditional use permits, discretionary industrial developments, and variations from height limits

established by zoning for properties which are located in the Airport Influence areas or near a military airport shall be reviewed by the Planning Department for compatibility with the Kem County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan.

3.0 Land Use Element Metropolitan Bakersfield General Plan

Goals

The following presents the goals and policies for land use in the Metropolitan Bakersfield General Plan area. Implementing programs are contained in the following sub-section.

- 1. Accommodate new development which captures the economic demands generated by the marketplace and establishes Bakersfield's role as the capital of the southern San Joaquin Valley.
- 2. Accommodate new development which provides a full mix of uses to support its population.
- 3. Accommodate new development which is compatible with and complements existing land uses.
- 4. Accommodate new development which channels land uses in a phased, orderly manner and is coordinated with the provision of infrastructure and public improvements.
- 5. Accommodate new development that is sensitive to the natural environment, and accounts for environmental hazards.
- 6. Establish a built environment which achieves a compatible functional and visual relationship among individual buildings and sites.
- 7. Target growth companies that meet clean air requirements, and create sustainable employment in jobs paying higher wages.

Policies

Goals will be achieved through the following policies which set more specific directions and guide actions. For ease of implementation, policies have been arranged with respect to land use designations they influence.

Land Use Designations

- 1. Provide for the following types of land uses, as depicted on the Land Use Plan:
 - a. Industrial
 - i. Service (SI .4 FAR, 6 stories): Industrial activities which involve outdoor storage or use of heavy equipment. Such uses produce significant air or noise pollution and are visually obtrusive.

Industrial Development

1. Allow for a variety of industrial uses, including land-extensive mineral extraction and processing, heavy manufacturing, light manufacturing, warehousing and distribution,

transportation-related, and research and development uses.

- 2. Protect existing industrial designations from incompatible land use intrusions.
- 3. Encourage the efficient use of existing industrial land uses through consolidation of building and storage facilities.
- 4. Provide for the clustering of new industrial development adjacent to existing industrial uses and along major transportation corridors.
- 5. Encourage upgrading of visual character of industrial areas through the use of landscaping or screening of visually unattractive buildings and storage areas.
- 6. Require that industrial uses provide design features, such as screen walls, landscaping and height, setback and lighting restrictions between the boundaries of adjacent residential land use designations so as to reduce impacts on residences due to light, noise, sound and vibration.
- 7. Street frontages along all new industrial development shall be landscaped.
- 8. Minimize impacts of industrial traffic on adjacent residential parcels through the use of site plan review and improvement standards.

Implementation

The following are programs to be carried out by the City of Bakersfield and County of Kern to implement the goals and policies of the Land Use Element. This listing is not to limit the scope of implementation of this plan. State law requires that planning agencies recommend various methods of implementation of the general plan as part of their on-going duties.

- 1. Subdivision Regulations Subdivision regulation is required by state law to control the manner in which land is divided. Subdivision map approvals must be consistent with the general plan. Local subdivision regulations should be reviewed and amended as appropriate to reflect the land use goals, objectives, policies and standards.
- Specific Plans State law (Government Code Section 65450) authorizes cities and counties to prepare Specific Plans for the systematic implementation of the general plan for all or part of the area covered by the general plan. Specific Plans are intended to provide more definite specifications of the type of uses to be permitted, development standards (setbacks, heights, landscape, architecture, etc.) and circulation and infrastructure improvements.
- 3. Development Review In the county, any development within the M-2 zone classification requires approval of a Special Development Standards Plot Plan Review. This review enables the county to formally review projects for compliance with urban development standards and obtain necessary street dedications and improvements. The review is performed at the staff level, therefore public hearings are not held on these projects. Site zoning that requires a Precise Development Plan is for discretionary projects that must be found consistent with the general plan.

Projects considered ministerial are not reviewed for consistency with the general plan, whereas discretionary projects must be consistent with the general plan.

- 4. Environmental Review Local guidelines for project processing shall reflect California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines which state that the environmental effects of a project must be taken into account as part of project consideration.
- 5. Design Review The goals, objectives, policies and standards contained in the Land Use Element encourage architectural and site compatibility in designated areas.

4.0 General Provisions

The Specific Plan applies exclusively to street and lot design, road improvements, and visual design standards for the land within its boundaries. Goals, policies and implementation measures contained within the various elements of the Kern County General Plan and Metropolitan Bakersfield General Plan remain in effect and are hereby incorporated by reference. The purpose of this Specific Plan is to provide details of the design and layout for the future development within the planning area as it is intended to act as a supplement to the adopted general plans.

Specific Plan Goals

In addition to the aforementioned goals, policies, and implementation measures, the following objectives shall be in addition to those contained within the various elements of the Kern County General Plan and the Metropolitan Bakersfield General Plan for the planning area:

- 1. Ensure that the County can accommodate anticipated future growth and development while maintaining a safe and healthful environment and a prosperous economy by preserving valuable natural resources, guiding development away from hazardous areas, and assuring the provision of adequate public services.
- 2. Accommodate industrial land uses as Kern County becomes a cost effective center and significant corridor for transporting goods throughout California and the United States.
- Reduce the current unemployment rate in Kern County by increasing the amount of square footage for new businesses by over 8 million square feet and increase job opportunities.
- 4. Support local budgets by replacing lost tax revenue from closed traditional brick and mortar retail locations with new tax revenues generated by industrial buildings.
- 5. Meet the continued and expanding demand of the global e-commerce fulfillment services market that depend on warehousing and shipping capabilities to get products transported in the shortest amount of time.
- 6. Generate economic growth through tax revenue and boost the allocation of resources to improve infrastructure, utilities and public services throughout the county.
- 7. To provide future roadway improvement standards and lot design for the Specific Plan area.
- 8. To supplement the goals, policies and implementation measures of the Kern County General Plan and the Metropolitan Bakersfield General Plan as they apply to the Specific Plan area.
- 9. To assure consistency with the adopted goals and policies of the Kern County General Plan and the Metropolitan Bakersfield General Plan and the Malibu Vineyards Industrial Parkway Specific Plan.

Specific Plan Policies

1. The total development within the Specific Plan Boundary shall not exceed 8.8 million square feet.

- 2. Industrial land use designations shall be limited to the 7.2 (Service Industrial) and SI (Service Industrial) as identified in the Kern County General Plan and the Metropolitan Bakersfield General Plan.
- 3. Uses in the M-2 PD (Medium Industrial, Precise Development overlay) zone classification shall be permitted in accordance with the Kern County Zoning Ordinance.

Specific Plan Implementation Measures

- 1. All development within the Specific Plan area shall be improved to Kern County standards and ordinances.
- 2. All development shall comply with all applicable Kern County and State Codes and Ordinances for construction, access, water mains, fire flows, and fire hydrants.
- 3. The street name and addressing system proposed for the project site shall be consistent with the Kern County street naming and addressing system.
- 4. Provision of adequate access, ingress and egress facilities and services, and the mitigation of traffic impacts.
- 5. Development shall have overall consistency with the Kern County General Plan and the Metropolitan Bakersfield General Plan.
- 6. Should a conflict arise between the implementation measures within this Specific Plan, then the more restrictive implementation measure(s) shall prevail.
- 7. Changes in lot configuration, parcel sizes and the location of internal local roadways shall be considered to be in substantial conformance with the proposed conceptual plan and not require an amendment to the Specific Plan, unless sufficient evidence has been identified as determined by the Planning Director indicating that the proposed layout of the site would cause an adverse effect on the public health, safety and welfare.
- 8. Terms used in this Specific Plan shall have the same meaning as defined in the Kern County General Plan and Implementation Ordinances.
- 9. Conditional Use Permits, Zone Variances and Modifications as provided for in the current Kern County Zoning Ordinance will be allowed subject to County approval.
- 10. Modifications or amendments to the approved Specific Plan, other than minor changes, will be processed as a specific plan amendment and are subject to the specific plan approval procedures described herein and the current Kern County Plans and Ordinances.
- 11. All construction within the Specific Plan boundaries shall comply with provisions of the Kem County Code of Building Regulations and the various related mechanical, structural, seismic safety requirements, and plumbing codes.

4.1 Public Services and Facilities

Goals

- 1. To establish criteria to implement related infrastructure facilities for the development.
- 2. To provide and develop phased infrastructure (sewer, water, drainage, and roadways) in the Specific Plan area.

Policies

- 1. Locations for new industrial activities shall be provided with adequate infrastructure (water, sewer, drainage, roadways, etc.) to minimize the effects on County services.
- 2. New development should pay its pro rata share of the local cost of expansions in services, facilities, and infrastructure which it generates and upon which it is dependent.
- 3. The developer shall assume full responsibility for costs incurred in service extensions or improvements that are required to serve the project. Cost sharing or other forms of recovery shall be available when the service extensions or improvements have a specific quantifiable regional significance.

Implementation Measures

- 1. All infrastructure improvement plans shall be prepared in compliance with California Building Codes and the Kern County Code of Building Regulations prior to development.
- 2. All utilities shall conform to the Kern County Subdivision Ordinance and to standards of the specific service companies and public utility districts.
- 3. The individual project applicants shall provide public utility easements as required.
- 4. Exterior transformers, utility pads, cable television and telephone boxes shall be located out of view in public right-of-ways or screened with walls, fences, or vegetation.
- 5. Temporary overhead power and telephone facilities may be permitted only during construction.
- 6. The County shall develop fiscal impact guidelines and shall be responsible for reviewing fiscal impact analysis to identify the cost to the County of services, facilities, and infrastructure expansion which new discretionary development necessitates.

4.1.1 Air Quality

The project area is located within Kern County's portion of the San Joaquin Valley Air Basin and among one of the eight counties that comprise the district. The developer has agreed to enter into a Developer Mitigation Agreement (DMA)/Voluntary Emissions Reduction Agreement (VERA) with the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD) to assure proper mitigation of air quality impacts. VERA is an innovative CEQA mitigation measure that has been utilized to

reduce air quality impacts from development projects. The VERA is an enforceable mechanism for Lead Agencies to mitigate project emission through the review process and the developer will reduce the impact emissions to net zero. Development shall comply with SJVAPCD rules and regulations.

Goals

- 1. Protection of public health maintained through the attainment and maintenance of ambient air quality standards for various atmospheric compounds and the enforcement of emissions limits for individual stationary sources.
- 2. Minimize the possibilities of increased levels of on- and off-site project emissions.
- 3. To encourage alternate modes of transportation to the site from other areas of Kern County.

Policies

- 1. The air implications of new discretionary land use proposals shall be considered in approval of major developments. Special emphasis will be placed on minimizing air quality degradation in the desert to enable effective military operations and in the valley region to meet attainment goals.
- 2. In considering discretionary projects for which an Environmental Impact Report must be prepared pursuant to CEQA, the appropriate decision making body, as part of its deliberations, will ensure that:
 - a. All feasible mitigation to reduce significant adverse air quality impacts have been adopted; and
 - b. The benefits of the proposed project outweigh any unavoidable significant adverse effects on air quality found to exist after inclusion of all feasible mitigation. This finding shall be made in a statement of overriding considerations and shall be supported by factual evidence to the extent that such a statement is required pursuant to CEQA.
- 3. Kern County shall continue to work with the San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District and the Kern County Air Pollution Control District toward air quality attainment with federal, State, and local standards.
- 4. The County shall continue to implement the local government control measures in coordination with the Kern Council of Governments and the San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District.

Implementation Measures

- 1. The development phases of the project must comply with the Federal Clean Air Act to protect the health, safety, and welfare of the public.
- 2. All discretionary permits shall be reviewed in compliance with the mitigation measure of the certified Environmental Impact Report.

3. Work with transit providers to develop long-range transit strategies based on future and anticipated land use plans.

4.1.2 Archaeological, Paleontological, Cultural, and Historic Preservation

The project site has been extensively farmed and in agricultural use since the 1980's. Should paleontological or architectural resources be encountered during construction activities, standard mitigation shall be immediately implemented. Should human remains be discovered, work shall halt and the coroner shall be notified immediately per Health and Safety Code requirements.

Policy

1. The County will promote the preservation of cultural and historic resources which provide ties with the past and constitute a heritage value to residents and visitors.

Implementation Measures

- 1. Coordinate with the California State University, Bakersfield's Archaeology Inventory Center.
- 2. The County shall address archaeological and historical resources for discretionary projects in accordance with the CEQA.
- 3. In areas of known paleontological resources, the County should address the preservation of these resources where feasible.
- 4. The County shall develop a list of Native American organizations and individuals who desire to be notified of proposed discretionary projects. This notification will be accomplished through the established procedures for discretionary projects and CEQA documents.
- 5. On a project specific basis, the County Planning Department shall evaluate the necessity for the involvement of a qualified Native American monitor for grading or other construction activities on discretionary projects that are subject to a CEQA document.

4.1.3 Threatened and Endangered Species

Policies

- 1. Threatened or endangered plant and wildlife species should be protected m accordance with State and federal laws.
- County should work closely with State and federal agencies to assure that discretionary projects avoid or minimize impacts to fish, wildlife, and botanical resources.
- 3. The County will seek cooperative efforts with local, State, and federal agencies to protect listed threatened and endangered plant and wildlife species through the use of conservation plans and other methods promoting management and conservation of habitat lands.

- 4. The County will promote public awareness of endangered species laws to help educate property owners and the development community of local, State, and federal programs concerning endangered species conservation issues.
- 5. Under the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the County, as lead agency, will solicit comments from the California Department of Fish and Game and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service when an environmental document (Negative Declaration, Mitigated Negative Declaration, or Environmental Impact Report) is prepared.
- 6. Riparian areas will be managed in accordance with United States Army Corps of Engineers, and the California Department of Fish and Game rules and regulations to enhance the drainage, flood control, biological, recreational, and other beneficial uses while acknowledging existing land use patterns.

Implementation Measures

- 1. Discretionary projects shall consider effects to biological resources as required by the California Environmental Quality Act.
- 2. Consult and consider the comments from responsible and trustee wildlife agencies when reviewing a discretionary project subject to the California Environmental Quality Act.
- 3. Pursue the development and implementation of conservation programs with State and federal wildlife agencies for property owners desiring streamlined endangered species mitigation programs.

4.1.4 Surface Water and Groundwater

Water System

Water service would be provided by Oildale Mutual Water Company (OMWC). Off-site improvements would include extension of OMWC's six-inch domestic water line and 12-inch non-potable water line, from Quinn Road along Imperial Street, to the southeast corner of the proposed project. Non-potable industrial water can be developed by OMWC using existing agriculture wells or new wells, as approved by CAWELO water district by agreement.

To facilitate water service, OMWC would need to annex the project area into its service area. The proposed annexation would involve 739 acres. The annexation would need to be considered and approved by the OMWC and the Kern County Local Agency Formation Commission in order to serve the project.

Goals

- 1. To promote adopted standards to maintain existing water quality.
- 2. To minimize groundwater pollution of manufacturing and industrial use.

Policies

- All methods of sewage disposal and water supply shall meet the requirements of the Kern County Environmental Health Services Department and the California Regional Water Quality Control Board. The Environmental Health Department shall periodically review and modify, as necessary, its requirements for sewage disposal and water supply, and shall comply with any new standards adopted by the State for implementation of Government Code Division 7 of the Water Code, Chapter 4.5 (Section 13290-13291.7). (Assembly Bill 885; 2000).
- 2. Water related infrastructure shall be provided in an efficient and cost effective manner.
- 3. Ensure that water quality standards are met for existing users and future development.
- 4. Ensure that adequate water storage, treatment, and transmission facilities are constructed concurrently with planned growth.
- 5. Ensure that appropriate funding mechanisms for water are in place to fund the needed improvements resulting from growth and subsequent development.
- 6. Ensure maintenance and repair of existing water systems.

Implementation Measures

- 1. The appropriate agency should develop sewer and water master plans in areas where these services are lacking or deficient and in areas where urban development exists or is designated. Seek non-local sources of funding for implementing capital improvement plans.
- 2. Water service for new industrial development in all areas of the project boundary shall be by community water facilities. Water well locations shall be approved by the Kern County Health Department for sewer facility setback standards.
- 3. The method of supply and siting of water wells shall be provided pursuant to the Kern County Health Department Standards.
- 4. Water wells and water tanks shall not be located in a planned road alignment.
- 5. Water wells and water well site standards shall be pursuant to the Kern County Zoning Ordinance.

4.1.5 Sewage Disposal System

Wastewater collection would be provided by North of the River Sanitary District (NORSD) No. 1. The nearest sewer trunk is a 36-inch line in Norris Road approximately three miles southeast from the project site.

A new sewer trunk line would be installed from the existing 36-inch line to the future intersection of Imperial Street at Endes Street via public right of way along Coffee Road and 7th Standard Road. Additionally, phase one would require installation of a sewer lift station to reach the new sewer trunk line.

Policies

- All methods of sewage disposal and water supply shall meet the requirements of the Kern County Environmental Health Services Department and the California Regional Water Quality Control Board. The Environmental Health Department shall periodically review and modify, as necessary, its requirements for sewage disposal and water supply, and shall comply with any new standards adopted by the State for implementation of Government Code Division 7 of the Water Code, Chapter 4.5 (Section 13290-13291.7). (Assembly Bill 885; 2000).
- 2. All development shall require utility connection to a community sewage treatment facility.
- 3. The developer shall provide plans delineating the location and gradient of a sewer line and treatment facilities.

Implementation Measures

- 1. The appropriate agency should develop sewer and water master plans in areas where these services are lacking or deficient and in areas where urban development exists or is designated. Seek non-local sources of funding for implementing capital improvement plans.
- 2. The location and gradient of the sewer lines are to be determined by the applicant's engineer in accordance with applicable Kern County Standards, NORSD specifications, and recommendations from the Regional Water Quality Control Board.
- 3. Installation of sewer lines for development and connection to a sewage treatment plant is required by this Specific Plan.
- 4. Minimum setback distances from sewage treatment facilities shall comply with Kern County Health Department requirements.
- 5. The project will be subject to the adherence to the District's specifications.
- 6. The project proponent will be responsible for connecting to the District's sewer system.
- 7. Implementation of the project shall require annexation to NORSD, including payment of all existing fess and applicable fees in order to provide service.
- 8. No septic/dry sewers allowed.

4.1.6 Drainage System

Stormwater would be collected by an on-site drainage system and conveyed to a detention basin to facilitate stormwater infiltration and metered discharge, emulating pre-development conditions. Each parcel will include an on-site retention basin dedicated for stormwater retention and management from the development. Since project construction would encompass an area greater than one acre, the project would be subject to a General Construction Permit under the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit program of the federal Clean Water Act.

As required under the General Construction Permit, the project proponent (or contractor) would prepare and implement a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP).

Policies

- 1. Street design and lot layout shall promote continuity for proper drainage flow and utility connections.
- 2. The developer shall provide drainage basins sized accordingly for stormwater retention and management.

Implementation Measure

1. Placement and sizing of the drainage sump site shall provide adequate size for ultimate development.

4.1.7 Emergency Response

The project area is served by the Kern County Sheriff's Department for law enforcement and public safety services (Kern County Sheriff's Office, 1350 Norris Road), Kern County Fire Department for fire protection services (Fire Station #62, 1652 Sunnyside Court), and Kern County Medical Emergency Services for medical care and emergency services.

Kern County will require fire hydrants and adequate diameter water pipelines for fire flow. Development plans shall be reviewed in compliance with all Kern County Uniform Fire Code, Standards and Ordinances with regards to fire hydrants, water flow, and emergency access.

Goals

- 1. Minimize injuries and loss of life and reduce property damage.
- 2. Ensure the availability and effective response of emergency services following a catastrophic event.

Policies

- 1. The County shall encourage extra precautions be taken for the design of significant lifeline installations, such as highways, utilities, and petrochemical pipelines.
- 2. The County shall require development for human occupancy to be placed in a location away from an active earthquake fault in order to minimize safety concerns.

Implementation Measures

- 1. The County shall review all development plans for preservation of any road or access easement for emergency access to maintain safe building setback along proposed roads. Alleys or rear access shall be provided if deemed necessary by the Kern County Fire Department.
- 2. Maintain adequate setbacks between oil/gas wells and development through the use of the zone districts DI (Drilling Island) and PE (Petroleum Extraction) and implementation of the uniform Fire Code 7904.32.3.

- Require geological and soils engineering investigations in identified significant geologic hazard areas in accordance with the Kern County Code of Building Regulations.
- 4. Require that plans and permits for installation of major lifeline components such as highways, utilities, petroleum or chemical pipelines to incorporate design features to accommodate potential fault movement in areas of active faults without prolonged disruption of essential service or threat to health and safety.

4.1.8 Light and Glare

Policies

- 1. Ensure that light and glare from discretionary new development projects are minimized in rural as well as urban areas.
- 2. Encourage the use of low-glare lighting to minimize nighttime glare effects on neighboring properties.
- 3. Encourage lighting used on-site during construction be minimal. Site lighting may include motion sensor lights for security purposes.

Implementation Measures

- 1. The County shall utilize CEQA Guidelines and the provisions of the Zoning Ordinance to minimize the impacts of light and glare on adjacent properties and in rural undeveloped areas.
- 2. Adequate lighting shall be provided by the individual project applicants following the issuance of occupancy permits to enhance crime prevention and law enforcement efforts.

4.1.9 Economic Development and Smart Growth

Policies

- 1. Discretionary development projects should be encouraged to incorporate innovative or "smart growth" land use planning techniques as design features.
- 2. Employ land use policies that protect the County's businesses from physical degradation and ensure orderly growth, thereby, sustaining opportunities for current and future generations to enjoy economic vitality.
- 3. Promote tourism-based businesses throughout the County.
- 4. Recognize the importance of major transportation corridors, airports, and rail lines as important economic tools for the establishment of commercial and industrial development and promotion.
- 5. Promote the utilization of the County by the film industry.
- 6. Provide for mixed land uses that offer a variety of employment opportunities and

enhance the County's economic assets to allow the capture of regional growth.

- 7. Promote improved public transportation service between major job centers and areas of transit dependency and high unemployment.
- 8. Support and work toward the elimination of disincentives for business and industry to prosper in Kern County, and create special economic development programs to encourage commerce and industry to locate in Kern County.
- 9. Support efforts to promote the County and its cities as an area with a positive business climate for commerce and industry.

Implementation Measures

- 1. Utilize the County's Economic Strategy and the Economic Incentive Program to promote economic growth and to maintain a strong local economy.
- 2. Develop Specific Plans for communities throughout the County which provide for a mix of land uses to promote employment opportunities and housing, while maintaining a good quality of life.
- 3. Allow for development of complementary businesses that take advantage of transportation corridors when providing infrastructure and services necessary to maintain adequate health and safety concerns.
- 4. Allow for compatible industrial and commercial growth, in conjunction with airport facilities, in accordance with the Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan.

4.1.10 Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan

Southern portions of the project site are within the Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP) for the Meadows Field Airport located approximately 1.5 miles southeast. These portions within phase one of the project are in ALUCP Zone B2, which may require a dedication of avigation easement and Zone C, which limits high-rise office buildings to no more than four stories. See *Figure 8 below.*



Figure 8 Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan

4.1.11 General Plan and Zoning Compatibility Matrix

Government Code Section 65860 requires that consistency exist between the General Plan, which represents long-range public policy, and the Zoning Ordinance of specific development regulations. The General Plan and Zoning Consistency Matrix is a method of defining consistency by comparing each zone district with land use categories set forth in the General Plan. The Matrix illustrates the suitability of the specific zoning districts with the policies specified in the text of the General Plan. *See Table 2 below.* The Matrix, which follows, applies two degrees of compatibility to land use designation and zoning:

- 1. Consistent: Zones which specifically implement the policies specified in the General Plan or allow uses found to be conditionally acceptable in such zones; and
- 2. Inconsistent: Zones which are inconsistent with General Plan policies for a particular land use designation.

			1.0			20	20	-			00			III			51	NIC			1	1.1					22-15					
	A(20)	A(80)	A-1	E(1/4)	E(1/2)	E(1)	E(21/2)	E(5)	E(10)	E(20)	2	R-2	R-3	MP		00	2	C.2	£	M-1	M-2	M-3		RF	SO	NR(5)	NR(10)	NR(20)	NR(40)	₽	FPP	SP
1.1 State and Federal Land	•		8-16					<u> - 10</u>					-	-	22					1				•	•		•	•			•	
1.2 Incorporated Cities	S 2		10 - 10		5	55 3		19 - 90		5	5 - 2		19 - 19		e 23	2		8 R		22	1	19 O		- 23	3		10.00		\$ 23	3		
3.1 Parks and Recreation															E 22	1		1 3	- 12	12		10 10								1		
3.2 Educational Facilities																																
3.3 Other Facilities															e 28										•					3		
3.4 Solid Waste Disposal Facility	•		8 B			18 5		8 B	- 3	3	6 6		31-13	- 3	1	5		8 3		33		•		. 8	ŝ		•		•	- 5		1
3.4.1 Solid Waste Disposal Facility Buffer	•																				8.	•				•	•	% •%				
3.5 Hazardous Waste Disposal			8 - S		2	10 - C		10 - N		2	0.0		8 - 18 1		2 - 62			84 - 194		007	-			1.00	Î	1000	1	1000	72	0		84 - S
Facilities Land Disposal Method	28		8 12		5			St 12		5		_	8 - 12		5 05			a 14		03	36					200	, ⁶ .,		8			
3.6 Hazardous Waste Disposal								· · · ·																								
Facilities Underground Injection Method	•	_	0-0			~		10-11									_			2		•					<u></u>				_	
3.7 Other Waste Facility	•																	٠	•	•	•	•		•		•	•	•				
3.7.1 Other Waste Facility Buffer	•					22.3				2	- A - A					3		•	•	•		•		•	1	•	•	•		3		
4.1 Accepted County Plan Areas	•		•	•	٠	٠	•	•	•		•	•	•	•		•	•	•	•			•		•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
4.2 Interim Rural Community Plan	•	•			•	•	•	•			•	•				•	•	•	•			-		•					2 13	•		
4.3 Specific Plan Required	•	•	•			•	•	•			•	•	•	3 • 1		•	•	•	•	•	٠	٠		•	•	•	٠	20 9 3		•	•	•
5.1 Max. 29 DU/Net Acre	•		9 B	•	•	•	٠	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	1 - 83			9 8	1	- 83		14		5 83	•			-	£ 83		•	•
5.2 Max. 16 DU/Net Acre	•		8 0	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	8 0	•	- 03					00		8 B		- 95	•		8 12		5 - 65	•	•	•
5.3 Max. 10 DU/Net Acre	•		0.0	٠		•	٠	•	٠	.	•														•					•	•	٠
5.4 Max. 4 DU/Net Acre	•		10 A			•	•	•	•		00-00	· · · ·	64 - CA	•		2		6 1		007	<u></u>	100	1	c 62	•	· · · ·	10 N	· · · ·	c 67	•	•	•
5.45 Max. 2 DU/Net Acre	•	1			٠	•	•	•	•	•	23			•		3		2 3		1		100		8 - 13 23	•	5				•	•	•
5.5 Max. 1 DU/Net Acre	•					•	٠	•	•					•											•					•	•	
5.6 Min. 2.5 Gross Acres/1 DU	•				s	25 2	٠	•	•	۲			· · · ·		6 68	8					3.	19 - 92 		1 13	•	•	•	•	•		•	•
5.7 Min. 5 Gross Acres/1 DU	•		11 – 11) —	20	i.	•	•	•	2.0		1	•		- 8					8			•	٠	٠	٠	•	•	•	•	•
5.75 Min. 10 Gross Acres/1 DU	•				2			•	•					•											•			•	•	•	•	•
5.8 Min. 20 Gross Acres/1 DU	•					2														- 11		0.1			•			(1 •1)	•	•		•
6.1 Regional Commercial	•		6 8	_	2	18 - 3		9 B			8 3		9 B		E 83	•	•	•	•	•		19 8		5 83	•	į.	6 8		8 83	•	•	•
6.2 General Commercial	•		8 18					3 12			~ ~ ~				5 65	•	•	•	•	•				•	•		a 12		5 05	•	•	
6.3 Highway Commercial	•															•	٠	•	•	•		1.1		٠	•					•	•	
7.1 Light Industrial	•		10 - 13 1		2	10 S		10 - 10 -			00 - O		6 - N			•	•	•	•	•		194 - 194 1			•	· · · ·	9 - S		c - 67	•	•	
7.2 Service Industrial	•		8 8		6	Q 8	5	8 8		8	<u> </u>		2 3		- 33	•	•	•	•	•		10		9 - 63 19	•	ŝ	8 - 18		8 - 83	•	•	•
7.3 Heavy Industrial	•															•	•	•	•	•	•	•			•					•	•	
8.1 Intensive Agriculture (Min. 20 Acres)	•		17 71 12 12		5 12		2			8										2				- 25	•				•		•	•
8.2 Resource Reserve (Min. 20 Acres)	•																								•				٠		•	•
8.3 Extensive Agriculture (Min. 80 or 20 Acres)	•	•																							•				0 00 0 00		•	
8.4 Mineral and Petroleum (Min. 5 Acres)	•	•																							•	•	•	2 0 •3			•	
8.5 Resource Management (Min. 20 Acres)	•	•	21.— A2			643	5	eh ke			61.—3		2)					3-3		-0		s)s		559	•	5	21.—12 -				•	•
NOTE: THE MAT	RIX	IS A	GUID	ETH	AT S	HOU	LD B	E US	ED IN	CON	JUN	CTIO	N WI	TH T	HE P	OLIC	ES A	ND P	ROVI	SIONS	OF TH	E GE	NERA	L PL	AN	°	0 O		0 - 20	- 0		19 I.
	_			_	-	_	-				-	-			11.	-	-				-				-			_				_

Table 2 Kern County General Plan and Zoning Compatibility Matrix

Table 3 Metropolitan Bakersfield General Plan and Zoning Compatibility Matrix

Map Code Designation

Metro Bakersfield General Plan

Land Use and Zoning Consistency Matrix

	1.5	Zone Classification																							-	_					
	A (20)	A (80)	A-1	E(1/4)	E(1/2)	E(1)	E (2 1/2)	E (5)	E(10)	E (20)	R-1	R-2	R-3	MP	8	C-1	C2	CH	M-1	M-2	M-3	RF	SO	NR (S)	NR (10)	NR (20)	NR (40)	DI	FPP	SP	PL
P - Public Facilities																•	•	•							•			•	۰	•	
PS - Public and Private Schools									•															۰			•			•	
PT - Public Transportation					1																•									۰	
P-SW - Solid Waste Facility Sites		1	1.1		1															*						•	٠				
OS - Open Space					1		1																								
OS-P - Open Space-Parks			1						•		•	•										•			٠				•	٠	
OS-S - Open Space-Slopes																													۰		
RR - Rural Residential		1		-	-																			1					•		
ER - Estate Residential																						1									
SR - Suburban Residential				•				•	•																			۰	•		
LR - Low Density Residential		1							۰	•				۰		٠													•		
LMR - Low Medium Density Residential *	•								•	•	•																	٠	۰		
HMR - High Medium Density Residential											•					•												۰	٠		
HR - High Density Residential		1								•																					
OC - Office Commercial			1		-								•												1	í					
HC - Highway Commercial																	•	•										٠	•		
GC - General Commercial	•										-	•			•	٠		•				٠	•		1.00	1			•		
MC - Major Commercial	•																٠	•				٠							•		
MUC - Mixed Use Commercial													•		•	٠													۰	۰	
LI - Light Industrial															٠								•		-			٠	•		
SI - Service Industrial												1.10				٠							٠				1	1	٠		
HI - Heavy Industrial																	۰	۰					•						•	_	_
R-IA - Intensive Agriculture																			-							٠			•	_	۰
R-EA - Extensive Agriculture																										۰	٠		•	_	
R-MP - Mineral & Petroleum																						•	•	•	•	•	•		•		•
	רסא	re: Th	NOT IE CO	E: TH MBIN	IE MA	DISTR	IS A UCTS	GUID ARE	e th Not I	AT SH NCLU	IOULL IDED (HICH	D BE IN THE	USED HIS M EIR PR	IN CO ATRJ JMAI	X, BU X, BU XY ZO	T AR	ON W E CON	ITH T NSIDE	HE PO		es an Siste Tent	ND PR NT W	ITH T	IONS THE G	OF TI ENER	HE GE AL PI	AN L	AL PL	an. Inati	0421	'OR

* Low Medium Density Residential (LMR) is consistent with the R-2 District when the development density is equal to or less than ten (10) dwelling units per net acre.

5.0 Noise Element

The State, recognizing the effects of noise upon people's health and well being, required that local jurisdictions prepare statements of policy indicating their intentions regarding noise and noise sources, establish desired maximum noise levels according to land use categories, set standards for noise emission from transportation facilities and fixed-point sources, and prepare a program for implementation of noise control measures. Noise Elements are mandatory per Government Code Section 65302 (f) and are prepared in accordance with Guidelines for the Preparation and Content of Noise Elements of the General Plan published by the California Office of Noise Control in 1976.

The major purpose of the Noise Element is to: (1) establish reasonable standards for maximum desired noise levels in Kem County, and; (2) develop an implementation program which could effectively deal with the noise problem.

Goals

- 1. Ensure the residents of Kern County are protected from excessive noise and that moderate levels of noise are maintained.
- 2. Protect the economic base of Kern County from the harmful effects of exposure to excessive noise, and by preventing the encroachment of incompatible land uses near known noise producing roadways, industries, railroads, airports, oil and gas extraction, and other sources.

Policies

- 1. Require noise level criteria applied to all categories of land uses to be consistent with the recommendations of the California Division of Occupational Safety and Health (DOSH).
- 2. Encourage vegetation and landscaping along roadways and adjacent to other noise sources in order to increase absorption of noise.
- 3. Utilize good land use planning principles to reduce conflicts related to noise emissions.
- 4. Ensure that new development in the vicinity of airports will be compatible with existing and projected airport noise levels as set forth in the ALUCP.
- 5. Employ the best available methods of noise control.

Implementation Measures

- 1. Utilize zoning regulations to assist in achieving noise-compatible land use patterns.
- 2. Require proper acoustical treatment of transportation facilities, including highways, airports, and railroads.
- 3. Review discretionary development plans to ensure compatibility with adopted ALUCP.
- 4. Require proposed commercial and industrial uses or operations to be designed or arranged so that they will not subject residential or other noise sensitive land uses to

exterior noise levels in excess of 45 dB CNEL.

6.0 Specific Plan Administration

6.1 Approval Authority

The Planning Director's responsibilities include the administration, interpretation, and enforcement of the Malibu Vineyards Industrial Parkway Specific Plan requirements and development standards, including the acceptance and processing of all land use permit applications. The Planning Director or his/her designee may approve development permits that meet the requirements of this Specific Plan and may approve, conditionally approve, or deny minor requests for waiver of Specific Plan standards. The Planning Director may impose conditions of approval or make interpretations of the Specific Plan, which may be appealed to the Planning Commission. The Planning Director may refer matters involving development issues to the Planning Commission, and may consult with the County Council attorneys on questions of interpretation.

6.1.1 Required Findings

An application for a Precise Development Plan Review (for a permitted use) or Conditional Use Permit (for a conditionally permitted use) may be approved or conditionally approved if, on the basis of application, plans, materials, and/or testimony submitted, the following findings can be made:

- 1. The project is consistent with the Malibu Vineyards Industrial Parkway Specific Plan, the Kern County General Plan, and the Metropolitan Bakersfield General Plan;
- 2. The project can provide the appropriate infrastructure and resources for water, sewer and electrical service; and
- 3. The project has demonstrated compliance with the Mitigation Measures identified within the General Plan Amendment Environmental Impact Report.

6.1.2 Implementation

The Malibu Vineyards Industrial Parkway Specific Plan will be implemented through the processing of parcel maps, minor land divisions and mergers, and Precise Development plans for modifications. The implementation process provides the mechanism for reviewing development plans and ensuring consistency with the Specific Plan objectives. The processes for the amendment of this Specific Plan are also provided in this chapter. All development within the Specific Plan is subject to the implementation procedures described herein.

Development Plan Review

The purpose of this section is to provide a process for the implementation and review of all site plans and precise development plans that will be required to implement the development and construction of this Specific Plan. An application for design review of the precise development plan is required prior to the issuance of any building permit within the Specific Plan area.

Specific Plan Amendments

Approval of this Specific Plan indicates acceptance by the Kern County Board of Supervisors of a general framework for development of the Specific Plan area. Part of that framework establishes specific development standards that constitute the zoning regulations for the Specific

Plan area. It is anticipated that certain modifications to the Specific Plan text, exhibits, and/or project may be necessary during the development of the project. Any modifications to the Specific Plan shall occur in accordance with the amendment process described in this section. These amendments, should they occur, are divided into two categories.

Time Limitations

An application for the modification of the master precise development plan shall be filed with the Planning Department in compliance with the Kern County Zoning Ordinance. Submittals will include, but are not limited to, new site plans. Each design approval granted through the precise development plan review process shall be acted upon within thirty days of submittal. Specific Plan amendments shall be processed efficiently and streamlined. Preliminary review comments for a Specific Plan amendment shall be provided within forty-five days of submittal.

Phasing Plan

Construction of the Malibu Vineyards Industrial Parkway Specific Plan will be phased in a logical sequence, in response to market demands. Ultimate phasing by recordation of phased final parcel maps will be finalized at time of sale to merchant builders based on market demands.

Phasing for the Malibu Vineyards Industrial Parkway Specific Plan will allow initial development to take place near Imperial Avenue and Imperial Road and gradually reach the northern portions of the Specific Plan area. Adjustments to the phasing sequence and sizes are permitted provided that utilities and public facilities are available to service the phase in question.

Future street improvements to access phase two shall be implemented in conjunction with the widening of Burbank Street and construction of the future canal and freeway overpass expansion.

Appendix C Farmland Conversion Study

FARMLAND CONVERSION STUDY REPORT

For:

Malibu Vineyards Industrial Park 738.48 Acres North of Imperial Road and East of Hwy 99 County of Kern, State of California

Portions of Sections 24 and 25, Township 28 South, Range 26 East, And, Sections 29 and 30, Township 28 South, Range 27 East M. D. B. & M.

Prepared for:

Malibu Vineyards, LP

Prepared by:



Project No. 04-157

September 2021



Farmland Conversion Study Report McIntosh & Associates Project No. 04-157-000

Table of Contents

1.0 F	Project Setting	1
1.1	Introduction	1
1.2	Project Description	1
1.3	Purpose of Study	2
2.0 R	egulatory Setting	3
2.1	Land Conservation (Williamson) Act	3
2.2	Trends of Farmland Conversion in the County	4
2.3	Metropolitan Bakersfield General Plan Provisions	4
2.4	Kern County General Plan Provisions	5
2.5	Additional Provisions	8
2.6	Department of Conservation	8
2.7	California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model – (LESA)	9
3.0	Environmental Setting	10
3.1	State of California Agricultural Production	10
3.2	Kern County Agricultural Production	10
3.3	Agricultural Production - Subject Property	11
3.4	Pesticide Usage - Subject Property	11
3.4	Agricultural Production - Adjacent Property	14
3.5	Historical and Current Aerial Photographs	17
3.6	Agricultural Crops and Yields for the Year 2017 - 2018	20
3.7	Agricultural Crops and Yields for the Year 2013-2018	20
3.8	Soils	20
3.8	.1 Land Capability Classifications	26
3.9	Water	27
3.1	0 Climate	27
4.0	Impacts of Farmland Conversion	28
4.1	Methodology	28
4.2	Metropolitan Bakersfield General Plan, and Kern County General Plan Factors	28
4.3	California Department of Conservation - Factors	30
4.3	.1 Seven Categories of Important Farmland	31
4.4	Buffer Zones	32
4.5	Water Supply	32
4.6	Water Quality	33
4.7	Competition for Water	33
4.8	Effects on Other Agricultural Properties or Operations	35
4.9	California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model – LESA	36
4.9	.1 Land Evaluation Factors	37
4.9	.2 Site Assessment Factors	37
4.9	.3 Final LESA Scoring	38
4.9	.4 Threshold of Significance	39



5.0	Mitigation	40
6.0	Conclusions	42
7.0	Resources	48

List of Tables

Table 1 Proposed Land Use and Zoning	2
Table 2 Land receiving benefit of California Land Conservation (Williamson) Act 2005	4
Table 3 Crops Grown on Subject Property for the years 2013-2018	11
Table 4 Chemicals / Pesticides Permitted for Use on the Project Site	12
Table 5 Crops Grown on Adjacent Properties 2013-2018	14
Table 6 Adjacent Properties Land Use	15
Table 7 Existing Dairy Farm Locations	17
Table 8 Agricultural Crops and Yields for the Year 2017-2018	20
Table 9 Agricultural Crops 2013-2018	21
Table 10 USDA Soil Survey	23
Table 11 USDA Land Capability Classifications	
Table 12 Land Capability Units	27
Table 13 Water Requirements – Urban and Agricultural	34
Table 14 Crop Irrigation Requirements for Subject Property	34
Table 15 Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Factors	39
Table 16 Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Final Score	39
Table 17 LESA Model Scoring Thresholds	40



Appendices

Appendix "A"

Location Map	A-1
Zoning Map No. 80	A-2
Zoning Map No. 81	A-3
Assessors Map No. 91-15	A-4
Assessors Map No. 91-16	A-5
Assessors Map No. 91-20	A-6
Assessors Map No. 482-01	A-7
Assessors Map No. 482-04	A-8
±	

Appendix "B"

Kern County General Plan Map	B-1
Kern County Circulation Element	B-2
Proposed Development	B-3
1 1	

Appendix "C"

Topographic Quadrangle Map	C-1
Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM)	C-2
Depth of Groundwater Map	C-3
Soils Information	C-4

Appendix "D"

2016 – 2018 Land Use Conversion Table A-10	D-1
2018 Important Farmland Area	D-2
2018 Important Farmland Area Map Legend	D-3

Appendix "E"

2013 Kern County Crop Report Summary	E-1
2013 Kern County Crop Report – Top 20 Crops	E-1
2013 Kern County Crop Report – Fruit & Nut Crops	E-1
2014 Kern County Crop Report Summary	E-2
2014 Kern County Crop Report – Top 20 Crops	E-2
2014 Kern County Crop Report – Fruit & Nut Crops	Е-2
2015 Kern County Crop Report Summary	E-3
2015 Kern County Crop Report – Top 20 Crops	E-3
2015 Kern County Crop Report – Fruit & Nut Crops	E-3
2016 Kern County Crop Report Summary	E-4
2016 Kern County Crop Report – Top 20 Crops	E-4



<u>Farmland</u>	Conversion	Stud	y Re	port

2016 Kern County Crop Report – Fruit & Nut Crops	E-4
2017 Kern County Crop Report Summary	E-5
2017 Kern County Crop Report – Top 20 Crops	E-5
2017 Kern County Crop Report – Fruit & Nut Crops	E-5
2018 Kern County Crop Report Summary	Е-б
2018 Kern County Crop Report – Top 20 Crops	Е-б
2018 Kern County Crop Report – Fruit & Nut Crops	E-6

Appendix "F"

2013 Adjacent crop information – Kern County GIS	F-1
2014 Adjacent crop information – Kern County GIS	F-2
2015 Adjacent crop information – Kern County GIS	F-3
2016 Adjacent crop information – Kern County GIS	F-4
2017 Adjacent crop information – Kern County GIS	F-5
2018 Adjacent crop information – Kern County GIS	F-6

Appendix "G"

Site Map Aerial Photograph Phase 1 – 1937	G- 1
Site Map Aerial Photograph Phase 2 – 1937	G-2
Site Map Aerial Photograph Phase 1 – 1952	G-3
Site Map Aerial Photograph Phase 2 – 1952	G-4
Site Map Aerial Photograph Phase 1 – 1968	G-5
Site Map Aerial Photograph Phase 2 – 1968	G-6
Site Map Aerial Photograph Phase 1 – 1994	G-7
Site Map Aerial Photograph Phase 2 – 1994	G-8
Site Map Aerial Photograph Phase 1 – 2005	G-9
Site Map Aerial Photograph Phase 2 – 2005	G-10
Site Map Aerial Photograph Phase 1 – 2012	G-11
Site Map Aerial Photograph Phase 2 – 2012	G-12
Site Map Aerial Photograph Phase 1 & 2 – 2013	G-13
Site Map Aerial Photograph Phase 1 & 2 – 2014	G-14
Site Map Aerial Photograph Phase 1 & 2 – 2015	G-15
Site Map Aerial Photograph Phase 1 & 2 – 2016	G-16
Site Map Aerial Photograph Phase 1 & 2 – 2017	G-17
Site Map Aerial Photograph Phase 1 & 2 – 2018	G-18

Appendix H

Site Index	H-1	
Site Photographs	H-2 –	- H24



Appendix "I

Existing Dairy Location Map	I-1
2005 Kern County Dairy List	I-2
GIS Dairy Map within 15 miles	I-3

Appendix "J"

Zone of Influence Boundary Map	J-1
LESA Model Spreadsheet0	J-2
California Department of Conservation - Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site	
Assessment Model (LESA)	J-3



1.0 Project Setting

1.1 Introduction

As the United States continues to urbanize, one of the many challenges facing Kern County is blending the need to preserve agricultural land and open space with the demand for development in metropolitan edges. Projects involving changes in land use sometimes convert agricultural lands to non-agricultural uses. Conserving productive agricultural lands requires a careful project-specific evaluation of the direct and indirect effects, as well as the cumulative effects, of agricultural land conversion. This study provides a checklist of items that should be considered by those analyzing the proposed project site. In order to analyze the proposed project's potential impact to agricultural lands, this study utilized factors identified in the Metropolitan Bakersfield General Plan (MBGP), Kern County General Plan (KCGP), and the California Department of Conservation's *California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment (LESA) Model* (Appendix "J").

1.2 **Project Description**

This Farmland Conversion Study addresses the conversion of approximately 738.48+/- acres of agricultural land located north of Imperial Road and east of Hwy 99, generally north of the City of Bakersfield to industrial uses. The subject property is located within the County of Kern and State of California within portions of Sections 24 & 25, Township 28 South, Range 26 East; and Sections 29 & 30, Township 28 South, Range 27 East, Mount Diablo Meridian (refer to Appendix "A").

The property is identified as Assessor's Parcel Number's: 482-010-01, 02, and 03; 091-150-03, 091-160-02, and 03; 091-160-02 and 03; 091-160-01; 091-160-13; 091-160-09; 091-160-16; 091-200-04 and 05; 091-200-13 and 14; 091-200-07; 091-160-16 (portion); 482-040-01 and 03; 482-040-02; 482-040-04; 482-010-11; and 482-040-05. The property is comprised of two (2) phases. Phase 1 includes 533.84 acres and is located between Burbank Street to the north and Imperial Avenue to the south, between the Lerdo Canal and Imperial Road to the west and east, respectively including that portion of the west half of the northwest quarter of Section 29 lying east of Imperial Road. Phase 2 includes approximately 204.64 acres including the property between State Hwy 99 and the Lerdo Canal, to the west and east respectively, lying south of Lerdo Hwy and north of Imperial Avenue. According to the United States Geological Survey (USGS) Oildale and Rosedale 7.5-minute quadrangle maps and visual inspection of the property, a majority of the topography of the site is flat, but slopes slightly from northeast to southwest. The property elevation ranges from approximately 550 to 450 feet above mean sea level at the center of the site.

The subject property is presently and has historically been used for agriculture. The property is mostly covered with grape vineyards with a structure located in


McIntosh & Associates Project No. 04-157-000

the eastern portion of the site. The structure appears to be used as a storage building and is associated with agricultural activities. The site includes outdoor storage of various farm related operational equipment, along with a fenced and secured concrete floor storage shed for pesticides. The project site is adjacent to agricultural uses and the nearest cluster of single-family residential homes are approximately 5,000-feet to the east between Amos Road and along Burbank Street. Some vacant land lies east of the easterly portion of property. Agricultural uses to the north. Highway 99 is adjacent to the west. Industrial uses lie east of the property approximately 5,000-feet along Hwy 65, and 5,500-feet to the south.

According to the County maintained Metropolitan Bakersfield General Plan-West (MBGP-W) and Kern County General Plan – Central Section (GP-Central), the current land use designation for the subject property is R-IA and 8.1 Intensive Agriculture). According to the Kern County Zoning Ordinance, the entire subject property is currently zoned A (Exclusive Agriculture). The property owner is proposing to change the zoning and amend the MBGP-W and GP-Central to change the property land use designation as follows:

Proposed Land Use and Zoning						
`General Plan Amendment				Zone Change		
From	То	Acres	From	То	Acres	
8.1/R-IA – Intensive Agriculture	SI (Service Industrial)	738.48+/-	A - (Exclusive Agriculture)	M-2 (Medium Industrial) / PD – (Precise Development)	738.48+/-	

Table 1 Proposed Land Use and Zoning

1.3 Purpose of Study

This Farmland Conversion Study addresses the conversion of approximately 738.48+/- acres of agricultural land to non-agricultural uses, and identifies impacts, mitigation, and significance after mitigation. The majority of subject property is within the MBGP planning area, the remaining northern portion is within the KCGP, and subject to the California Environmental Quality Act.

The Lead Agency (County of Kern) typically bases a determination of agricultural resources significance on the thresholds established by the CEQA Guidelines. The Environmental Checklist Form of the CEQA Guidelines (Appendix "G"), contains a list of impacts that may be deemed potentially significant. The lead agency should address questions from this checklist that are relevant to a projects environmental effects. The questions from Appendix "G", pertaining to agricultural resources follow:

<u>Agricultural Resources</u> - In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the



McIntosh & Associates Project No. 04-157-000

California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland.

Would the Project:

- a. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance, as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?
- b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act Contract?
- 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?

2.0 Regulatory Setting

2.1 Land Conservation (Williamson) Act

The California Land Conservation Act of 1965, also known as the Williamson Act, was established with the basic intent of encouraging the preservation of the state's agricultural lands in view of the increasing trends toward their "premature and unnecessary" urbanization. The Williamson Act enables local governments to enter into contracts with private landowners for the purpose of restricting specific parcels of land to agricultural or related open space use. In return, landowners receive property tax assessments, which are much lower than normal because they are based upon farming and open space uses as opposed to full market value. Local governments receive an annual subvention of forgone property tax revenues from the state via the Open Space Subvention Act of 1971.

The State Department of Conservation passed legislation in 1998 that would allow individual counties to establish an additional program for farmlands to enter into contract with the State to receive a similar benefit as the Williamson Act contract. The Farmland Security Zone is a 20-year self-renewing contract that allows property owners with qualifying parcels to receive an additional 35 percent in tax savings above that which is received under the Williamson Act land use contract.

The total acres of prime and nonprime farmland reported to the State Department of Conservation with the Kern County annual Subvention Report for 2019 were 1,472,603.10* acres of prime and nonprime land under a California Land Conservation (Williamson) Act contract, and 176,596.96 acres enrolled in Farmland Security Zone contracts (Kern County Planning – Board of Supervisors report October 15, 2019). *Note Kern County cover letter dated October 15, 2019 incorrectly



summarizes acreage as 1,462,603.10. Tables reflect 595,648.63 Prime and 876,954.47 nonprime which total 1,472,603.10 acres.

Both of these contracts require that lands be within an established agricultural preserve. Agricultural lands that are not under contract face the greatest threat for conversion, as they are assessed higher property taxes due to their proximity to urbanization.

According to the Kern County Planning Department, the property is within the boundaries of Agricultural Preserve No. 8. None of the subject property is subject to a Williamson Act land use contract.

2.2 Trends of Farmland Conversion in the County

According to the California Land Conservation (Williamson) Act 2019 Status Report, prepared by the Department of Conservation, maintained by Kern County annual Subvention Report, the following is a breakdown of contracted lands receiving benefit of decreased property taxation for 2019 (See Table 2).

Table	2	Land	receiving	benefit	of	California	Land	Conservation
(Willia	mson	n) Act 20	D19					

California Land Conservation (Williamson) Act 2019						
Williamson Act Contract	Prime	595,648.63 acres				
	Non-Prime	876,954.47 acres				
Non-contracted *	Prime	14,166.69 acres				
	Non-Prime	28,441.93 acres				
Farmland Security Zone Contract - Urban	Prime	14,212.87 acres				
	Non-Prime	0 acres				
Farmland Security Zone Contract – Non-Urban	Prime	162,384.09 acres				
	Non-Prime	0 acres				

* These lands have requested non-renewal of their contract and are in the process of "backing out" of the 9-year contract.

2.3 Metropolitan Bakersfield General Plan Provisions

The City of Bakersfield, in collaboration with Kern County, prepared the MBGP. This document establishes policies to provide decision-makers with long-range guidance affecting the future character of the Bakersfield planning area. The MBGP also acts to clarify and articulate the relationship and intentions of local government to the rights and expectations of the general public, property owners and prospective investors. Through the Plan, the City and County can inform these groups of its goals, policies and development standards, thereby communicating what must be done to meet the objectives of the MBGP.



McIntosh & Associates Project No. 04-157-000

The MBGP provides for the continuation of historical growth patterns in the western Bakersfield region by allowing for the greatest growth potential in this area. The land use goals of the MBGP provide for the accommodation of:

- New development which captures the economic demands generated by the marketplace and establishes Bakersfield's role as the capital of the southern San Joaquin Valley;
- New development which provides a full mix of uses to support its population;
- New development which channels land uses in a phased, orderly manner and is coordinated with the provision of infrastructure and public improvements;
- New development, which is compatible with and complements existing land uses.

The Elements within the MBGP that provide policies and implementation measures for the conservation and/or improvements on agricultural lands include the Land Use, Conservation, and Open Space Elements. Below is an outline of the applicable goals within these Elements:

- Allow for the continuance of agricultural uses in areas designated for future urban development;
- Provide for the planned management, conservation, and wise utilization of agricultural land in the planning area;
- Promote soil conservation and minimize development of prime agricultural land as defined by the following criteria:
 - Capability Class I and/or II irrigated soils;
 - 80-100 Storie Index rating;
 - gross crop return of \$200 or more per acre per year;
 - annual carrying capacity of one animal unit per acre per year
- Establish urban development patterns and practices that promote soil conservation and that protect areas of agricultural production of food and fiber crops, and nursery products.

The Land Use Element of the MBGP outlines residential policies and implementation measures regulating how the land will be utilized.

2.4 Kern County General Plan Provisions

The KCGP is a policy document designed to give long-range guidance to those County officials making decisions affecting the growth and resources of the unincorporated Kern County jurisdiction, excluding the Metropolitan Bakersfield planning area.



McIntosh & Associates Project No. 04-157-000

According to the KCGP, agriculture has been, and will continue to be, vital to the economy of Kern County. The development of major water projects has greatly increased the amount of land in agricultural production during the last two decades. However, conflicts over the use of agricultural land frequently occur. As is the case for other urbanizing regions, the loss of valuable agricultural lands to urban development is a prime concern. Land division; even where actual development does not take place, can adversely affect the County's agricultural resource base. This is particularly a problem in extensive agriculture areas, such as rangeland, where land values can be significantly increased beyond values based on agricultural productivity.

The KCGP provides goals, policies, and implementation measures for the conservation and/or improvements on agricultural lands. Below is an outline of the policy that addresses General Plan Amendment proposals for agricultural land (KCGP, Land Use, Conservation, and Open Space Element, Section 1.9 - Resource Land Use Designation):

- When evaluating General Plan Amendment proposals to change a Map Code 8.1 (Intensive Agriculture) designation to accommodate residential, commercial, or industrial development, the County shall consider the following factors:
 - a. Approval of the proposal will not unreasonably interfere with agricultural operations on surrounding lands.
 - There will adequate buffers such as landscaping and walls put in place to eliminate interference with agricultural operations on surrounding lands.
 - b. Necessary public services (fire, sheriff, etc.) and infrastructure are available to adequately serve the project.
 - Prior to approval, the County jurisdiction requires an assessment to ensure adequate capacity to provide services for the project area can be met. This is usually completed through project fees and property taxes.
 - The proposed will be comprised of over 6 million square feet of warehouse space to house distribution and/or fulfillment center needs. The tax revenue generated by this project will boost the allocation of resources to improve infrastructure, utilities and public services throughout the entire County.
 - c. There is a demonstrated need for the proposed project location based upon population projections, market studies and other indicators.
 - Economic data shows Kern County has a 10.7% unemployment rate, compared to 7.9% for the state of California as of July 2021. Increase in warehouse square footage provides job opportunities, income growth, and



property tax generation by e-commerce related activities and industrial buildings. Kern County is also placed in an ideal location for distribution of goods to the Pacific Northwest, south and east.

- Distribution and fulfillment centers maintain a high rate of employment. Neighboring Majestic Tejon distribution centers have a current employment base of about 3,000 FTEs. Similarly, the Amazon distribution center has created over 1,000 jobs to local residents.
- Income and property taxes generated by e-commerce related and industrial buildings can help buoy local budgets by replacing lost tax revenue from closed traditional brick and mortar retail locations.
- The global e-commerce fulfillment services market size was valued at \$69.68 billion in 2019 and continues to expand. These types of businesses significantly depend upon the warehousing and shipping capabilities to get products transported in the shortest amount of time. This market is increasing demand for creation of warehouses in ideal locations.
- As retail undergoes a structural change, these centers are guaranteed to generate large financial benefits to the County of Kern. The 2.6 million square foot Amazon distribution center generates over \$2,000,000 in property taxes annually.
- d. The requested change in land use designation is accompanied by a zone change and other implementing land use applications for a specific development proposal.
 - The general plan amendment will change the existing site designation from R-IA (Intensive Agriculture)/A (Agriculture) to SI (Service Industrial)/M-2 (Medium Industrial) and zone change will change the existing zoning classification from A (Exclusive Agriculture) to M-2 PD (Medium Industrial Precise Development) to accommodate the proposed uses.
 - Additional land use applications could include: Precise Development plan update showing improvements on Map Nos. 80, 81 and 82; sphere of influence amendment (LAFCO); annexation into OMWC Service Area; utility extensions from OMWC; encroachment permits obtained from the Building Department; improvements/expansion of Imperial Road intersection; and encroachment Permits from Building Department.
- e. The site is contiguous to properties that are developed or characterized by nonagricultural land uses.
 - Although the site is contiguous with agricultural uses, there are business industrial sites to the south and east.



- f. Past agricultural use of the site has led to soil infertility or other soil conditions, which render the property unsuitable for long-term agricultural use.
 - The site rotates its crops and only 350 acres are currently being utilized for agricultural purposes, while 390 acres are fallow. The soil of this prime farmland is still suitable for longterm agricultural activities. However, water is a significant problem for farming purposes. The cost of pumping or purchasing water from the limited supplies is unsustainable for cultivation.
- g. Approval of the proposed project outweighs the need to retain the land for long-term agricultural use.
 - To date, nearly 390 acres of the site's prime farmland have been removed from production and have not had negative impacts on adjacent agricultural operations. There may have been a decrease in table grapes over the last seven years, but the positive outcome of future jobs will further benefit the economy on numerous levels.
- h. Where adjacent or within proximity (1/2 mile) to existing urban areas, the County shall discourage agricultural conversion that is discontinuous with urban development.
 - The site is ½ mile north of existing industrial uses and would be in harmony with the character and logical path of urban development based on current and planned development within proximity to SR 99.

2.5 Additional Provisions

According to the most recent Farmland Conversion Report: 2006 to 2008, prepared by the staff of the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program in the Department of Conservation, Farmland of Local Importance is classified as:

"Farmland of Local Importance is land of importance to the local economy, as defined by each county's local advisory committee and adopted by its Board of Supervisors.

Farmland of Local Importance is either currently producing, or has the capability of production, but does not meet the criteria of Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, or Unique Farmland. Authority to adopt or to recommend changes to the category of Farmland of Local Importance rests with the Board of Supervisors in each county."

The FMMP states "The Kern County Board of Supervisors determined that there will be no Farmland of Local Importance in Kern County".

2.6 Department of Conservation

In Section 4.3 of this study, prime farmland is defined and discussed. Prime



McIntosh & Associates Project No. 04-157-000

farmland, as defined by the United Stated Department of Agriculture (USDA), are soils that are best suited to producing food, seed, forage, fiber, and oilseed crops. In addition, prime farmland produces the highest yields with minimal units of energy and economic resources, and farming theses soils results in the least damage to the environment.

Prime farmland soils commonly get an adequate and dependable supply of moisture from precipitation or irrigation. Temperature and growing season are favorable, and the level of acidity or alkalinity is acceptable. The soils have few rocks and are permeable to water and air, not excessively erodible or saturated with water for long periods and are not flooded during the growing season. Approximately 738.48 acres or 100 percent of the project site would meet the requirements for prime farmland if undeveloped and water for irrigation is available. The prime farmland soils in the project site are: (138) Delano sandy loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes (93.05 acres); (145) Delano sandy loam, 1 to 5 percent slopes (402.47 acres); (174) Kimberlina fine sandy loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes MLRA 17 (113.73); and (184) Lewkalb sandy loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes (45.79 acres).

2.7 California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model – (LESA)

Land Evaluation and Site Assessment (LESA) is a term used to define an approach for rating the relative quality of land resources based upon specific measurable features. The formulation of the California Agricultural LESA Model is the result of Senate Bill 850 (Chapter 812/1993), which charges the Resources Agency, in consultation with the Governor's Office of Planning and Research, to develop an amendment to Appendix G of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines. Such an amendment is intended "to provide lead agencies with an optional methodology to ensure significant effects on the environment of agricultural land conversions are quantitatively and consistently considered in the environmental review process" (Public Resources Code Section 21095).

The California Agricultural LESA Model is composed of six different factors: two Land Evaluation (LE) factors are based upon measures of soil resource quality; four Site Assessment (SA) factors provide measures of a given project's size, water resource availability, surrounding agricultural lands, and surrounding protected resource lands. For a given project, each of these factors is separately rated on a 100-point scale. The factors are then weighted relative to one another and combined, resulting in a single numeric score for a given project, with a maximum attainable score of 100 points, The projects score becomes the basis for making a determination of a projects potential significance, based upon a range of established scoring thresholds.



3.0 Environmental Setting

3.1 State of California Agricultural Production

According to the most recent 2019 California Agriculture Highlights prepared by the California Department of Food & Agriculture, California had 69,900 farming operations for the year 2019. The Statewide Summary 2017 (the most recent year available reflects California represents 9 percent of the nation's total farming operations; however, these farms account for 12 percent of the national gross cash receipts from farming. California land in farms totaled 24.5 million acres for the year 2017, and the number of farms decreased by 9 percent from the year 2012. The average size farm in California is 348 acres, and approximately 350 crops are recognized in the state, including seeds, flowers and ornamental grasses. The 2017 total value of agricultural products sold that were produced in California was \$45,154,359,000. Modern agricultural practices in the United States have greatly increased the productivity of an acre of land. One acre can produce 12.02 tons of table grapes, 2.0 tons of pistachios, 1.15 tons of almonds, or 0.94 tons of blueberries. California's crops account for 84 percent and livestock commodities account for 16 percent of the state's gross farm income.

3.2 Kern County Agricultural Production

The valley region of Kern County is highly suitable for agricultural cultivation. A review of the California Department of Food and Agriculture Crop Reports indicates a history of high agricultural production for many crops over the years and continuing to the present. Factors that influence high agricultural activity today are climate, availability of water, dependable market demand, good soils, and most importantly, proper management. Agriculture in Kern County has been extensive since the introduction of livestock in the 1860's. Livestock raising on large land grants and some production of grain under dry-farming methods were the primary agricultural pursuits until about 1880. Rapid agricultural development occurred after 1880 due to the development of irrigation, inexpensive land, favorable crop yields, the arrival of two railroads, the development of the petroleum industry, and access to markets.

The most recent 2018 Agricultural Crop Report prepared by the Kern County Agricultural Commissioner's Office states that Kern County contains 865,813 acres of harvested land. Within that acreage, 551,495 acres were harvested for Fruit and Nut Crops. The 2018 total value of agricultural commodities produced in Kern County was \$7,466,152,000, an increase of approximately .9716 percent over the 2017 crop value. The total harvested acreage decreased approximately .9787 percent from 2017. The 2018 top six commodities were grapes, almonds, pistachios, citrus, milk, and carrots.



3.3 Agricultural Production - Subject Property

The subject property includes approximately 738.48 acres of agricultural land. Grapeman Farms, LP is the grower from 2014 to the present. Historically the site has been used for table grape production. Agricultural crops grown on the subject property from 2014 to 2019 are listed in Table 3.

	Agricultural Crops - 2014-2019 Portion of Section , Township 31S., Range 28E., M.D.M.						
Year	Permit and Permitee	Crop	Acres	Yield Per Acre (Ton)	Total Yield (Ton)		
2019	Grapeman Farms, LP	Table Grapes					
2018	Grapeman Farms, LP	Table Grapes	588	10	5880		
2017	Grapeman Farms, LP	Table Grapes	638	10	6380		
2016	Grapeman Farms, LP	Table Grapes	688	10	6880		
2015	Grapeman Farms, LP	Table Grapes	733	10	7330		
2014	Grapeman Farms, LP	Table Grapes	733	10	7330		

Table 3 Crops Grown on Subject Property for the years 2013-2019

3.4 Pesticide Usage - Subject Property

The project site has been utilized for agricultural purposes from at least the 1940s to the present. Grape Man Farms, LP is the present grower, and possesses a Restricted Materials Permit No. 1505134 for applications of pesticides and herbicides, which expires on December 31, 2020.



McIntosh & Associates Project No. 04-157-000

Information pertaining to pesticide use within the subject property has been provided by the Kern County GIS Mapping System, Kern County Department of Agriculture records, and the property owner, Malibu Vineyards, LP.

According to property owner, and information obtained from the Kern County Agricultural Commissioner's pesticide permit records indicate that the following pesticides, herbicides, fertilizers, and general soil amendments have been licensed and were applied to the project site from 2014 to 2019. (See Table 4)

Table 4 Chemicals / Pesticides Permitted for Use on the Project Site

Chemicals / Pesticides Permitted for Use on Project Site 2014-2019					
Name	Туре	Years Applied			
BSP LIME SULFUR SOLUTION	FUNGICIDE	2014			
DITHANE F-45 RAIN SHIELD	FUNGICIDE	2017, 2016, 2015, 2014			
DUSTING SULFUR	FUNGICIDE	2019, 2018, 2017, 2016, 2015, 2014			
ELEVATE 50WDG	FUNGICIDE	2019, 2018, 2017, 2016, 2015			
GIB GRO 20% POWDER	FUNGICIDE	2014			
INSPIRE SUPER (CA, H	FUNGICIDE	2019, 2018			
KALIGREEN	FUNGICIDE	2019, 2018, 2017, 2016, 2015			
KIMZALL	FUNGICIDE	2019, 2018, 2017, 2016, 2015, 2014			
KOCIDE 3000	FUNGICIDE	2019, 2018, 2017, 2015, 2016			
Chemicals / Pestie	cides Permitted for	r Use on Project Site			
2014-2019					
Name	Туре	Years Applied			
Name MANZATE PRO-STICK	Type FUNGICIDE	Years Applied 2019, 2018, 2017, 2016, 2015			
NameMANZATE PRO-STICKOSO 5%SC	Type FUNGICIDE FUNGICIDE	Years Applied 2019, 2018, 2017, 2016, 2015 2019, 2018			
NameMANZATE PRO-STICKOSO 5%SCPHT DRYOUT DUST	TypeFUNGICIDEFUNGICIDEFUNGICIDE	Years Applied 2019, 2018, 2017, 2016, 2015 2019, 2018 2019, 2018			
NameMANZATE PRO-STICKOSO 5%SCPHT DRYOUT DUSTPRISTINE(R) FUNGICIDE	TypeFUNGICIDEFUNGICIDEFUNGICIDEFUNGICIDE	Years Applied 2019, 2018, 2017, 2016, 2015 2019, 2018 2019, 2018 2019, 2018, 2017, 2016, 2015, 2014			
NameMANZATE PRO-STICKOSO 5%SCPHT DRYOUT DUSTPRISTINE(R) FUNGICIDEQUINTEC	TypeFUNGICIDEFUNGICIDEFUNGICIDEFUNGICIDEFUNGICIDE	Years Applied 2019, 2018, 2017, 2016, 2015 2019, 2018 2019, 2018 2019, 2018, 2017, 2016, 2015, 2014 2019, 2018, 2017, 2016, 2015, 2014			
NameMANZATE PRO-STICKOSO 5%SCPHT DRYOUT DUSTPRISTINE(R) FUNGICIDEQUINTECRALLY 40 WSP	TypeFUNGICIDEFUNGICIDEFUNGICIDEFUNGICIDEFUNGICIDEFUNGICIDE	Years Applied 2019, 2018, 2017, 2016, 2015 2019, 2018 2019, 2018 2019, 2018, 2017, 2016, 2015, 2014 2019, 2018, 2017 2019, 2018, 2017 2019, 2018, 2017, 2016, 2015, 2014			
NameMANZATE PRO-STICKOSO 5%SCPHT DRYOUT DUSTPRISTINE(R) FUNGICIDEQUINTECRALLY 40 WSPROVRAL BRAND 4 FLOWABLE	TypeFUNGICIDEFUNGICIDEFUNGICIDEFUNGICIDEFUNGICIDEFUNGICIDEFUNGICIDEFUNGICIDE	Years Applied 2019, 2018, 2017, 2016, 2015 2019, 2018 2019, 2018 2019, 2018, 2017, 2016, 2015, 2014 2019, 2018, 2017, 2016, 2015, 2014 2019, 2018, 2017, 2016, 2015, 2014 2019, 2018, 2017, 2016, 2015, 2014 2019, 2018, 2017, 2016, 2015, 2014			
NameMANZATE PRO-STICKOSO 5%SCPHT DRYOUT DUSTPRISTINE(R) FUNGICIDEQUINTECRALLY 40 WSPROVRAL BRAND 4 FLOWABLESCALA BRAND SC FUNGI	TypeFUNGICIDEFUNGICIDEFUNGICIDEFUNGICIDEFUNGICIDEFUNGICIDEFUNGICIDEFUNGICIDEFUNGICIDE	Years Applied 2019, 2018, 2017, 2016, 2015 2019, 2018 2019, 2018 2019, 2018, 2017, 2016, 2015, 2014 2019, 2018, 2017, 2016, 2015, 2014 2019, 2018, 2017, 2016, 2015, 2014 2019, 2018, 2017, 2016, 2015, 2014 2019, 2018, 2017, 2016, 2015, 2014 2019, 2018, 2017, 2016, 2015, 2014 2019, 2018, 2017, 2016, 2015, 2014			
NameMANZATE PRO-STICKOSO 5%SCPHT DRYOUT DUSTPRISTINE(R) FUNGICIDEQUINTECRALLY 40 WSPROVRAL BRAND 4 FLOWABLESCALA BRAND SC FUNGISERENADE ASO	TypeFUNGICIDEFUNGICIDEFUNGICIDEFUNGICIDEFUNGICIDEFUNGICIDEFUNGICIDEFUNGICIDEFUNGICIDEFUNGICIDEFUNGICIDE	Years Applied 2019, 2018, 2017, 2016, 2015 2019, 2018 2019, 2018 2019, 2018, 2017, 2016, 2015, 2014 2019, 2018, 2017, 2016, 2015, 2014 2019, 2018, 2017, 2016, 2015, 2014 2019, 2018, 2017, 2016, 2015, 2014 2017, 2016, 2015, 2014 2019, 2018, 2017, 2016, 2015, 2014 2019, 2018, 2017, 2016, 2015, 2014 2019, 2018, 2017, 2016, 2015, 2014 2019, 2018, 2017, 2016, 2015, 2014			
NameMANZATE PRO-STICKOSO 5%SCPHT DRYOUT DUSTPRISTINE(R) FUNGICIDEQUINTECRALLY 40 WSPROVRAL BRAND 4 FLOWABLESCALA BRAND SC FUNGISERENADE ASOSOVRAN(R) FUNGICIDE	TypeFUNGICIDEFUNGICIDEFUNGICIDEFUNGICIDEFUNGICIDEFUNGICIDEFUNGICIDEFUNGICIDEFUNGICIDEFUNGICIDEFUNGICIDEFUNGICIDEFUNGICIDE	Years Applied 2019, 2018, 2017, 2016, 2015 2019, 2018 2019, 2018 2019, 2018 2019, 2018, 2017, 2016, 2015, 2014 2019, 2018, 2017, 2016, 2015, 2014 2019, 2018, 2017, 2016, 2015, 2014 2019, 2018, 2017, 2016, 2015, 2014 2019, 2018, 2017, 2016, 2015, 2014 2019, 2018, 2017, 2016, 2015, 2014 2019, 2018, 2017, 2016, 2015, 2014 2019, 2018, 2017, 2016, 2015, 2014			
NameMANZATE PRO-STICKOSO 5%SCPHT DRYOUT DUSTPRISTINE(R) FUNGICIDEQUINTECRALLY 40 WSPROVRAL BRAND 4 FLOWABLESCALA BRAND SC FUNGISERENADE ASOSOVRAN(R) FUNGICIDESPRAY SULFUR	TypeFUNGICIDEFUNGICIDEFUNGICIDEFUNGICIDEFUNGICIDEFUNGICIDEFUNGICIDEFUNGICIDEFUNGICIDEFUNGICIDEFUNGICIDEFUNGICIDEFUNGICIDEFUNGICIDEFUNGICIDE	Years Applied 2019, 2018, 2017, 2016, 2015 2019, 2018 2019, 2018 2019, 2018, 2017, 2016, 2015, 2014 2019, 2018, 2017, 2016, 2015, 2014 2019, 2018, 2017, 2016, 2015, 2014 2019, 2018, 2017, 2016, 2015, 2014 2019, 2018, 2017, 2016, 2015, 2014 2019, 2018, 2017, 2016, 2015, 2014 2019, 2018, 2017, 2016, 2015, 2014 2019, 2018, 2017, 2016 2019, 2018, 2017, 2016 2019, 2018, 2017, 2016 2019, 2018, 2017, 2016			
NameMANZATE PRO-STICKOSO 5% SCPHT DRYOUT DUSTPRISTINE(R) FUNGICIDEQUINTECRALLY 40 WSPROVRAL BRAND 4 FLOWABLESCALA BRAND SC FUNGISERENADE ASOSOVRAN(R) FUNGICIDESPRAY SULFURSWITCH 62.5WG	TypeFUNGICIDEFUNGICIDEFUNGICIDEFUNGICIDEFUNGICIDEFUNGICIDEFUNGICIDEFUNGICIDEFUNGICIDEFUNGICIDEFUNGICIDEFUNGICIDEFUNGICIDEFUNGICIDEFUNGICIDEFUNGICIDEFUNGICIDE	Years Applied 2019, 2018, 2017, 2016, 2015 2019, 2018 2019, 2018 2019, 2018, 2017, 2016, 2015, 2014 2019, 2018, 2017, 2016, 2015, 2014 2019, 2018, 2017, 2016, 2015, 2014 2019, 2018, 2017, 2016, 2015, 2014 2019, 2018, 2017, 2016, 2015, 2014 2019, 2018, 2017, 2016, 2015, 2014 2019, 2018, 2017, 2016, 2015, 2014 2019, 2018, 2017, 2016, 2015, 2014 2019, 2018, 2017, 2016, 2015, 2014 2019, 2018, 2017, 2016, 2015, 2014 2019, 2018, 2017, 2016, 2015			



McIntosh & Associates Project No. 04-157-000

	-		I		
TOLEDO 45 WP	FUN	GICIDE	20	016	
TORINO	FUN	GICIDE	20	019, 2018, 2017, 2016, 2014	
VANGARD WG (CA)	FUNGICIDE		20	2019, 2018, 2017, 2016, 2015, 2014	
VINTRE	FUN	GICIDE	20	019, 2018, 2017, 2016, 2015, 2014	
VITICURE	FUN	GICIDE	20	019, 2018, 2017	
VIVANDO(R) FUNGICIDE	FUN	GICIDE	20	019, 2018, 2016	
WIL-DRY	FUN	GICIDE	20	019, 2018, 2017, 2014	
CHATEAU	HER	BICIDE	20	018, 2016, 2015, 2014	
DUPONT MATRIX	HER	BICIDE	20	017, 2016, 2015, 2014	
FUSILADE DX	HER	BICIDE	20	015, 2014	
GLUFOSINATE 280 SL	HER	BICIDE	20	017, 2015, 2014	
GLY STAR ORIGINAL	HER	BICIDE	20	019, 2018	
GOAL 2XL	HER	BICIDE	20	019, 2018, 2017, 2016, 2015, 2014	
GRAMOXONE SL 2.0	HER	BICIDE	20	019, 2018, 2017, 2016, 2015, 2014	
HINGE	HER	BICIDE	20	019, 2018	
LIFELINE	HER	BICIDE	20	2019, 2018, 2017, 2016, 2015	
PHT FASTSTRIKE (CA)	HER	BICIDE	20	2019, 2018, 2017	
PROWL H20	HER	BICIDE	20	2017	
RECKON 280 SL	HER	BICIDE	20	014	
RELY 280 SL	HER	BICIDE	20	2016, 2014	
ROUNDUP POWERMAX HER	HER	BICIDE	20	2019, 2018, 2017, 2016	
Chemicals / Pestic	cides	Permitted for	r U	Jse on Project Site	
		2014-2019			
Name		Туре		Years Applied	
ROUNDUP WEATHER MASX		HERBICIDE		2016, 2015, 2014	
SMOKE		HERBICIDE		2019, 2018, 2017	
SURFLAN A.S.		HERBICIDE		2016	
SURMISE		HERBICIDE		2016	
ABACUS		INSECTICIDE		2016, 2014	
ABBA ULTRA		INSECTICIDE		2019, 2018, 2017, 2015	
ADMIRE PRO SYSTEMIC		INSECTICIDE		2019, 2018, 2017, 2016, 2015, 2014	
APPLAUD INSECT GROWTH		INSECTICIDE		2019, 2018, 2017, 2016, 2015, 2014	
BELAY(R) INSECTICIDE		INSECTICIDE		2019, 2018, 2017, 2016	
BYTHROID XL		INSECTICIDE		2017, 2015, 2014	
DANITOL		INSECTICIDE		2015, 2014	
DELEGATE WG		INSECTICIDE		2019, 2018, 2015	
				2010 2019 2017 2016 2015 2014	



McIntosh & Associates Project No. 04-157-000

PROKIL CRYOLITE 96	INSECTICIDE	2019, 2018, 2017, 2016, 2015, 2014
SUCCESS	INSECTICIDE	2019, 2018, 2017, 2016, 2015, 2014
VENONM	INSECTICIDE	2015, 2014
ACTIVATOR 90	PESTICIDE	2016, 2015
AGRI-DEX	PESTICIDE	2019, 2018, 2017, 2016, 2015, 2014
BRANDT TRIPLELINE DE	PESTICIDE	2019, 2018, 2017, 2015, 2014
BUD PRO GROWTH REGULATOR	PESTICIDE	2016
CHAMP FORMULA 2 FLOW	PESTICIDE	2019, 2018, 2017, 2016, 2015, 2014
CHECKMATE VMB-F	PESTICIDE	2019, 2018, 2017, 2016
ELIMINO	PESTICIDE	2019, 2018, 2017
ETHEPON 2	PESTICIDE	2016, 2014
FALGRO 2X LV	PESTICIDE	2019, 2018, 2017, 2016, 2015, 2014
GIBB MAX	PESTICIDE	2014
HELENA AGRI-DEX	PESTICIDE	2015, 2014
KINETIC A NONIONIC W	PESTICIDE	2019, 2018, 2017, 2016, 2015, 2014
KROP-MAX	PESTICIDE	2017, 2016, 2014
MOTIVATE	PESTICIDE	2019, 2018
MOVENTO	PESTICIDE	2019, 2018, 2017, 2016, 2015, 2014
PROGIBB(R) LV PLUS	PESTICIDE	2019, 2018, 2014

3.4 Agricultural Production - Adjacent Property

The crops grown on adjacent properties for the years 2014-2019, and the land uses for the adjacent property are presented in the Tables 5 and 6 below.

 Table 5 Crops Grown on Adjacent Properties 2014-2019

Crops Grown on Adjacent Properties				
	2014-2019			
Year	Location	Crops		
2014	North	Grapes, Tangerines		
	East	Grapes, Potatoes, Pistachios		
	South	Uncultivated Ag, Grapes		
	West	Grapes, Pistachios		
2015	North	Grapes, Tangerines		
	East	Grapes, Pistachios, Potatoes		
	South	Grapes, Uncultivated Ag		



McIntosh & Associates Project No. 04-157-000

Crops Grown on Adjacent Properties 2014-2019				
Year	Location	Crops		
	West	Grapes, Pistachios		
2016	North	Grapes, Tangerines		
	East	Grapes, Potatoes, Pistachios		
	South	Grapes, Uncultivated Ag		
	West	Grapes, Pistachios		
2017	North	Grapes, Tangerines, Carrots		
	East	Grapes, Uncultivated Ag, Pistachios		
	South	Grapes, Uncultivated Ag		
	West	Uncultivated Ag, Grapes, Pistachios		
2018	North	Grapes, Tangerines, Carrots		
	East	Grapes, Carrots, Pistachios		
	South	Grapes		
	West	Uncultivated Ag, Grapes, Pistachios		
2019-2020	North	Uncultivated Ag, Grapes, Pistachios, Tangerines,		
	East	Grapes, Pistachios		
	South	Grapes		
	West	Uncultivated Ag, Grapes		

Source: Kern County GIS 08-06-20

Table 6 Adjacent Properties Land Use

Adjacent Properties Land Use,							
	General Plan and Zoning						
Location	General Plan	Current Land Use	Zoning				
North	R-IA (Resource Intensive Agriculture) 8.1 (Resource Intensive Agriculture)	Agricultural	A (Exclusive Agriculture)				
South	SI (Service Industrial) LI (Light Industrial)	Agricultural	A (Exclusive Agriculture) M-2 PD (Medium Industrial Precise Development Combining)				
East	R-IA (Resource Intensive Agriculture) R-MP (Resource Mineral & Petroleum) SI (Service Industrial)	Agricultural, Industrial	A (Exclusive Agriculture) M-2 (Medium Industrial) M-2 PD (Medium Industrial Precise Development Combining)				
West	R-IA (Resource Intensive	Highway 99,	Specific Plan – Coberly West				



McIntosh & Associates Project No. 04-157-000

Adjacent Properties Land Use, General Plan and Zoning					
Location	General Plan	Current Land Use	Zoning		
	Agriculture)	Union Pacific			
	HI (Heavy Industrial)	RR, vacant			
	SI (Service Industrial)	Agricultural,			
	(City of Shafter)	Industrial			
	Specific Plan				

Source: Metropolitan Bakersfield General Plan West – March 21, 2013 (County Maintained) and General plan – Central Section – July 27, 2010

Dairy Locations

According to the most recent Kern County Dairy Information provided by the Kern County GIS map, there are currently 64 existing dairies located within Kern County. Nearby dairies are located approximately 15 miles west of the project site and are referenced in Table 7 and Appendix "1-2"



Table 7	Existing	Dairy Farm	Locations
---------	----------	-------------------	-----------

Existing Dairy Farm Locations						
Location	Name	Section	Township	Range	Zone Map	
1	Oasis Holsteins	14	28S	24E	78	
2	Aukeman*	15	28S	24E	78	
3	Faial Land Co Vermeer & Goedhart	22	28S	24E	78	
4	Tjaarda Dairy*	34	28S	24E	78	
5	Goyenetche Family	10	29S	24E	99	
*	Designates dairy approved under "by right" provision					

3.5 Historical and Current Aerial Photographs

The historical and current aerial photographs were reviewed to help establish the history of the subject property. Historically, the majority of the site has been used as agricultural land. The following aerial photographs are provided as listed below (Refer to Appendix "G"):

1937 - Undeveloped and Agricultural land

Phase 1 - The project site is visible as fallow land State Route Highway 99 is visible along the west boundary of the project site. The Lerdo Canal is also visible along the western boundary. Small farms are visible to the west, and east.

Phase 2 – The project site is visibly being actively farmed. Farming activity is also visible west and north.

1952 - Agricultural land

Phase 1 - Farming activity is visible on a portion of the project site. The metal building and irrigation pond are visible in the northeastern portion of the property. State Route Highway 99 is visible along the west boundary of the project site. The Lerdo Canal is also visible along the western boundary. Small farming operations remain in the west and east

Phase 2 – Farming activity remains visible. Farming continues to remain west and north, and farming activity is now visible to the east. State Route Highway 99 is visible along the west boundary of the project site.

1968 - Agricultural land

Phase 1 - A portion of the site continues to be farmed. There is farming activity west and east, along with fallow land to the east. State Route Highway 99 is visible along the west boundary of the project site. The Lerdo Canal is also visible along the western boundary.

Phase 2 – Roughly 50 percent of the project is visibly being farmed. Farming continues west of the site, however the area directly north and east are visibly

fallow. State Route Highway 99 is visible along the west boundary of the project site.

1994 - Agricultural land

Phase 1 – Farming activity is visible throughout the site. The irrigation pond is in the upper northeast corner appears to be operational. Farming actives continue west, north, and east of the site. Area south remains fallow. State Route Highway 99 is visible along the west boundary of the project site. The Lerdo Canal is also visible along the western boundary.

Phase 2 – Approximately 60 percent of the project site is visibly being farmed. Areas north, west and east are being farmed (portion of area east fallow). State Route Highway 99 is visible along the west boundary of the project site.

2005 - Agricultural land

Phase 1 – Aerial photos are now available in color. Farming activity is visible over approximately 50 percent of the property. Areas east, north and south are being farmed. Area west is fallow. State Route Highway 99 is visible along the west boundary of the project site. The Lerdo Canal is also visible along the western boundary.

Phase 2 – Farming continues within the northern 60 percent of the project site. Farming is also visible west, north and east. State Route Highway 99 is visible along the west boundary of the project site.

2012 - Agricultural land

Phase 1 – Farming activity is visible on approximately 50 percent of the site and continues east, north and south. State Route Highway 99 is visible along the west boundary of the project site. The Lerdo Canal is also visible along the western boundary.

Phase 2 – Farming activity is visible on the entire site. Farming activity is visible west, north, and east. State Route Highway 99 is visible along the west boundary of the project site.

2013 - Agricultural land

Phase 1 and 2 are now included on one aerial photo and we are displaying an overlay with the project areas shown. Phase 1 reflects about the same reduction in farming activity as was in 2012. Phase 2 100 percent of the property is being actively farmed.

State Route Highway 99 is visible along the west boundary of the project site. The Lerdo Canal is also visible along the western boundary of Phase 1.



2014 - Agricultural land

Phase 1 and 2 are now included on one aerial photo and we are displaying an overlay with the project areas shown. Phase 1 reflects an increas in farming activity as was reflected in 2013. 75 percent of the south half of Section 30 is fallow. Phase 2 100 percent of the property is actively being farmed.

State Route Highway 99 is visible along the west boundary of the project site. The Lerdo Canal is also visible along the western boundary of Phase 1.

2015 - Agricultural land

Phase 1 and 2 are now included on one aerial photo and we are displaying an overlay with the project areas shown. Phase 1 shows visible increase in farming activity, approximately 10 percent is fallow. Phase 2 reflects a portion of land as being fallow, all remaining property is being actively farmed.

State Route Highway 99 is visible along the west boundary of the project site. The Lerdo Canal is also visible along the western boundary of Phase 1.

2016 - Agricultural land

Phase 1 and 2 are now included on one aerial photo and we are displaying an overlay with the project areas shown. Phase 1 shows visible decrease in farming activity, approximately 20-25 percent is fallow. Phase 2 reflects a portion of land in the center being fallow which represents approximately 20 percent and all remaining property is being actively farmed.

State Route Highway 99 is visible along the west boundary of the project site. The Lerdo Canal is also visible along the western boundary of Phase 1.

2017 - Agricultural land

Phase 1 and 2 are now included on one aerial photo and we are displaying an overlay with the project areas shown. Phase 1 visibly reflects farming activity, approximately 10-15 percent is fallow. Phase 2 reflects a change from 2016 as the center portion of land is being actively farmed. Portions of the northern property and all of the southern property are fallow.

State Route Highway 99 is visible along the west boundary of the project site. The Lerdo Canal is also visible along the western boundary of Phase 1.

2018 - Agricultural land

Phase 1 and 2 are now included on one aerial photo and we are displaying an overlay with the project areas shown. Phase 1 visibly reflects farming activity



McIntosh & Associates Project No. 04-157-000

throughout the entire property. Phase 2 reflects a change from 2017 in that additional property at the north boundary is fallow and all of the southern property is fallow.

State Route Highway 99 is visible along the west boundary of the project site. The Lerdo Canal is also visible along the western boundary of Phase 1.

3.6 Agricultural Crops and Yields for the Year 2014 - 2018

According to the farmer, the agricultural crops grown on the subject property for the years 2014 through 2018 consisted of table grape crops. The 2019 growing year was incomplete during the preparation of this document, instead crop data from 2018 will be used as it is the last complete growing year for which data is available.

The yield per acre, cost to produce, and net value of each year's crop is listed in Table 8.

Agricultural Crops - 2018 Portion of Sections 24 & 25, Township 28S., Range 26E., and Sections 29 & 30. T28S, R27E., M.D.M.								
Year	Сгор	Acres	Yield Per Acre (Ton)	Total Yield (Ton)	Unit Value	Cost to produce per acre	Net Value	Net Value Per unit
2018	Table Grapes	588	10	5880	\$1676	*\$10,888	\$3,452,736	\$587.20
	Fallow	150						
*	Based upon University of California Cooperative Extension, Cost and Return Studies							

Table 8 Agricultural Crops and Yields for the Year 2018

Table Grapes – Table Grapes were ranked number one of the top five crops grown in Kern County for the year 2018. The typical yield of table grapes is 12.02 tons per acre and the cost to produce table grapes is estimated at \$10,888.00 per acre (*Based upon University of California Cooperative Extension, Cost and Return Studies*). The table grape crop value is estimated at \$1,676.00 per ton per Kern County 2018 Crop Report. Therefore, the net crop value is approximately \$587.20 per ton, or \$3,452,736 for the 588 acres of table grape crop.

3.7 Agricultural Crops and Yields for the Year 2013-2017

Agricultural crops grown on the subject property for the years 2013 through 2017 consisted of table grape crops. The yield per acre, cost to produce, and net value of each years' crop is listed in Table 9.



Agricultural Crops - 2014-2017 Portion of Section 7, Township 31S., Range 28E., M.D.M.									
Year	Crop	Acres	Yield Per Acre (Ton)	Total Yield (Ton)	Unit Value	Cost to produce per acre	Net Value	Net Value Per unit	
2017	Table Grapes	638	10	6380	\$2,020	*\$10,888	\$5,941,056	\$931.20	
2016	Table Grapes	688	10	6880	\$2,025	*\$10,888	\$6,441,056	\$936.20	
2015	Table Grapes	733	10	7330	\$2,047	*\$10,888	\$7,023,606	\$958.20	
2014	Table Grapes	733	10	7330	\$1,900	*\$10,888	\$5,946,096	\$811.20	
2013	Table Grapes	733	10	7330	\$1,811	*\$10,888	\$5,293,726	\$722.20	
*	Based upon University of California Cooperative Extension, Cost and Return Studies								

Table 9 Agricultural Crops 2014-2017

<u>2017</u>

Table Grapes – Table Grapes were ranked number one of the top five crops grown in Kern County for the year 2017. The typical yield of table grapes is 11 tons per acre and the cost to produce table grapes is estimated at \$10,888.00 per acre (*Based upon University of California Cooperative Extension, Cost and Return Studies*). The table grape crop value is estimated at \$2,020.00 per ton per Kern County 2017 Crop Report. Therefore, the net crop value is approximately \$931.20 per ton, or \$5,941,056 for the 638 acres of table grape crop.

<u>2016</u>

Table Grapes – Table Grapes were ranked number one of the top five crops grown in Kern County for the year 2016. The typical yield of table grapes is 11.78 tons per acre and the cost to produce table grapes is estimated at \$10,888.00 per acre (*Based upon University of California Cooperative Extension, Cost and Return Studies*). The table grape crop value is estimated at \$2,025.00 per ton per Kern County 2016 Crop Report. Therefore, the net crop value is approximately \$936.20 per ton, or \$6,441,056 for the 688 acres of table grape crop.



<u>2015</u>

Table Grapes – Table Grapes were ranked number one of the top five crops grown in Kern County for the year 2015. The typical yield of table grapes is 11.58 tons per acre and the cost to produce table grapes is estimated at \$10,888.00 per acre (*Based upon University of California Cooperative Extension, Cost and Return Studies*). The table grape crop value is estimated at \$2,047.00 per ton per Kern County 2015 Crop Report. Therefore, the net crop value is approximately \$958.20 per ton, or \$7,023,606 for the 733 acres of table grape crop.

<u>2014</u>

Table Grapes – Table Grapes were ranked number one of the top five crops grown in Kern County for the year 2014. The typical yield of table grapes is 12.85 tons per acre and the cost to produce table grapes is estimated at \$10,888.00 per acre (*Based upon University of California Cooperative Extension, Cost and Return Studies*). The table grape crop value is estimated at \$1,900.00 per ton per Kern County 2014 Crop Report. Therefore, the net crop value is approximately \$811.20 per ton, or \$5,946,096 for the 733 acres of table grape crop.

<u>2013</u>

Table Grapes – Table Grapes were ranked number one of the top five crops grown in Kern County for the year 2013. The typical yield of table grapes is 13.61 tons per acre and the cost to produce table grapes is estimated at \$10,888.00 per acre (*Based upon University of California Cooperative Extension, Cost and Return Studies*). The table grape crop value is estimated at \$1,811.00 per ton per Kern County 2013 Crop Report. Therefore, the net crop value is approximately \$722.20 per ton, or \$5,293,726 for the 733 acres of table grape crop.

3.8 Soils

As defined by the United Stated Department of Agriculture (USDA), prime farmland is land that has the best combination of physical and chemical characteristics for producing food, feed, forage, fiber, and oilseed crops and that is available for these uses. It has the combination of soil properties, growing season, and moisture supply needed to produce sustained high yields of crops in an economic manner if it is treated and managed according to acceptable farming methods. Prime farmland soils produce the highest yields with minimal units of energy and economic resources, and farming in these soils result in the least damage to the environment.

The USDA Soil Survey of Kern County, California - Northwestern Part were utilized to determine the soil units occurring within the proposed site and are listed in Table 10.

Table 10 USDA Soil Survey

USDA Soil Survey of Kern County, California - Northwestern Part						
Man	Map Unit Name	Capability	V Classification	Land	Acres in	
Unit		Irrigated	Non-irrigated	Capability Class	Site	
(138)	Delano sandy loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes	1	6с	Π	93.05	
(145)	Driver course sandy loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes	2s	7s	Π	402.47	
(146) ne	Delano sandy loam, 1 to 5 percent slopes	2e	бе	IIIe	81.97	
(174)	Kimberlina fine sandy loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes MLRA 17	1	7e	Π	113.73	
(184)	Lewkalb sandy loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes	2s	7s	IIs	45.79	
(257)	Water				1.47	

The number and symbol following each soil type represent the index symbol and number of the Soil Conservation Service Soil Survey map unit.

(138) Delano sandy loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes:

Very deep, well drained soil with 0 to 2 percent slopes. It is formed in alluvium weathered from granite. The typical profile of this soil unit includes a 0 to 6 inch deep surface layer, dark brown fine sandy loam. The underlying material includes a layer located at a depth of 6 to 11 inches with pale brown, sandy loam brown. 11-63 inches with light brown to yellowish brown, sandy clay to sandy loam. Potential rooting depth is 60 inches.

Permeability is moderately slow and available water capacity is high. Surface runoff is slow. The hazard of water erosion and wind erosion is slight to moderate respectively. The hazard of flooding is rare. The shrink-swell potential is low and the corrosivity class is high for steel and moderate for concrete.

Current uses of areas on this type of soils are irrigated crops, rangeland, and home site development. Commonly grown crops are cotton, alfalfa, dry beans, carrots, lettuce, corn, barley, and wheat. If this unit is used for irrigated crops, the major management factor is soil stratification, deep leaching, and dust hazards. Approximately 93.05 acres of the proposed project site are in this category. These soils are in capability class IIs-0 irrigated and capability class VIIe non-irrigated (Refer to Tables 11 and 12). It is considered prime farmland where water for irrigation is available. (USDA Northwestern Kern Soil Survey).

(145) Delano sandy loam, 1 to 5 percent slopes:

Very deep, well drained soil with 0 to 2 percent slopes. It is formed in alluvium weathered from granite. The typical profile of this soil unit includes a 0 to 6 inch



McIntosh & Associates Project No. 04-157-000

deep surface layer, dark brown fine sandy loam. The underlying material includes a layer located at a depth of 6 to 11 inches with pale brown, sandy loam brown. 11-63 inches with light brown to yellowish brown, sandy clay to sandy loam. Potential rooting depth is 60 inches.

Permeability is moderately slow and available water capacity is high. Surface runoff is slow. The hazard of water erosion and wind erosion is slight to moderate respectively. The hazard of flooding is rare. The shrink-swell potential is low and the corrosivity class is high for steel and moderate for concrete.

Current uses of areas on this type of soils are irrigated crops, rangeland, and home site development. Commonly grown crops are cotton, alfalfa, dry beans, carrots, lettuce, corn, barley, and wheat. If this unit is used for irrigated crops, the major management factor is soil stratification, deep leaching, and dust hazards. Approximately 93.05 acres of the proposed project site are in this category. These soils are in capability class IIs-0 irrigated and capability class VIIe non-irrigated (Refer to Tables 11 and 12). It is considered prime farmland where water for irrigation is available. (USDA Northwestern Kern Soil Survey).

(174) Kimberlina fine sandy loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes MLRA 17:

Very deep, well drained soil with 0 to 2 percent slopes. It is formed on flood plains and recent alluvium fans. These soils formed in mixed alluvium derived dominantly from igneous and or sedimentary rock sources. The typical profile of this soil unit includes a 0 to 9 inch deep surface layer, brown fine sandy loam, dark grayish brown. The underlying material includes a layer located at a depth of 9 to 31 inches with pale brown, fine sandy loam brown. 31-45 inches with pale brown to dark greyish brown. Potential rooting depth is 60 inches.

Permeability is well drained, negligible to medium runoff, moderately rapid and moderate permeability, however saline-sodic phases and soils with sandy clay loam substratums have moderately slow permeability.

Current uses of areas on this type of soils are irrigated field, forage, and row crops. Approximately 113.73 acres of the proposed project site are in this category. These soils are in capability class IIs-0 irrigated and capability class VIIe non-irrigated (Refer to Tables 11 and 12). It is considered prime farmland where water for irrigation is available. (USDA Northwestern Kern Soil Survey).

(184) Lewkalb sandy loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes:

Deep, well drained soil with 0 to 2 percent slopes. It is formed in sedimentary and granitic alluvium. The typical profile of this soil unit includes a 0 to 2 inch deep surface layer, light brownish grey sandy loam, dark greyish brown. The underlying material includes a layer located at a depth of 2 to 23 inches with pale



McIntosh & Associates Project No. 04-157-000

brown, sandy loam brown. 23-40 inches with light gray sandy loam, light brownish grey. 40-65 inches, light grey loamy sand, light brownish grey.

Permeability is will drained, very slow or slow runoff, permeability is is moderate or moderately rapid in the surface horizons and slow in the underlying silca cemented horizons. Current uses of areas on this type of soils are used mainly for range. When water is available, irrigated crops such as cotton, alfalfa, sugar beets, potatoes, and carrots are grown. Vegetation is mainly red brome, foxtail fescue, and filaree and is within the California prairie vegetation type I the Kuchler map.

Approximately 45.79 acres of the proposed project site are in this category. These soils are in capability class IIs-0 irrigated and capability class VIIe nonirrigated (Refer to Tables 11 and 12). It is considered prime farmland where water for irrigation is available. (USDA Northwestern Kern Soil Survey).

The USDA Northwestern Kern Soil Survey states which soil units meet the requirements for prime farmland if water for irrigation is available. According to the Northwestern Soil Survey, the entire site, approximately 748.38 acres is classified as prime farmland if water for irrigation is available.

However, as defined by the California Land Conservation act (G.C. § 51201), prime agricultural soils include Class I and II soils, storie index 80-100 soils, vineyards and orchards, and soils which yield a minimum of \$200 an acre per year. As previously noted in Section 2.3 of this study, the MBGP – Conservation/Soils and Agriculture Element – states among its Goals to "Promote soil conservation and minimize development of prime agricultural land as defined by the following criteria:

- Capability Class I and/or II irrigated soils;
- 80-100 Storie Index rating;
- gross crop return of \$200 or more per acre per year;
- annual carrying capacity of one animal unit per acre per year"

The proposed project site is comprised of (138) Delano sandy loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes (93.05 acres); (145) Delano sandy loam, 1 to 5 percent slopes (402.47 acres); (174) Kimberlina fine sandy loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes MLRA 17 (113.73); and (184) Lewkalb sandy loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes (45.79 acres) which are classified by the United States Department of Agriculture Soil Conservation Service, are Class II's and III's soils respectively. This soil unit is also classified as a prime farmland soil by the Kern County Soil Survey, Northwestern Kern. Therefore, the entire site is considered prime per the California Land Conservation Act and the MBGP definition. Approval and implementation of the land use change will result in a loss of approximately 738.48 acres of prime agricultural land.



3.8.1 Land Capability Classifications

As defined by the United Stated Department of Agriculture (USDA), the land capability classification shows the suitability of soils for most kinds of field crops. The soils are grouped according to their limitations for field crops, the risk of damage if they are used for crops, and the way they respond to management.

In the Capability system, soils are generally grouped at three levels: capability class, subclass, and unit. Capability subclasses are soil groups within a class. They are designated by adding a, e,w,s, or c to the class number, for example IIe. The letter e shows the main limitation as erosion unless close-growing plant cover is maintained; w shows that water in or on the soil interferes with plant growth or cultivation; s shows that the soil is limited mainly because it is shallow, droughty, or stony; and c, used in only some parts of the United States, shows that the chief limitation is climate that is very cold or very dry.

Capability units are soil groups within a subclass. The soils in a capability unit are enough alike to be suited to the same crops and pasture plants, to require similar management, and to have similar productivity. Capability units are designated by adding an Arabic numeral to the subclass symbol, for example, IIe-1 or IIIe-8. The numbers used to designate units within the subclass are as indicated in Table 12 below:

United Stated Department of Agriculture (USDA)					
Land Capability Classifications					
Class	Definition				
Class I	Soil has few limitations that restrict their use				
Class II	Soil has moderate limitations that reduce the choice of plants or that require moderate conservation practices				
Class III	Soil has severe limitations that reduce the choice of plants or require special conservation practices, or both				
Class IV	Soil has severe limitations that reduce the choice of plants or that require very careful management, or both.				
Class V	Soils are not likely to erode but have other limitations, impractical to remove, that limit their use.				
Class VI	Soil has severe limitations that make them generally unsuitable for cultivation				
Class VII	Soil has severe limitations that make them unsuitable for cultivation				
Class VIII	Soils and miscellaneous areas have limitations that nearly preclude their use for commercial crop production				

Table 11 USDA Land Capability Classifications



Table 12 La	and Capa	bility Units
-------------	----------	--------------

	United Stated Department of Agriculture (USDA)					
Land Capability Units						
Number	Definition					
0	Indicates limitations caused by stony, cobbly, or gravelly material in the substratum.					
1	Indicates limitations caused by slope or by an actual or potential erosion hazard.					
2	Indicates a limitation of wetness caused by poor drainage or flooding.					
3	Indicates a limitation of slow or very slow permeability of the subsoil or substratum is caused by a clayey subsoil or by a substratum that is semi-consolidated.					
4	Indicates a low available water capacity in sandy or gravely soils.					
5	Indicates limitations caused by a fine textured or very fine textured surface layer.					
6	Indicates limitations caused by salts or alkali.					
7	Indicates limitations caused by rocks, stones, or cobblestones.					
8	Indicates that the soil has a very low or low available water capacity because the root zone generally is less than 40 inches deep over massive bedrock.					
9	Indicates limitations caused by low or very low fertility, acidity, or toxicity that cannot be corrected by adding normal amounts of fertilizer, lime, or other amendments.					
10	Indicates a high organic matter content, peats, and mucks.					

No unit designations are shown for class I soils because the soil characteristics are similar for all soils in the class. Unit designations are not given for soils in classes V through VIII because these soils normally are not intensively managed as cropland.

3.9 Water

The most recent data provided by the Cawelo Water District GSA Groundwater Sustainability Plan (Spring 2017) indicates that the unconfined water table range from approximately 20 to 120 feet below ground surface (bgs) beneath the project site. Four active, (150 hp) electric-powered irrigation wells are situated in various locations on the project site. Irrigation ponds are also utilized for purpose of irrigation. The method of irrigation used on the subject property is drip irrigation.

3.10 Climate

Bakersfield's climate is considered Mediterranean (*Köppen Csa*) and is characterized by hot, dry summers and cool, wet winters. Bakersfield's temperature exceeds 100 degrees for an average of 33 days a year and several days each summer can be expected to top 110 degrees. Temperatures can drop below freezing approximately 12 days annually. The precipitation averages 39 days a year. Bakersfield has an average of 272 sunny days per year and 93 cloudy days per year. The average rainfall (30-year period) is 6.45 inches per year.



4.0 Impacts of Farmland Conversion

4.1 Methodology

This study utilizes a combination of the analysis of factors provided in the MBGP and the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (LESA, California Department of Conservation – Office of Land Conservation, 1997) to identify the proposed project's potential impact to agricultural lands.

4.2 Metropolitan Bakersfield General Plan, and Kern County General Plan Factors

The MBGP recommends that certain factors be evaluated when determining the appropriateness of proposed agricultural conversions (MBGP, page V-13). These factors include:

- Soil quality
- Availability of irrigation water
- Proximity to non-agricultural uses
- Proximity to intensive parcelization
- Effect of properties subject to Williamson Act land use contracts
- Ability to be provided with urban services such as sewer, water, roads, etc.
- Ability to affect the application of agricultural chemicals on nearby agricultural properties
- Ability to create a precedent-setting situation that leads to the premature conversion of prime agricultural lands
- Demonstrated project need
- Necessity of buffers such as lower densities, setbacks, etc.

According to the KCGP, when evaluating General Plan Amendment proposals to change a Map Code 8.1 (Intensive Agriculture) designation to industrial development, the County shall consider the following factors:

- Locations for new industrial activities shall be provided with adequate infrastructure (water, sewage disposal systems, roads, drainage, etc.) to minimize effects on County services.
- Provide for the clustering of new industrial development adjacent to existing industrial uses and along major transportation corridors.
- Require that industrial uses provide design features such as screen walls, landscaping, increased height and/or setbacks, and lighting restrictions between the boundaries of adjacent residential land use designations so as to reduce impacts on residences due to light, noise, sound, and vibration.
- Requests for new Map Code 7.2 (Service Industrial) designations should be discouraged on sites contiguous to or located within 1/4 mile of residentially designated property.



- All industrial development equal to or greater than 40 acres in a rural area will require the adoption of a Specific Plan prior to development approval.
- Where feasible, locate future industrial activities in close proximity to railroad facilities and inter- and intra-State transportation corridors to minimize extensive travel through urban areas and to promote alternative transportation of goods.

This section includes a general discussion of the above-mentioned factors. This study's findings regarding these factors are included in Section 6.0 Conclusions.

In California, the nation's leading farm state, the issue is complicated by widely varying numbers about the extent of conversion and by contrasting opinions about the causes and consequences of farmland loss. The Metropolitan Bakersfield General Plan area has been experiencing intense urbanization for the last two decades, and is actively annexing properties by providing the infrastructure needed to serve more densely populated communities. Urbanization in farming areas typically begins with conversion of one or a few parcels adjacent to the city limit line. The encroachment of urban uses on existing agricultural areas is prevalent adjacent to the City, where both farmers and urban neighbors operate with both negative and positive consequences. The challenge is to minimize the negative interactions and create the conditions for a long-term and mutually beneficial coexistence between farmers and urban residents. The negative interactions can be divided into the impacts that farmers can have on urban neighbors and the impacts that urban neighbors can have on farmers.

Farming operations can affect urban neighbors by creating inconveniences or discomforts such as equipment noise, odors from manure and other chemicals, and dust or smoke. Farming operations may also result in impacts such as traffic of farm machinery on the streets. The introduction of adjacent residential uses creates a greater number of land use conflicts than non-residential urban uses such as commercial and industrial uses.

The introduction of urban uses in existing agricultural areas can affect farming operations. Urban uses can create adverse impacts such as the introduction of pests, disease and weeds, increased flooding and siltation, and increased traffic, vandalism, and trespassing. In Kern County, a farmer must receive a "Restricted Materials Permit" to apply chemicals to the crops, and the Kern County Department of Agriculture monitors the application by permits, to ensure that it is applied within regulations. For example, there are restrictions on the application of cotton harvest aides (DEF, Folex, Paraquat) during the cotton defoliation season. DEF, Folex and Paraquat shall not be applied within 1/8 mile of any school. Paraquat should not be applied within 1/8 mile of any residential zoned or inhabited area, or within 1/4 mile if applied by air. DEF or Folex shall not be applied within 1/2 mile of any area zoned as residential or any school in session or due to be in session within 24 hours. Restrictions to chemical and pesticides application are an additional impact on farming operations resulting from residential developments near existing agricultural areas.



McIntosh & Associates Project No. 04-157-000

The proposed project may have an impact on local growers. Farmers near the proposed project will inevitably be affected by the planned development. Substantial planned urban development on properties near the proposed project site indicates that this site is in the logical path of development. In addition, Highway 99 would provide a buffer between uses within the project site and agricultural activities west of it. The future Expressway would provide adequate circulation for the project site and neighboring uses.

The conversion of this property from agricultural use to industrial use is not expected to create cumulative or growth-inducing impacts to other nearby farmlands. Existing land use designation of properties to the south and southeast, as well as, proposed and pending land use designation amendments and planned future development of properties to the west and southwest (shown in Appendix "B") demonstrate that the project is along the logical path of urban development and the proposed project in itself will not induce further growth.

The impact of the proposed industrial development on local growers is considered minimal because of the restrictions and limitations that are already in place as a result of rural residential development near the project site.

Existing and planned urban development on properties directly adjacent to, and near the proposed project site indicates that this site is in the logical path of development. The following factors indicate that the proposed project area and adjacent properties will be affected by future urban development:

- The Proposed Expressway Alignment is located along the central project area of Phase 1.
- Proposed Highway 99 on and off ramps at Burbank Blvd.

Planned future development (shown in Appendix "B", Proposed Projects near the Subject Property) and planned roadway system expansion near the proposed project site demonstrate that the project is along the logical path of urban development.

4.3 California Department of Conservation - Factors

In this section, prime farmland is defined and discussed, and the prime farmland soils in the project site are listed in Table 10. As defined by the USDA, are soils that are best suited to producing food, seed, forage, fiber, and oilseed crops. In addition, prime farmland produces the highest yields with minimal units of energy and economic resources, and farming theses soils results in the least damage to the environment.

Prime farmland soils commonly get an adequate and dependable supply of moisture from precipitation or irrigation. Temperature and growing season are favorable, and the level of acidity or alkalinity is acceptable. The soils have few rocks and are permeable to water and air, not excessively erodible or saturated with water for long periods and are not flooded during the growing season. The project site (314.31



acres) would meet the requirements for prime farmland if undeveloped and water for irrigation is available.

4.3.1 Seven Categories of Important Farmland

The California Department of Conservation has determined seven categories of Important Farmland:

<u>Prime Farmland</u> - This has the best combination of physical and chemical characteristics for crop production. It has the soil quality, growing seasons and moisture supply needed to produce sustained high yield crops when treated and managed, including water management, according to current farming methods. Implementation of the proposed project will result in a loss of approximately 314.31 acres of soil considered prime farmland soil by the Kern County Soil Survey, Southwest Kern if water for irrigation is available.

<u>Farmland of Statewide Importance</u> - This is land other than prime farmland that has a good combination of physical and chemical characteristics for the production of crops, and has been used for the production of irrigated crops within the last three years. None of the project site is in this category.

<u>Unique Farmland</u> – This is land that does not meet the criteria for Prime Farmland or Farmland of Statewide Importance, and land that is currently used for the production of specific high economic value crops. It has the special combination of soil quality, location, growing season and moisture supply needed to produce sustained high quality or high yields of specific crops (i.e. oranges, olives, avocados, cut flowers) when treated and managed according to current farming methods. This category excludes abandoned orchards or vineyards. None of the project site is in this category.

<u>Farmland of Local Importance</u> – This land produces crops or has the capability of production, or is used for the production of confined livestock. It is other than Prime, Statewide Importance or Unique Farmland. It may be important to the local economy due to its productivity. A local advisory committee set up by the SCS in each county initially identified farmland of Local Importance. The Kern County Board of Supervisors has determined that there will be no Farmland of Local Importance in Kern County. None of the project site is in this category.

<u>Grazing Land</u> – This is land on which the existing vegetation, whether grown naturally or through management, is suitable for grazing or browsing of livestock. It is identified in minimum mapping units of 40 acres and does not include land previously identified above. None of the project site is in this category.

<u>Urban and Built-up Land</u> – This land is used for residential, industrial, commercial, construction, institutional, public administrative purposes, etc. None of the project site is in this category.

McIntosh & Associates Project No. 04-157-000

<u>Other Land</u> – This is land not included in any of the other mapping categories and generally includes rural development with a density of less than one structure per 1.5 acres, marginal agricultural lands, brush, timber, roads and other rural land uses.

4.4 Buffer Zones

Buffer zones are well-defined strips of land located between farmland and urban development used to minimize possible conflicts between these uses. Buffers essentially create a separation between agricultural and urban uses, which minimize negative impacts on both sides of an edge boundary, especially the effects of chemical drift from farming activity. Agricultural buffers come in different forms—natural barriers created by landscape features such as waterways, roads, landscaping, walls, residential setbacks, open space greenbelts, and combinations of various types. Key issues in their design and creation are their permanence, maintenance, and which of the landowners—developer/homeowner or farmer will provide the land or barrier.

If developments adjacent to agricultural fields do not include buffer zones in their design, the burden falls upon the grower to provide a buffer between these uses. This often means the grower must allocate a portion of their land to the creation of a buffer zone. As an example, growers might be required to refrain from spraying or harvesting the outside rows of their crops. In those cases, buffer zones represent a loss to the farmer of both crop production and income. However, with commercial development, a buffer zone may include a parking lot or landscape area. Farmers can utilize their entire site for crop production if the adjacent development is commercial or industrial in nature, as these types of uses are not considered to be sensitive receptors.

The MBGP policy implementation for the Land Use Plan states that "Suitable land use buffers, such as transitional lot sizes, shall be planned so as to intervene between existing agricultural uses and planned urban uses."

The roadway rights-of-way will serve as buffers for the proposed development along some of the subject site's boundaries, such as adjacent to existing Imperial Avenue and Burbank Street. In addition, State Route 99 on the west boundary provides a buffer between the project site and adjacent agricultural land.

4.5 Water Supply

Water is an important input in crop production. It has been the most important factor responsible for yield increases in the past 20 years. Some water districts have limits on the amount of water they can deliver to agricultural crops. Water demands change somewhat when croplands are converted to urban uses. Net irrigation requirements give the average amount of water required by specific crops at given locations in addition to the amount of water normally received there in the form of precipitation. Urban water consumption depends on the land use established. Some industrial users, such as food processors, require very



large volumes of water. Commercial uses require less water than industrial uses, but more water than residential uses.

Vegetable irrigation in a drought year with potential periods of power outages and the announcements of reduced water supply can severely reduce vegetable yields. Growers have seen increases in water supply costs for their crops, which are attributed to the higher costs on energy to run the pump.

The agricultural water wells on the project site will be abandoned when the agricultural production ceases in anticipation of the pending industrial development.

4.6 Water Quality

The amount and type of water contamination generated in urban areas differ from those generated in farmlands. Urbanization usually results in increased surface water concentrations of fecal coliforms, oil, grease, and heavy metals. Most farmers systematically apply a variety of pesticides and fertilizers to their crops. Some of these chemicals reach the soil and eventually leach into the groundwater. Soil and groundwater contamination also occur where chemicals are mixed or stored, where wells are constructed or abandoned, and through rainwater infiltration. Agricultural application of pesticides accounts for approximately 92 percent of all pesticide use in California (including chlorine).

Conversion of farmlands to urban use decreases the area whereon which vegetation is treated with chemicals decreases due to the addition of impervious surfaces associated with non-agricultural uses.

4.7 Competition for Water

California has a relatively abundant supply of water, but the state's Mediterranean climate and varied geography results in an uneven spatial and temporal distribution of water supply. The Sierra Nevada Mountain range that lines the eastern edge of the State capture and store precipitation that occurs in the winter that can be used for summer irrigation in the Central Valley. Average annual statewide precipitation is about 23 inches, corresponding to a volume of 200 million acre-feet. About 65 percent of this precipitation is consumed through evaporation and transpiration by trees, plants, and other vegetation. The remaining 35 percent comprises the state's average annual runoff of about 71 million acre-feet.

The DWR projects a decline in California's irrigated acreage by 2020, due in part to urbanization of agricultural lands in the San Joaquin Valley. Potential changes in water use resulting from land use conversion is of concern by local agencies responsible for land use planning or for providing water supplies.

Changes in water usage depends on the types of crops grown, and the density and type of urban development in an area. In the case of single-family dwellings, applied water use varies with housing density. Numerous studies have shown



McIntosh & Associates Project No. 04-157-000

that dwellings on larger lots use more water per dwelling unit due to the larger landscaped areas. However, higher density developments have the greater applied water use per acre of land. A recent DWR study showed that applied water use of single-family dwellings and agricultural crops were similar at low housing densities (four or five units per acre). However, higher density singlefamily dwellings (six units or more per acre) that have become common in today's new home construction market tended to have greater applied water requirements than some crops. See Table 13.

Water Requirements					
Urban and Agricultural					
Type of UseApplied Water Use (af/acre)					
Urban	3.2				
Agricultural 3.35					
Source: California Department of Water Resources Bulletin #132-17					

Table 13 Water Requirements – Urban and Agricultural

Project Site - Crop Irrigation							
Year	Crop	Acres	H ₂ 0-AcFt /Ac.	Total AcFt			
2019	Table Grapes	313	3.6	1,126.8			
2018	Table Grapes	588	3.6	2,116.8			
2017	Table Grapes	638	3.6	2,296.8			
2016	Table Grapes	688	3.6	2,476.8			
2015	Table Grapes	733	3.6	2,638.8			
2014	Table Grapes	733	3.6	2,638.8			
Source: ht	Source: http://coststudies.ucdavis.edu/						

Table 14 Crop Irrigation Requirements for Subject Property

Continued growth has caused expansion of urban development onto adjoining agricultural lands in the area. The DWR urban water usage (urban water use includes residential, commercial, and industrial purposes) is equivalent to about 3.2 af/acre. The typical agricultural applied water use for table grapes is 3.6 af./acre.



McIntosh & Associates Project No. 04-157-000

As agricultural conversion replaces agricultural water users with urban water usage, the average fixed costs of maintaining and operating agricultural water delivery systems increase. Agricultural water consumption could eventually decrease below the minimum threshold necessary to operate delivery systems economically.

4.8 Effects on Other Agricultural Properties or Operations

Other changes in the existing environment could affect adjacent agricultural land by limiting the agricultural feasibility of the land. The following types of effects from agricultural conversion could generally reduce agricultural feasibility:

- Conversion of farmland may affect nearby growers by placing restrictions and limitations on pesticides, fungicides, and herbicides used on the crops. Restrictions could also be placed on noise, burning, and dust.
- Layout and design of the proposed high cube buildings within close proximity could block the sun or cast shadows on the crops.
- Vehicle emissions from adjacent transportation routes and increased roadways can impact the health and survival of the crops.
- Because of increased residential and commercial development, the farmers' share of the water supply could decline as competition for water increases. Agricultural water consumption could eventually decrease below the minimum threshold necessary to operate delivery systems economically.
- As urbanization proceeds in Bakersfield, land prices may increase above the land's value for agricultural production.
- Increased traffic congestion reduces the efficiency and increases the hazards of moving crops and farm machinery along rural roads. Road congestion also increases the amount of time required to transport crops, which in turn increases shipping costs and the risk of spoilage.
- Croplands and nearby agricultural lands that support farming are important sources of food, water, and cover for some native plants and animals. These resources are largely eliminated when farmlands are converted to urban use.
- Vandalism is on the rise in the Metropolitan Bakersfield area. Fields adjacent to highways experience unauthorized entry most frequently. Trespass, crop pilferage, and damage to irrigation equipment have become common problems in Kern County. Farmers often incur major costs when farm equipment has to be left unguarded overnight and is damaged from vandalism.

Planned development near the proposed project site and planned roadway system expansion near and within the proposed project site demonstrate indicate



that the subject property is along the logical path of urban development. Planned development adjacent to the proposed project site shows that restrictions and limitations will inevitably be placed on the grower with the proximity of urban uses. In addition, planned roadways will contribute to create a buffer between the proposed project and adjacent farming operations. The implementation of the Mitigation Measures outlined in Section 5 will greatly reduce the project's impact on other agricultural properties, considering them minimal.

With respect to cumulative growth-inducing impacts, the conversion of this property from agricultural to commercial and industrial uses would increase the total acreage of urban uses.

4.9 California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model – LESA

Land Evaluation and Site Assessment (LESA) is a term used to define an approach for rating the relative quality of land resources based upon specific measurable features. The formulation of the California Agricultural LESA Model is the result of Senate Bill 850 (Chapter 812/1993), which charges the Resources Agency, in consultation with the Governor's Office of Planning and Research, to develop an amendment to Appendix G of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines. Such an amendment is intended "to provide lead agencies with an optional methodology to ensure significant effects on the environment of agricultural land conversions are quantitatively and consistently considered in the environmental review process" (Public Resources Code Section 21095).

A LESA Model is created by defining and measuring two separate set of factors. The first set, Land Evaluation (LE), includes two different factors (Land Capability Classification Rating and Storie Index Rating) that are intended to measure the inherent, soil-based qualities of land as they relate to agricultural suitability.

The second set, Site Assessment (SA), includes factors that are intended to measure social, economic, and geographic attributes that also contribute to the overall value of agricultural land. This second set includes four different factors to provide measures of a give project's size, water resource availability, surrounding agricultural lands, and surrounding protected resource lands.

For a given project, each of these six factors is separately rated in a 100-point scale. The factors are then weighted relative to one another and combined, resulting in a single numeric score for a given project, with a maximum attainable score of 100 points. This final project score becomes the basis for making a determination of a project's potential impacts level of significance, based upon a range of established scoring thresholds.

4.9.1 Land Evaluation Factors

The California Agricultural LESA Model includes two LE factors that are separately rated:

- a. <u>The Land Capability Classification Rating (LCC).</u> The LCC indicates the suitability of soils for most kinds of crops. Groupings are made according to the limitations of the soils when used to grow crops and the risk of damage to soils when used in agriculture. Soils are rated from Class I to Class VIII, with soils having the fewest limitations receiving the highest rating (Class I). Specific Subclasses are also utilized to further characterize soils (refer to Table 1A and Table 2 in Appendix "J").
- b. <u>The Storie Index Rating.</u> The Storie Index provides a numeric rating (based upon a 100 scale) of the relative degree of suitability or value of a given soil for intensive agriculture. The rating is based upon soil characteristics only. Four factors that represent the inherent characteristics and qualities of the soil are considered in the Storie Index rating. The factors are: profile characteristics, texture of the surface layer, slope, and other factors such as drainage or salinity (refer to Table 1A in Appendix "J"). In some situations, only the USDA's LCC information may be available. In those cases, the Storie Index ratings can be calculated from information contained in soil surveys by qualified soil scientists. If, however, limitation of time and/or resources restrict the derivation of the Storie Index rating solely upon the LCC rating.

4.9.2 Site Assessment Factors

The four SA factors that are separately rated and included in the California Agricultural LESA Model are:

- **a.** <u>The Project Size Rating.</u> The Project Size rating is based upon identifying acreage figures for three separate grouping of soil classes within the project site, and then determining with grouping generates the highest Project Size score. The Project Size Rating relies upon acreage figures that were tabulated under the Land Capability Classification Rating (refer to Table 1B and Table 3 in Appendix "J").
- **b.** <u>The Water Resources Availability Rating.</u> The Water Resources Availability rating is based upon identifying the various water sources that may supply a given property, and then determining whether different restrictions in supply are likely to take place in years that are characterized as being periods of drought and non drought (refer to Table 4 and Table 5 in Appendix "J").
- **c.** <u>The Surrounding Agricultural Land Rating.</u> Determination of the Surrounding Agricultural Land rating is based upon identification of a


McIntosh & Associates Project No. 04-157-000

project's Zone of Influence (ZOI), which is defined as that land near a given project, both directly adjoining and within a defined distance away, that is likely to influence, and be influenced, by the agricultural land use of the subject project site. The Surrounding Agricultural Land rating is designed to provide a measurement of the level of agricultural land use for lands in close proximity to a given project. The California Agricultural LESA Model rates the potential significance of the conversion of an agricultural parcel that has a large proportion of surrounding land in agricultural production more highly than one that has relatively small percentage of surrounding land in agricultural production. The definition of the ZOI that accounts for surrounding lands up to a minimum of one quarter mile from the project boundary is the result of several iterations during model development for assessing an area that will generally be a representative sample of surrounding land use (refer to Table 6 in Appendix "J").

- **d.** <u>The Surrounding Protected Resource Land Rating.</u> The Surrounding Protected Resource Land rating is essentially an extension of the Surrounding Agricultural Land rating, and it is scored in a similar manner (refer to Table 7 in Appendix "E"). Protected resource lands are those lands with long-term use restrictions that are compatible with or supportive of agricultural uses of land. Included among them are the following:
 - Williamson Act contracted lands
 - Publicly owned lands maintained as a park, forest, or watershed resources
 - Lands with agricultural, wildlife habitat, open space, or other natural resource easements that restrict the conversion of such land to urban and industrial uses.

4.9.3 Final LESA Scoring

A single LESA score is generated for a given project after all the individual LE and SA factors have been scored and weighted. The California Agricultural LESA Model is weighted so that 50 percent of the total LESA score of a given project is derived from the LE factors and 50 percent from the SA factors. Individual factor weights are listed in Table 12, with the sum of the factor weights required to equal 100 percent. For the subject property, the final LESA score is determined to be 87.45 points. (See Table 16)



Table 15	Land Evaluation	and Site	Assessment Factors
----------	-----------------	----------	--------------------

Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Factors			
Land Evaluation Factors			
Land Capability Classification (LCC)	25%		
Storie Index Rating	25%		
Land Evaluation Subtotal	50%		
Site Assessment Factors			
Project Size Rating	15%		
Water Resource Availability Rating	15%		
Surrounding Agricultural Lands Rating	15%		
Surrounding Protected Resource Lands Rating	5%		
Site Assessment Subtotal 50%			
TOTAL LESA FACTOR WEIGHTING100%			

For the subject property, the final LESA score was determined to be as follows:

 Table 16 Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Final Score

Land Evaluation and Site Assessment				
Factor Name	Factor Rating (0-100 Points)	Factor Weighting (Total=1.0)	Weighted Factor Rating	
Land Evaluation				
Land Capability Classification	85.9	0.5	42.95	
Storie Index Rating		-	-	
Site Assessment				
Project Size	100	0.15	15	
Water Resource Availability	100	0.15	15	
Surrounding Agricultural Lands	90	0.15	13.5	
Protected Resource Lands	20	0.05	1.0	
	Total LESA Score		87.45	

The Kern County California Soil Survey for the Southwestern region does not include the Storie Index for each soil unit, therefore the LE portion of the analysis accounts for 50 percent of the LESA Score.

4.9.4 Threshold of Significance

The California Agricultural LESA Model is designed to make determinations of the potential significance of a project's conversion of agricultural lands during the Initial Study phase of the CEQA process. Scoring thresholds are based upon both the total LESA score and the component LE and SA separate subscores. In



this manner the scoring thresholds are dependent upon the attainment of a minimum score for the LE and SA subscores so that a single threshold is not the result of heavily skewed subscores (i.e., a site with a very high LE score but a very low SA score, or vice-versa). The California Agricultural LESA Model scoring thresholds are as follows:

LESA Model Scoring Thresholds			
Total LESA Score	Scoring Decision		
0 to 39 points	Not considered significant		
40 to 59 points	Considered significant only if LE and SA subscores are each greater than or equal to 20 points		
60 to 79 points	Considered significant unless either LE or SA subscore is less than 20 points		
80 to 100 points	Considered Significant		

Table 17 LESA Model Scoring Thresholds

According to the California Agricultural LESA Model Threshold of Significance, the total score of 87.45 points for the subject property would be considered a significant environmental impact resulting from the conversion of agricultural properties to non-agricultural uses (LE and SA are both more than 20 points). This is due to the project size, water resource availability, soil quality, and surrounding agricultural lands.

5.0 Mitigation

The applicant may be required to mitigate the loss of agricultural lands, on a oneto-one basis, as determined by the Planning Director. Prior to securing a grading or building permit, whichever occurs first, the applicant shall submit written verification of the applicant's compliance with this mitigation measure to the Planning Director's satisfaction. Compliance with this condition may be phased as the project is developed. The amount of agricultural land to be mitigated shall be equal to the amount of land being developed as each phase is developed.

During the life of the project, if the County of Kern or other responsible agency adopts an agricultural land mitigation program that provides equal or more effective mitigation, the applicant may choose to participate in that alternate program to mitigate the loss of agricultural land impacts. Prior to participation in the alternate program, the applicant shall obtain written approval from the Kern County Planning Department agreeing to the participation, and the applicant shall submit written verification of compliance with the alternate program at the same time described above in the first paragraph.



McIntosh & Associates Project No. 04-157-000

Completion of the mitigation measure, or with the Planning Director's approval, a combination of mitigation measures, can be on qualifying agricultural land within the San Joaquin Valley (San Joaquin, Stanislaus, Merced, Fresno, Madera, Kings, Tulare, Kern), or outside the San Joaquin Valley with written evidence that the same or equivalent crops can be produced on the mitigation land. The following Mitigation Measures would reduce the impacts of the project:

- AG-1 Buffers such as setbacks, berms, greenbelts, canal, and open space areas shall be established to separate farmland from incompatible urban uses.
- AG-2 Right-to-Farm Covenant shall be placed on the project property acknowledging and implementing Chapter 8.56 – RIGHT-TO-FARM AND RIGHT-TO-BUSINESS.

8.56.010 – Not a nuisance.

A. No agricultural, ranching, hydrocarbon extraction or refining, energy production or mining activity, operation, or facility, or appurtenances thereof, as defined in Civil Code Sections 3482.5(e) and 3482.6(e), or any transportation activity in conjunction therewith, lawfully established and conducted or maintained in a manner consistent with lawful, proper and accepted customs and standards as established by similar activities in the same locality, shall be or become a nuisance, public or private, due to any changed condition in or about the locality, including, but not limited to, unrelated residences, if it was not a nuisance at the time it began.

- AG-3 Project shall be designed to reduce conflicts to the extent feasible between the project and its operation and the continued use of adjacent properties in active commercial agricultural production. Design considerations shall include, but not exclusive to: windows that open and ventilation systems placed so as to not bring in air adjacent to agricultural operations; project egress and ingress not in conflict with agricultural operations or access to the fields; sufficient on-site parking to discourage parking on or adjacent to agricultural lands; prohibition of such off-site parking; provisions for physical buffers or zones between the project and agricultural operations that reduce conflicts between agricultural uses and the project.
- AG-4 Farmland related resources such as water necessary for agriculture will be protected.
- AG-5 Methods for providing mitigation could include mitigation bank credits or conservation easements per California Civil Code 815 et seq. Appendix 1.
- AG-6 Paying in-lieu fees that would contribute to an agricultural resource protection fund that could be used to purchase voluntary conservation easements or complete other projects that will protect and conserve



agricultural land. Mitigation standards can address the valuation and geographic location of agricultural land.

- AG-7 Mitigation ratio, for example each 1-acre of agricultural land lost to development 2-acres shall be acquired under easement (2:1, similar to the City of Davis), or a 1:1 ratio (similar to the City of Brentwood) for land lost to development.
- AG-8 Encourage municipalities in Kern County to adopt agricultural mitigation ordinances (protect agricultural lands from conversion to nonagricultural uses).
- AG-9 Compensate for the impact by replacing or providing substitute resources or environments.

6.0 Conclusions

It is assumed that further development of the MBGP Planning Area will occur, and most likely on "prime" agricultural soils that exist on the valley floor. The MBGP concludes that conversion of prime agricultural lands to urban uses will result in a reduction of the regional agricultural economy and is considered a significant adverse impact. However, a statement of overriding conditions for this impact was adopted when the MBGP was certified. With implementation of mitigation measures found in Section 5.0 Mitigation, impacts within the southern portion of the project site and MBGP area would be less than significant. Since the project is not completely within the MBGP, the statement of overriding conditions cannot be fully relied upon. Conversion of prime agricultural lands to urban uses in the northern portion of the project site governed by the KCGP and its related policies will result in a significant and unavoidable adverse impact.

While conflicts between urban and farming uses may exist, diminishing the edge relationships and exposures between the two, as well as adopting policies and regulations to mitigate their mutual impacts can minimize them. State and Federal Law restricts pesticide use in certain areas, and "right-to-farm" ordinances alone would not diminish the impact of the restrictions on pesticide use on farming operations. The project site will be adjacent to residential uses along its eastern boundary. The proposed project would be separated from adjacent properties by existing and planned roadways, which would contribute to minimize land use conflicts. Highway 99 would provide a buffer between uses within the project site and agricultural activities west of it. The future Expressway, and Burbank Street would provide a buffer on the north side, and Imperial Avenue on the south side.

Implementation of the proposed project will result in a conversion of approximately 738.48 acres of farmland to urban uses. These 738.48 acres include approximately 738.48 acres of soil capability Class I, II and III irrigated prime agricultural land. The potential lost crop value is theoretically estimated at \$9,854,880 for 588 acres of table grapes with a yield of 10 tons/acre (based on 2018 crop data).



According to the California Agricultural LESA Model Threshold of Significance, the total score of 87.45 points for the subject property would be considered a significant environmental impact resulting from the conversion of agricultural properties to non-agricultural uses (LE and SA are both more than 20 points). This is due to the project size, water resource availability, soil quality, and surrounding agricultural lands.

Implementation of the proposed project would result in a significant impact from the conversion of approximately 738.48 acres of land currently used for agricultural uses to urban uses. A statement of overriding considerations for this impact for portion of the site was adopted when the MBGP was certified. Implementation of mitigation measures found in Section 5.0 Mitigation would help reduce impacts, but would still be considered significant and unavoidable.

Detailed findings according to the MBGP requirements (Chapter V - Conservation/Soils and Agriculture Element, Policy 14) are presented below.

Soil quality

Finding: The proposed project site is comprised of: (138) Delano sandy loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes (93.05 acres); (145) Delano sandy loam, 1 to 5 percent slopes (402.47 acres); (174) Kimberlina fine sandy loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes MLRA 17 (113.73); and (184) Lewkalb sandy loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes (45.79 acres), which, as classified by the United States Department of Agriculture Soil Conservation Service, are Class IIs and IIIs soils respectively. This soil unit is also classified as a prime farmland soil by the Kern County Soil Survey, Southwest Kern. The entire site is considered prime per the California Land Conservation Act and the MBGP definition. Approval and implementation of the land use change will result in a loss of approximately 738.48 acres of prime agricultural land.

Implementation of the proposed project will result in a conversion of approximately 738.48 acres of farmland to urban uses. These 738.48 acres include approximately 738.48 acres of soil capability Class I and Class II irrigated prime agricultural land. The lost crop value is theoretically estimated at \$9,854,880 for 588 acres of table grapes (based on 2018 crop data).

The MBGP states that conversion of prime agricultural lands to urban uses will result in a reduction of the regional agricultural economy and is considered a significant adverse impact. However, statement of overriding considerations for this impact was adopted when the MBGP was certified Implementation of the proposed project would result in a significant impact from the conversion of approximately 738.48 acres of land currently used for agricultural uses to urban uses. However, with implementation of mitigation measures found in Section 5.0 Mitigation, the project would be considered an insignificant impact.

Availability of irrigation water



McIntosh & Associates Project No. 04-157-000

Finding: The property has several irrigation pumps and irrigation filtration system located on the site used for crop irrigation. In addition, water within Phase 1 is available from Cawelo Water District and due to SGMA they must have an agreement with Oildale Mutual Water District to extract groundwater Phase 2 is in North Kern Water District which has an agreement with Oildale Mutual Water District. If water is unavailable from the District, the main sources of water for irrigation is Lerdo Canal.

Water demands change somewhat when croplands are converted to urban uses. Urban water consumption is higher in most industrial uses. Irrigation in a drought year with potential periods of power outages and the announcements of reduced water supply can severely reduce crop yields. Growers have seen increases in water supply costs for their crops which are attributed to the higher costs on energy (electrical) to run the pumps.

Unless existing Agricultural wells are deemed useful, they will be abandoned when the agricultural production ceases in anticipation of the pending industrial development.

No Impact

Proximity to non-agricultural uses

Finding: Planned future development and planned roadway system expansion near and within the proposed project site demonstrate that the project is along the logical path of urban development.

- Future Expressway alignment within the Phase 1 boundary of the proposed project
- Interchange on/off ramps at Burbank Street from State Highway 99

The property is comprised of two (2) phases. Phase 1 is located between Burbank Street to the north and Imperial Avenue to the south, between the Lerdo Canal and Imperial Road to the west and east, respectively including that portion of the west half of the northwest quarter of Section 29 lying east of Imperial Road. Phase 2 including the property between State Hwy 99 and the Lerdo Canal, to the west and east respectively, lying south of Lerdo Hwy and north of Imperial Avenue. The roadway right-of-way will serve as buffers for most of the project boundaries.

Current development near the Subject Property (southeast) and the abovementioned considerations show that the subject property is along the logical path of urban development.

Proximity to intensive parcelization

Finding: The encroachment of urban uses on existing agricultural areas can result in negative interactions between farmers and urban neighbors. Farming



McIntosh & Associates Project No. 04-157-000

operations can affect urban neighbors by creating inconveniences or discomforts such as equipment noise, odors from manure and other chemicals, and dust or smoke. Urban uses can create adverse impacts to farmers such as the introduction of pests, disease and weeds, increased complaints about noise, dust, smoke, odors, and spray drift from pesticide and fertilizer use, restrictions to the application of pesticides and chemicals, increased flooding and siltation, and increased traffic, vandalism, and trespassing.

The subject property will be significantly and unavoidably affected by the close proximity of urbanized areas. Farming practices will be more restricted as to the manner of application and type of herbicides and pesticides that can be utilized in the vicinity of these urbanized areas. The subject property, as well as others in the area, is the next logical step for urbanization in this area due to the planned urban development near the property and its significant impacts to the crop production.

Effects on properties subject to Williamson Act land use contracts

Finding: The project site is not subject to a Williamson Act land use contracts.

No Impact.

Ability to be provided with urban services

Finding: As part of the proposed project the developer will provide infrastructure services adequate for the project. Development standards and ordinances will require provisions of infrastructure and public service financing, water facility development, subdivision mapping, vesting of rights, and other matters.

No Impact

Ability to affect the application of agricultural chemicals on nearby agricultural properties

Finding: Urban encroachment impacts adjacent lands remaining in agricultural production as conflicts arise from the infringement of the new industrial users, into the area.

The level of significance of any impact on local growers resulting from development of the proposed project is considered minimal due to restrictions and limitations that are placed on the growers with the proximity of planned urban developments. In addition, existing and planned roadways will create buffers between the proposed project and adjacent farming operations.

No Impact

Ability to create a precedent-setting situation that leads to the premature conversion of prime agricultural lands



McIntosh & Associates Project No. 04-157-000

Finding: The conversion of this property from agricultural use to industrial use is not expected to create a precedent-setting situation that leads to the premature conversion of prime agricultural lands. Proposed development (shown in Appendix "B") demonstrates that the project is along the logical path of urban development.

No Impact

Demonstrated project need

Finding: The MBGP states that the Bakersfield Planning Department projects the population of the plan area to be 520,500 in the Year 2020. Population growth will result in the need for approximately 37,000 housing units (MBGP – Land Use Element, Page II-4). The proposed project intends to create industrial services for the rapidly growing Bakersfield community, and job opportunities in a manner consistent with the goals and policies of the MBGP. The proposed project will also ensure that the area develops in a comprehensive and coordinated fashion with adequate consideration of traffic and circulation, public safety, site and resource management and project financing.

It is assumed that future development in the MBGP Planning Area would continue to include "prime" agricultural soils that exist on the Valley floor. This loss has not limited itself to the City of Bakersfield and Kern County but has become an issue of statewide concern. The MBGP concludes that conversion of prime agricultural lands to urban uses will result in a reduction of the regional agricultural economy and is considered to be a significant adverse impact. A statement of overriding considerations for this impact was adopted when the MBGP was certified.

Planned urban development southeast of the site, and within close proximity near the proposed project site indicates that this project is on the logical path of development. The MBGP encourages the orderly outward expansion of new urban development that maintains continuity of existing development and allows incremental expansion of infrastructure and public services. The proposal complies with the MBGP's criteria.

No Impact

Necessity of buffers such as lower densities, setbacks, etc.

Finding: If urban developments do not include buffer zones in their design, growers must sometimes allocate a portion of their land to the creation of a buffer zone adjacent to agricultural fields. As an example, growers might be required to refrain from spraying or harvesting the outside rows of their crops. In those cases, buffer zones represent a loss to the farmer of both crop production and income.



McIntosh & Associates Project No. 04-157-000

Buffer zones can consist of a road, canal, walls, easements, setbacks, etc. The property is comprised of two (2) phases. Phase 1 is located between Burbank Street to the north and Imperial Avenue to the south, between the Lerdo Canal and Imperial Road to the west and east, respectively including that portion of the west half of the northwest quarter of Section 29 lying east of Imperial Road. Phase 2 including the property between State Hwy 99 and the Lerdo Canal, to the west and east respectively, lying south of Lerdo Hwy and north of Imperial Avenue. The roads right-of-way will serve as general buffers for most of the project boundaries.

The future development of the subject property is not proposing the creation of a buffer zone. However, compliance with the Kern County Zoning and Subdivision Ordinances, and with implementation of mitigation measures found in Section 5.0 Mitigation will guarantee that adequate buffers be provided to avoid conflict between agricultural and urban uses.

No Impact

7.0 Resources

• Air Quality Resources Board

Instruction Manual – 1997)

(Air Quality San Joaquin Valley -2020)

 California Department of Conservation – Office of Land Conservation (California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model –

California Department of Food and Agriculture

(California Agricultural Resource Directory 2018 Crop Year Production Information)

California Farm Bureau Federation

(Facts and Stats about California Agriculture – 2017-2018)

California Farm Water Coalition

(The Water Fact Book - California Agriculture and Its Use of Water)

• City of Bakersfield

(Metropolitan Bakersfield General Plan Map, West - 2013)

• Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program - Department Of Conservation

(Farmland Conversion Report 2004 to 2018)

(Kern County – Interim Farmland Area 2004-2018 Land Use Conversion)

(Kern County - Important Farmland Area 2016-2018 Land Use Conversion)

(Important Farmland in California, 2018)

• Kern County Planning and Development Services Department

(Kern County Zoning Ordinance - March 2020)

(Kern County General Plan Elements – Land Use, Open Space, and Conservation Element)

(Williamson Act Land Use Contract - GIS Mapping)

(Hazardous Wastes and Substances Site List - 2019)

(Guidelines for Agricultural Soils/Farmland Conversion Studies)

• Kern County Department Of Agriculture and Measurement Standards

(Pesticide Use Report Data – 2014-2019)

(Kern County Agricultural Crop Reports – Summary, Top Twenty Crops, – Fruit and Nut Crops 2014-2019)



• State of California

(California Environmental Quality Act, Sacramento - January 1991)
(California Health and Safety Code § 11501 thru 11503)
(California Health and Safety Code § 26569.24 thru 26569.28)
(A.B. 645, Ch. 1135: Organic Food Act - February 21, 1991)
(Division of Oil, Gas & Geothermal Resources –1998)

United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Services

(Southwest Kern Soil Survey Maps and Information, 2006)

- United States Department of Agriculture Soil Conservation Service (USDA Soil Survey of Kern County, California, Southwestern Part)
- University of California Cooperative Extension
 (Sample Cost to Establish and Produce)
 (California Production in California)
- University of California Davis

 (Agriculture in Urbanizing Communities July 21, 2000)
- Environmental Data Resources (Aerial Photographs 1937; 1952; 1968; 1994; 2005; 2012)
- Kern County Engineering and Survey Services (Aerial Photographs 2013; 2014; 2015; 2016; 2017; 2018)
- United States Geological Survey
 (Topographic Quadrangle Map Rosedale and Oildale, CA)
- Federal Emergency Management Agency (Flood Insurance Rate Map Community Panel 06029C1825E)
- California Department of Water Resources
 (SGMA Bulletin 118)

Farmland Conversion Study Report Final McIntosh & Associates Project No. 004-157-000

APPENDIX A

Figures





McIntosh & Associates Project No. 004-157-000



PROPOSED PROJECT

Portions of Sections 24 & 25, Township 28 South, Range26 East & Portions of Sections 29 & 30, Township 28 South, Range 27 East County of Kern, State of California

> Project Location Maps Figure A-1



McIntosh & Associates Project No. 004-157-000



PROPOSED PROJECT

Portions of Sections 24 & 25, Township 28 South, Range26 East & Portions of Sections 29 & 30, Township 28 South, Range 27 East County of Kern, State of California

County of Kern Zoning Map 80





PROPOSED PROJECT

Portions of Sections 24 & 25, Township 28 South, Range26 East & Portions of Sections 29 & 30, Township 28 South, Range 27 East County of Kern, State of California

County of Kern Zoning Map 81





ASSESSORS MAP NO. 91-15 COUNTY OF KERN

PROPOSED PROJECT

Portions of Sections 24 & 25, Township 28 South, Range26 East & Portions of Sections 29 & 30, Township 28 South, Range 27 East County of Kern, State of California

Assessors Parcel Map 91-15 Figure A-4





ASSESSORS MAP NO. 91-16

PROPOSED PROJECT

Portions of Sections 24 & 25, Township 28 South, Range26 East & Portions of Sections 29 & 30, Township 28 South, Range 27 East County of Kern, State of California

Assessors Parcel Map 91-16

McIntosh & Associates Project No. 004-157-000

NTOSH SSOCIATES



ASSESSORS MAP NO. 91-20

PROPOSED PROJECT

Portions of Sections 24 & 25, Township 28 South, Range26 East & Portions of Sections 29 & 30, Township 28 South, Range 27 East County of Kern, State of California

Assessors Parcel Map 91-20





PROPOSED PROJECT

Portions of Sections 24 & 25, Township 28 South, Range26 East & Portions of Sections 29 & 30, Township 28 South, Range 27 East County of Kern, State of California

Assessors Parcel Map 482-01



McIntosh & Associates Project No. 004-157-000



ASSESSORS MAP NO.482-04 COUNTY OF KERN

PROPOSED PROJECT

Portions of Sections 24 & 25, Township 28 South, Range26 East & Portions of Sections 29 & 30, Township 28 South, Range 27 East County of Kern, State of California

Assessors Parcel Map 482-04

Farmland Conversion Study Report Final McIntosh & Associates Project No. 004-157-000

APPENDIX B

Figures







PROPOSED PROJECT

Portions of Sections 24 & 25, Township 28 South, Range26 East & Portions of Sections 29 & 30, Township 28 South, Range 27 East County of Kern, State of California

> Kern County General Plan Figure B-1





PROPOSED PROJECT

Portions of Sections 24 & 25, Township 28 South, Range26 East & Portions of Sections 29 & 30, Township 28 South, Range 27 East County of Kern, State of California

Kern County Circulation Map

Figure B-2



McIntosh & Associates Project No. 004-157-000



PROPOSED PROJECT

Portions of Sections 24 & 25, Township 28 South, Range26 East & Portions of Sections 29 & 30, Township 28 South, Range 27 East County of Kern, State of California

Kern County Developments near Proposed Project Figure B-3 Farmland Conversion Study Report Final McIntosh & Associates Project No. 004-157-000

APPENDIX C

Figures





McIntosh & Associates Project No. 004-157-000



PROPOSED PROJECT

Portions of Sections 24 & 25, Township 28 South, Range26 East & Portions of Sections 29 & 30, Township 28 South, Range 27 East County of Kern, State of California

United States Geological Survey Topographic Quadrangle Map Figure C-1



McIntosh & Associates Project No. 004-157-000



Explanation of Zone Designation:

ZONE 'X' - Areas Determined To Be Outside The 0.2% Annual Chance Flood plane

PROPOSED PROJECT

Portions of Sections 24 & 25, Township 28 South, Range26 East & Portions of Sections 29 & 30, Township 28 South, Range 27 East County of Kern, State of California

Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM)

Figure C-2





Source: Cawelo GSA Groundwater Sustainability Plan -Draft Final Dated: December 16, 2019

PROPOSED PROJECT

Portions of Sections 24 & 25, Township 28 South, Range26 East & Portions of Sections 29 & 30, Township 28 South, Range 27 East County of Kern, State of California

Depth of Ground Water Map Figure C-3





Kern County, California, Southwest Part (CA666)

PROPOSED PROJECT

Portions of Sections 24 & 25, Township 28 South, Range26 East & Portions of Sections 29 & 30, Township 28 South, Range 27 East County of Kern, State of California

> USDA Soils Survey Map Figure C-4

Farmland Conversion Study Report Final McIntosh & Associates Project No. 004-157-000

APPENDIX D

Figures





0 819 2,851 4,707 6,780 4,495 15,505 104 2,533 18,142 11.720 82 used for dryland grain production for three or more update cycles 4,495 4,495 4,588 22 1,812 6,422 686 2,362 896 cation of a potted plant 2,405 due to the addition of In or land to land left Idle 18 230 655 Conversion to Grazing Land is primarily duel (1) Conversion to Unique Farmand is due tha (3) Conversion to Unique Farmand is primarily (4) Conversion to muthan and Bulti-up Land is (5) Water related conversions were primarily due ë Prime Farmiand (1) Farmiand of Statewide Importance (1) (2) And of Local Importance ATANT FARMLAND SUBTOTA LAND USE CATEGORY Grazing Land (3) AGRICULTURAL LAND SUBTOTAL Urban and Bulit-up Land (4) TOTAL ACREAGE CONVERTED ue Farmland (1) Other Land Water Area (5)

orchards, vineyards, row crops, nurseries, alfalfs, and irrigated pasture. ient infrastructure and the use of detailed digital imagery to delineate more distinct urban boundaries

Lake Isabella and Lake Woo ā martly due to a lack of were primarily due to bo

Farmland Conversion Study Report Final

Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program

2016-2018 Land Use Conversion

KERN COUNTY

TABLE A-11

PART II

McIntosh & Associates Project No. 004-157-000



KERN COUNTY

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION Division of Land Resource Protection

County Summary and Change by Land Use Category PART I

LAND USE CATEGORY

rmland of Statewide Importance and of Local Importance RTANT FARMLAND SUBTO

me Farmland

Ilque Farmland

TABLE A-10

Water Area TOTAL AREA INVENTORIED

Other Land

ISCULTURAL LAND SUBTOTAL In and Built-up Land

Land

Kern County 2016 – 2018 Land Use Conversion Table

Land Use Conversion Table

Figure D-1





California Important Farmland: Most Recent



PROPOSED PROJECT

Portions of Sections 24 & 25, Township 28 South, Range26 East & Portions of Sections 29 & 30, Township 28 South, Range 27 East County of Kern, State of California

Kern County Important Farmlands

Figure D-2

McIntosh & Associates Project No. 004-157-000

PRIME FARMLAND
 PRIME FARMLAND HAS THE BEST COMBINATION OF PHYSICAL AND CHEMICAL FEATURES ABLE TO SUSTAIN LONG-THEM AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION. THIS LAND HAS THE SOIL QUALTY, GROWING SEASON, AND MOISTURE SUPPLY NEEDED TO PRODUCE SUSTAINED HIGH YIELDS. LAND MUST HAVE BEEN USED FOR INHIGATED AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION AT SOME TIME DURING THE FOUR YEARS PROOF TO THE MAPPING DATE.
FARMLAND OF STATEWIDE IMPORTANCE
FARMLAND OF STATEWIDE IMPORTANCE IS SIMILAR TO PRIME FARMLAND BUT WITH MINOR SHORTCOMINGS, SUCH AS GREATER SLOPES OR LESS ABILITY TO STORE SOIL MOISTURE. LAND MUST HAVE BEEN USED FOR IRRIGATED AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION AT SOME TIME DURING THE FOUR YEARS PRIOR TO THE MAPPING DATE.
UNIQUE FARMLAND
UNIQUE FARMLAND CONSISTS OF LESSER QUALITY SOILS USED FOR THE PRODUCTION OF THE STATES LEADING AGRICULTURAL CROPS. THIS LAND IS USUALLY IRRIGATED, BUT MAY INCLUDE NONRENGATED ORCHARDS OR UNBETARDS AS FOUND IN SOME CLIMATIC 220NES IN CALIFORNIA. LAND MUST HAVE BEEN CROPPED AT SOME TIME DURING THE FOUR YEARS PRIOR TO THE MAPPING DATE.
GRAZING LAND
GRAZING LAND IS LAND ON WHICH THE EXISTING VEGETATION IS SUITED TO THE GRAZING OF LIVESTOCK.
CONFINED ANIMAL AGRICULTURE
CONFINED ANIMAL AGRICULTURAL LANDS INCLUDE POULTRY FACILITIES, FEEDLOTS, DAIRY FACILITIES, AND FISH FARMS, IN SOME COUNTIES, CONFINED ANIMAL AGRICULTURE IS A COMPONENT OF THE FARMLAND OF LOCAL IMPORTANCE CATEGORY.
NONAGRICULTURAL AND NATURAL VEGETATION
NONAGRECULTURAL AND NATURAL VEGETATION INCLUDES HEAVILY WOODED, ROCKY OR BARREN AREAS, RIPARIAN AND WETLAND AREAS, GRASSLAND AREAS WHICH DO NOT QUALIFY FOR GRAZING LAND DUE TO THEIR SIZE OR LAND MANAGEMENT RESTRICTIONS, SMALL WATER BODIES AND RECREATIONAL WATER SKI LARES. CONSTRUCTED WETLANDS ARE ALSO INCLUDED IN THIS CATEGORY.
SEMI-AGRICULTURAL AND RURAL COMMERCIAL LAND
SEMI-AGRICULTURAL AND RURAL COMMERCIAL LAND INCLUDES FARMSTEADS, AGRICULTURAL STORAGE AND PACKING SHEDS, UNPAVED PARKING AREAS, COMPOSTING FACILITIES, EQUINE FACILITIES, FIREWOOD LOTS, AND CAMPGROUNDS.
VACANT OR DISTURBED LAND
VACANT OR DISTURBED LAND INCLUDES OPEN FIELD AREAS THAT DO NOT QUALIFY FOR AN AGRICULTURAL CATEGORY, MINERAL AND OIL EXTRACTION AREAS, OFF ROAD VEHICLE AREAS, ELECTRICAL SUBSTATIONS, CHANNELIZED CANALS, AND RURAL FREEWAY INTERCHANGES.
RURAL RESIDENTIAL LAND
RURAL RESIDENTIAL LAND INCLUDES RESIDENTIAL AREAS OF ONE TO FIVE STRUCTURES PER TEN ACRES.
URBAN AND BUILT-UP LAND
URBAN AND BUILT-UP LAND IS OCCUPIED BY STRUCTURES WITH A BUILDING DENSITY OF AT LEART 1 UNIT TO 1.5 ACRES, OR APPROXIMATELY 6 STRUCTURES TO A 10-ACRE PARCEL. COMMON EXAMPLES INCLUDE RESIDENTIAL, INDUSTRIAL, COMMERCIAL, INSTITUTIONAL FACILITIES, CEMETERIES, AIRPORTS, GOLF COURSES, SANITARY LANDFELS, SEWAGE TREATMENT, AND WATER CONTROL STRUCTURES.
WATER
PERENNIAL WATER BODIES WITH AN EXTENT OF AT LEAST 40 ACRES.
PROPOSED PROJECT

Portions of Sections 24 & 25, Township 28 South, Range26 East & Portions of Sections 29 & 30, Township 28 South, Range 27 East County of Kern, State of California

Kern County Important Farmlands Legend 2018 Figure D-3 Farmland Conversion Study Report Final McIntosh & Associates Project No. 004-157-000

APPENDIX E

Figures





KERN COUNTY 2013 CROP REPORT SUMMARY

COMMODITY	YEAR	HARVESTED ACRES	RANGE	TOTAL VALUE
Fruit & Nut Crops	2013	422,146		\$ 4,133,389,000
	*2012	411,579,		\$ 3.790.085.000
Field Crops & Rangeland	2013	339,746	1,488,000	522,365,000
	*2012	381,856	1,479,000	539,374,000
Vegetable Crops	2013	73,500		686,789,000
-	2012	79,348		714,149,000
Nursery Crops	2013	2,087		111,270,590
	2012	3,008		100,824,100
Industrial & Wood Crops	2013			14,176,000
	2012			15,717,000
Seed Crops	2013	1,550		5,305,000
	2012	12,590		7,742,000
Livestock & Poultry	2013			418,926,000
	2012			395,078,000
Livestock & Poultry Products	2013			819,880,000
	2012			732,385,000
Apiary Products	2013			57,755,000
	2012			56,707,000
Totals	2013	839,079	1,488,000	\$ 6,769,855,590
	*2012	878,381	1,479,000	\$ 6,351,061,100
	2013		,	\$6,769,668,590
Timber	*2012			\$ 6,351,686,100
*revised				

(Information provided by the Kern County Department of Agriculture and Measurement Standards website: <u>www.kernaq.com</u>)




KERN COUNTY 2013 CROP REPORT

TOP 20 CROPS

COMMODITY	VALUE	2012 RANKING
1. Grapes, All	\$ 1,822,092,000) 1
2. Almonds, Including By-Products	970,808,000	2
3. Milk, Market & Manufacturing	764,728,000	3
4. Citrus, Fresh & Processing	641,691,000	*5
5. Cattle & Calves	408,897,000	6
6. Pistachios	388,189,000	*4
7. Carrots, Fresh & Processing	335,088,000	7
8. Hay, Alfalfa	217,964,000	8
9. Cotton, Including Processed Cottonseed	146,537,000	9
10. Potatoes, Fresh & Processing	109,222,000	10
11. Pomegranates, Fresh & Processing	88,474,000	12
12. Cherries	80,228,000	22
13. Silage & Forage	68,521,000	11
14. Bell Peppers, Fresh & Processing	59,659,000	17
15. Apiary Products	57,755,000	14
16. Nursery, Fruit and Nut Trees & Vines	56,056,000	13
17. Tomatoes, Fresh & Processing	55,115,000	15
18. Egg & Egg Product	52,055,000	16
19. Nursery, Roses	45,353,000	19
20. Onions, Fresh & Dehydrator	35,156,000	20



Fruit & Nut Crops 2013

CROP	YEAR	HARVESTED ACRES	PRODUCTION PER ACRES	TOTAL PRODUCTION	UNIT	UNIT VALUE	TOTAL VALUE
Almonds	2013	147,000	1.14	a/168,000	Ton	\$ 5,490.00	\$ 922,672,000
	2012	144,000	1.13	a/163,000	Ton	\$ 4,770.00	\$ 777,306,000
Almond	2013			325,000	Ton	148.00	48,136,000
By-Products	2012			301,000	Ton	148.00	44,551,000
, Apricots	2013			, 	Ton		
	2012				Ton		
Blueberries	2013	635	6.72	4.270	Ton	4.520.00	19.290.000
	2012	642	6.15	3.950	Ton	4.090.00	16.144.000
Cherries	2013	5.540	3.09	17.100	Ton	4.690.00	80.228.000
	2012	5.110	0.90	4.580	Ton	5.380.00	24.654.000
Citrus. All	2013	55.017	15.23	837,900	Ton		641.691.000
	2012	53 747	17 17	922 700	Ton		620 350 000
Grapefruit	2012	827	18.14	15.000	Ton	703.00	10.546.000
Capenaie	2012	827	18 74	15 500	Ton	765.00	11 857 000
Lemons	2012	3 170	14 79	46 900	Ton	902.00	42 305 000
Lennons	2013	3 150	11 56	36 400	Ton	999.00	36 358 000
Oranges	2012	28 800	11.50	322 000	Ton	679.00	218 777 000
Navels	2013	20,000	12.62	395,000	Ton	713.00	281 834 000
Oranges	2012	6 5 2 0	15.02	10/ 000	Ton	644.00	67 019 000
Valoncia	2013	6,520	14.26	104,000	Ton	675.00	64 697 000
Tangorino	2012	15 700	14.50	176.000	Ton	1 600 00	281 286 000
	2013	14 100	× 20	117,000	Ton	1,000.00	104 200,000
& Tangelo	2012	14,100	8.30	117,000	Ton	1,000.00	21 759 000
All Citrue	2015			262,000	Ton	125.00	21,758,000
All Citrus	2012	105 000	12.07	263,000	Ton	119.00	31,404,000
Grapes, All	2013	105,000	12.87	1,351,300	Ton		1,822,092,000
Deisia	2012 h (2012	101,800	11.26	1,146,070	Ton		1,498,987,000
<u>Raisin</u>	D/2013	19,200	13.00	249,600	Ton		252,947,000
<u>variety</u>	0/2012	19,800	9.98	197,570	Ton		196,567,000
Fresh	2013			124,900	Ton	1,700.00	212,404,000
Market	2012			109,900	Ton	1,480.00	162,443,000
Raisins	C/2013			13,400	Ion	1,650.00	22,047,000
. .	c/2012			12,000	Ion	1,900.00	22,831,000
Processing	2013			11,600	Ion	397.00	4,606,000
	2012			4,970	Ton	362.00	1,797,000
Crushed	2013			51,500	Ton	270.00	13,890,000
	2012			30,100	Ton	315.00	9,496,000
Table	2013	58,600	13.61	797,700	Ton		Ş
							1,445,006,000
Variety	2012	54,600	12.17	664,500	Ton		\$
							1,184,388,000
Fresh	2013			719,000	Ton	\$ 1,990.00	1,427,237,000
Market	2012			605,000	Ton	\$ 1,930.00	1,168,654,000
Crushed	2013			78,700	Ton	226.00	17,769,000
	2012			59,500	Ton	264.00	15,734,000
Wine	2013	27,200	11.18	304,000	Ton		124,139,000
Variety	2012	27,400	10.36	284,000	Ton		118,032,000
Crushed	2013			304,000	Ton	408.00	124,139,000
	2012			284,000	Ton	416.00	118,032,000
Nectarines	2013	424	8.28	3,510	Ton	1,980.00	6,958,000
	*2012	505	6.44	3,250	Ton	1,810.00	5,891,000
Olives	2013				Ton		
	2012				Ton		



Farmland Conversion Study Report Final

McIntosh & Associates Project No. 004-157-000

Fruit & Nut Crops 2013

VALUE
227,000
443,000
189,000
226,000
274,000
329,000
841,000
328,000
437,000
638,000
354,000
238,000
389,000
085,000
22 27 32 84 32 43 63 35 23 38 08

*Revised

a/ Almond production stated in terms of Nut Meat Equivalents. b/ Total production includes raisins on a Fresh Equivalent basis. c/ A combined value reflecting free tonnage and reserve tonnage: Dry Ratio: 2013 - 4.60 to 1 2012 - 4.38 to 1 d/ Pistachio and Walnut production stated in terms of In-Shell Equivalents.

e/Includes: Apple (Fresh & Processed), Apricots, Avocado, Blackberry, Blueberry (Processed), Boysenberry, Cashew, Chestnut, Fig (Fresh & Dry), Jujube, Kiwi, Kumquat, Lime, Olive, Peach (Processed), Pear, Pecan, Persimmon, Plum, Plumcot, Pluot, Pomegranate (Fresh & Juice), Prune, Raspberry, Strawberry, and Quince,

f/ Includes: Apple (Fresh & Processed), Apricots, Avocado, Blackberry, Boysenberry, Fig (Fresh & Dry), Jujube, Kiwi, Lime, Olive, Peach (Processed), Pear, Pecan, Persimmon, Plum, Plumcot, Pluot, Pomegranate (Fresh & Juice), Prune, Raspberry, Strawberry, and Quince.



KERN COUNTY 2014 CROP REPORT SUMMARY

COMMODITY	YEAR	HARVESTED ACRES	RANGE	TOTAL VALUE
Fruit & Nut Crops	2014	510,308		\$ 4,769,213,000
	2013	422,146		\$ 4,133,389,000
Field Crops & Rangeland	2014	298,843	1,450,000	507,302,000
	2013	339,746	1,488,000	522,365,000
Vegetable Crops	2014	66,450		648,857,000
	2013	73,550		686,789,000
Nursery Crops	2014	3,356		93,719,690
	2013	2,087		111,270,590
Industrial & Wood Crops	2014			18.498.000
	2013			14,176,000
Seed Crops	2014	1.500		6.591.000
	2013	1,550		5,305,000
	2010	1,000		0,000,000
Livestock & Poultry	2014			443,650,000
	2013			418,926,000
Livestock & Poultry Products	2014			980,756,000
	2013			819,880,000
Aplary Products	2014			83,737,000
	2013			57,755,000
Totals	2014	880,457	1,450,000	\$ 7,552,323,690
	2013	839,079	1,488,000	\$ 6,769,855,590
Total Value without Timber	2014			\$7,552,156,690
	2013			\$ 6,769,668,590





KERN COUNTY 2014 CROP REPORT

TOP 20 CROPS

COMMODITY	VALUE	<u>2013 RANKING</u>
1. Grapes, All	\$ 1,718,183,000	1
2. Almonds, Including By-Products	1,488,182,000	2
3. Milk, Market & Manufacturing	915,124,000	3
4. Citrus, Fresh & Processing	892,874,000	4
5. Cattle & Calves	428,854,000	5
6. Pistachios	401,049,000	6
7. Carrots, Fresh & Processing	288,063,000	7
8. Hay, Alfalfa	227,973,000	8
9. Cotton, Including Processed Cottonseed	117,568,000	9
10. Pomegranates, Fresh & Processing	87,313,000	11
11. Potatoes, Fresh & Processing	84,751,000	10
12. Apiary Products	83,737,000	15
13. Tomatoes, Fresh & Processing	81,768,000	17
14. Silage & Forage	81,334,000	13
15. Bell Peppers, Fresh & Processing	77,495,000	14
16. Eggs & Egg Product	62,689,000	18
17. Nursery, Fruit and Nut Trees & Vines	52,390,000	16
18. Onions, Fresh & Dehydrator	42,966,000	20
19. Nursery, Roses	35,391,000	19
20. Garlic, Fresh & Processing	34,447,000	23



Farmland Conversion Study Report Final McIntosh & Associates Project No. 004-157-000

				0.000			
CROP	YEAR	HARVESTED ACRES	PRODUCTION PER ACRE	TOTAL PRODUCTION	UNIT	UNIT VALUE	TOTAL VALUE
Almond	2014	199,000	1.01	a/201,000	Ton	\$ 7,120.00	\$1,432,099,000
	2013	147,000	1.14	a/168,000	Ton	\$ 5,490.00	\$ 922,672,000
Almond	2014			329,000	Ton	170.00	56,083,000
By-Products	2013			325,000	Ton	148.00	48,136,000
Apricots	2014				Ton		
	2013				Ton		
Blueberries	2014	608	7.37	4,480	Ton	5,300.00	23,757,000
	2013	635	6.72	4,270	Ton	4,520.00	19,290,000
Cherries	2014	5,180	0.83	4,300	Ton	6,840.00	29,419,000
	2013	5,540	3.09	17,100	Ton	4,690.00	80,228,000
Citrus, All	2014	64,234	14.79	949,800	Ton		892,874,000
	2013	55,017	15.23	837,900	Ton		641,691,000
Grapefruit	2014	864	15.39	13,300	Ton	706.00	9,388,000
	2013	827	18.14	15,000	Ton	703.00	10,546,000
Lemons	2014	3,290	10.49	34,500	Ton	1,270.00	43,873,000
	2013	3,170	14.79	46,900	Ton	902.00	42,305,000
Oranges,	2014	31,400	10.25	322,000	Ton	942.00	303,378,000
Navels	2013	28,800	11.18	322,000	Ton	679.00	218,777,000
Oranges,	2014	5,680	13.38	76,000	Ton	783.00	59,484,000
Valencia	2013	6,520	15.95	104,000	Ton	644.00	67,019,000
Tangerine4	2014	23,000	10.48	241,000	Ton	1,800.00	441,821,000
& Tangelo	2013	15,700	11.21	176,000	Ton	1,600.00	281,286,000
Processing,	2014			263,000	Ton	133.00	34,930,000
All Citrus	2013			174,000	Ton	125.00	21,758,000
Grapes, All	2014	106,200	12.26	1,302,300	Ton		1,718,183,000
	2013	105,000	12.87	1,351,300	Ton		1,822,092,000
Raisin	b/2014	16,800	14.16	237,900	Ton		128,559,000
Variety	b/2013	19,200	13.00	249,600	Ton		252,947,000
Fresh	2014			64,400	Ton	1,030.00	66,251,000
Market	2013			124,900	Ton	1,700.00	212,404,000
Raisins	c/2014			29,900	Ton	1,770.00	53,047,000
	c/2013			13,400	Ton	1,650.00	22,047,000
Processing	2014			6,300	Ton	435.00	2,741,000
	2013			11,600	Ton	397.00	4,606,000
Crushed	2014			34,400	Ton	190.00	6,520,000
	2013			51,500	Ton	270.00	13,890,000
Table	2014	61,600	12.85	791,400	Ton		\$ 1,503,844,000

Fruit & Nut Crops 2014



Farmland Conversion Study Report Final

McIntosh & Associates Project No. 004-157-000

				oropo			
CROP	YEAR	HARVESTED	PRODUCTION	TOTAL	UNIT	UNIT	TOTAL
		ACRES	PER ACRE	PRODUCTION		VALUE	VALUE
Variety	2013	58,600	13.61	797,700	Ton		\$ 1,445,006,000
Fresh	2014			721,000	Ton	\$ 2,070.00	1,490,053,000
Market	2013			719,000	Ton	\$ 1,990.00	1,427,237,000
Crushed	2014			70,400	Ton	196.00	13,791,000
	2013			78,700	Ton	226.00	17,769,000
Wine	2014	27,800	9.82	273,000	Ton		85,780,000
Variety	2013	27,200	11.18	304,000	Ton		124,139,000
Crushed	2014			273,000	Ton	314.00	85,780,000
	2013			304,000	Ton	408.00	124,139,000
Nectarines	2014	295	9.76	2,880	Ton	1,300.00	3,750,000
	2013	424	8.28	3,510	Ton	1,980.00	6,958,000
Peaches	2014				Ton		
	2013	1,110	12.97	14,400	Ton	1,130.00	16,227,000
Pistachios	2014	102,900	0.78	d/79,900	Ton	5,020.00	401,049,000
	2013	76,000	1.23	d/93,300	Ton	4,160.00	388,189,000
Plums	2014	57	9.30	530	Ton	1,220.00	645,000
	2013				Ton		
Tomatoes,	2014	840	19.17	16,100	Ton	965.00	15,534,000
Fresh	2013	1,310	15.05	19,720	Ton	724.00	14,274,000
Tomatoes,	2014	14,000	52.86	740,000	Ton	89.50	66,234,000
Processed	2013	12,000	46.50	558,000	Ton	73.20	40,841,000
Walnuts	2014	794	1.47	d/1,170	Ton	3,390.00	3,964,000
	2013	710	1.03	d/730	Ton	4,710.00	3,437,000
Miscellaneous	e/2014	16,200		95,000	Ton		125,622,000
	f/2013	17,400		222,000	Ton		129,354,000
Totals	2014	510,308		3,726,460	Ton		\$4,769,213,000
	2013	422,146		3,615,230	Ton		\$ 4,133,389,000

Fruit & Nut Crops 2014

a/ Almond production stated in terms of Nut Meat Equivalents.

b/ Total production includes raisins on a Fresh Equivalent basis.

c/ A combined value reflecting free tonnage and reserve tonnage: Dry Ratio: 2014 - 4.44 to 1 2013 - 4.60 to 1

d/ Pistachio and Walnut production stated in terms of In-Shell Equivalents.

e/Includes: Apple (Fresh & Processed), Apricots, Avocado, Blackberry, Blueberry (Processed),

Boysenberry, Fig (Fresh & Dry), Jujube, Kiwi, Kumquat, Lime, Olive, Peach (Fresh & Processed), Pear, Pecan, Persimmon, Plumcot, Pluot, Pomegranate (Fresh & Juice), Prune, Raspberry, Strawberry, and Quince,

f/ Includes: Apple (Fresh & Processed), Apricots, Avocado, Blackberry, Blueberry (Processed), Boysenberry, Cashew, Chestnut, Fig (Fresh & Dry), Jujube, Kiwi, Ku,quat, Lime, Olive, Peach (Processed), Pear, Pecan, Persimmon, Plum, Plumcot, Pluot, Pomegranate (Fresh & Juice), Prune, Raspberry, Strawberry, and Quince.



Farmland Conversion Study Report FinalMcIntosh & Associates Project No. 004-157-000

KERN COUNTY 2015 CROP REPORT SUMMARY

COMMODITY	YEAR	HARVESTED	RANGE	TOTAL VALUE
Fruit & Nut Crops	2015 2014	525,398 510,308		\$ 4,670,622,000 \$ 4,769,213,000
Field Crops &	2015 2014	286,010 298,843	1,449,000 1,450,000	340,618,000 507,302,000
Vegetable Crops	2015 2014	66,170 66,450		654,165,000 648,857,000
Nursery Crops	2015 2014	2,087 3,356		83,264,690 93,719,690
Industrial & Wood	2015 2014			12,838,000 18,498,000
Seed Crops	2015 2014	1,390 1,500		11,251,000 6,591,000
Livestock & Poultry	2015 2014			370,376,000 443,650,000
Livestock & Poultry	2015 2014			652,917,000 980,756,000
Apiary Products	2015 2014			82,772,000 83,737,000
Totals	2015 2014	881,055 880,457	1,449,000 1,450,000	\$ 6,878,823,690 \$ 7,552,323,690
Total Value without	2015 2014			\$ 6,878,660,690 \$ 7,552,156,690



KERN COUNTY 2015 CROP REPORT

TOP 20 CROPS

	COMMODITY	VALUE	2014 RANKING
1.	Grapes, All	\$ 1,643,103,000	1
2.	Almonds, Including By-Products	1,487,789,000	2
3.	Citrus, Fresh & Processing	927,694,000	4
4.	Milk, Market & Manufacturing	594,816,000	3
5.	Cattle & Calves	355,789,000	5
6.	Carrots, Fresh & Process	299,398,000	7
7.	Pistachios	245,174,000	6
8.	Pomegranates, Fresh & Process	190,935,000	10
9.	Hay, Alfalfa	133,685,000	8
10.	Silage & Forage	84,773,000	14
11.	Apiary Products	82,772,000	12
12.	Potatoes, Fresh & Processing	81,716,000	11
13.	Tomatoes, Fresh & Processing	62,106,000	13
14.	Nursery, Fruit and Nut Trees & Vines	52,746,000	17
15.	Eggs & Egg Product	52,498,000	16
16.	Onions, Fresh & Dehydrator	51,043,000	18
17.	Cotton, Including Processed Cottonseed	50,578,000	9
18.	Bell Peppers, Fresh & Processing	42,855,000	15
19.	Cherries	42,368,000	21
20.	Garlic, Fresh & Processing	39,569,000	20



 Farmland Conversion Study Report Final
 McIntosh & Associates Project No. 004-157-000

				<u></u>		•	
CROP	YEAR	HARVESTED	PRODUCTION	TOTAL	UNIT	UNIT	TOTAL
		ACRES	PER ACRE	PRODUCTION		VALUE	VALUE
Almonds		210,000	0.94	a/197,000	Ton	\$ 7,380.00	\$ 1,453,855,000
	2014	199,000	1.01	a/201,000	Ton	\$ 7,120.00	\$ 1,432,099,000
Almond	2015			300,000	Ton	113.00	33,934,000
By-Products	2014			329,000	Ton	170.00	56,083,000
Apricots	2015	192	6.82	1.310	Ton	1.910	2.496.000
Apricoto	2014				Ton		
Blueberries	2015	669	4 1 1	2 750	Ton	6 310 00	17 354 000
Dideberries	2014	608	7 37	4 480	Ton	5 300 00	23 757 000
Charries	2014	5 290	1 70	9,400 8 000	Ton	<i>4</i> 710 00	12 368 000
Chernes	2013	5,250	0.83	4 300	Ton	6 840 00	20 /10 000
Citaria All	2014	65 217	17.09	1 112 000		0,840.00	027 604 000
Citrus, All	2015	05,217	17.00	1,115,900	Ion		927,094,000
	2014	64,234	14.79	949,800	Ion		892,874,000
Grapefruit	2015	927	16.18	15,000	Ton	794.00	11,913,000
	2014	864	15.39	13,300	Ton	/06.00	9,388,000
Lemons	2015	3,290	16.69	54,900	Ton	1,280.00	70,455,000
	2014	3,290	10.49	34,500	Ton	1,270.00	43,873,000
Oranges,	2015	31,000	12.61	391,000	Ton	776.00	303,162,000
Navels	2014	31,400	10.25	322,000	Ton	942.00	303,378,000
Oranges,	2015	5,300	16.23	86,000	Ton	749.00	64,397,000
Valencia	2014	5,680	13.38	76,000	Ton	783.00	59,484,000
Tangerine	2015	24,700	11.13	275,000	Ton	1,600.00	441,289,000
& Tangelo	2014	23,000	10.48	241,000	Ton	1,800.00	441,821,000
Processing.	2015			292,000	Ton	125.00	36,478,000
All Citrus	2014			263,000	Ton	133.00	34,930,000
Granes All	2015	106.200	11.36	1.205.910	Ton		1.643.103.000
Grupes, All	2014	106.200	12.26	1.302.300	Ton		1.718.183.000
Raisin	b/2015	15 200	15.84	240 810	Ton		118 859 000
Varioty	b/2014	16 800	14 16	237 900	Ton		128 559 000
Freeb	2015	10,000	14.10	25,800	Ton	1 700 00	120,335,000
Flesh	2013			64,400	Ton	1,700.00	66 251 000
IVIdi Kel	c/2014			42 000	Ton	1,030.00	68 762 000
Raisins	c/2015			45,000	Ion	1,000.00	52 047 000
	C/2014			29,900	Ion	1,770.00	53,047,000
Processing	2015			6,110	Ton	536.00	3,272,000
	2014			6,300	Ton	435.00	2,741,000
Crushed	2015			20,100	Ton	151.00	3,038,000
	2014			34,400	Ton	190.00	6,520,000
Table	2015	61,000	11.58	706,100	Ton		\$ 1,445,700,000
Variety	2014	61,600	12.85	791,400	Ton		\$ 1,503,844,000
Fresh	2015			654,000	Ton	\$ 2,200.00	1,437,885,000
Market	2014			721,000	Ton	\$ 2,070.00	1,490,053,000
Crushed	2015			52,100	Ton	150.00	7,815,000
	2014			70,400	Ton	196.00	13,791,000
Wine	2015	30,000	8.63	259,000	Ton		78,544,000
Variety	2014	27,800	9.82	273,000	Ton		85,780,000
Crushed	2015			259,000	Ton	303.00	78,544,000
	2014			273,000	Ton	314.00	85,780,000
Nectarines	2015				Ton		
	2014	295	9.76	2,880	Ton	1,300.00	3,750,000
Pistachios	2015	108,300	0.36	d/39,300	Ton	6,240.00	245,174,000
	2014	102.900	0.78	d/79,900	Ton	5,020.00	401.049.000
Plums	2015	40	7.75	310	Ton	1.800.00	557.000
	2014	57	9.30	530	Ton	1,220.00	645,000
						,	,-,-

Fruit & Nut Crops 2015



Farmland Conversion Study Report Final

McIntosh & Associates Project No. 004-157-000

Fruit & Nut Crops 2015

CROP	YEAR	HARVESTED	PRODUCTION	TOTAL	UNIT	UNIT	TOTAL
		ACRES	PER ACRE	PRODUCTION		VALUE	VALUE
Tomatoes,	2015	760	15.92	12,100	Ton	752.00	9,094,000
Fresh	2014	840	19.17	16,100	Ton	965.00	15,534,000
Tomatoes,	2015	14,500	45.72	663,000	Ton	80.00	53,012,000
Processed	2014	14,000	52.86	740,000	Ton	89.50	66,234,000
Walnuts	2015	1,330	2.08	d/2,760	Ton	2,440.00	6,723,000
	2014	794	1.47	d/1,170	Ton	3,390.00	3,964,000
Miscellaneous	e/2015	12,900		158,00	Ton		235,258,000
				0			
	f/2014	16,200		95,00	Ton		125,622,000
				0			
Totals	2015	525,398		3,705,330	Ton		\$ 4,670,662,000
	2014	510,308		3,726,460	Ton		\$ 4,769,213,000

Note: Organic commodities included/ Almond production stated in terms of Nut Meat Equivalents. b/ Total production includes raisins on a Fresh Equivalent basis.

c/ A combined value reflecting free tonnage and reserve tonnage: Dry Ratio: 2015 - 4.39 to 1 2014 - 4.44 to 1

d/ Pistachio and Walnut production stated in terms of In-Shell Equivalents.

e/Includes: Apple (Fresh & Processed), Apricot (Processed) Avocado, Blackberry, Blueberry (Processed), Boysenberry, Cherry (Processed), Fig (Fresh & Dry), Jujube, Kiwi, Kumquat, Lime, Nectarines, Olive, Peach (Fresh & Processed), Pear, Pecan, Persimmon, Pomegranate (Fresh & Juice), Raspberry, Strawberry, and Quince,

f/ Includes: Apple (Fresh & Processed), Apricots, Avocado, Blackberry, Blueberry (Processed), Boysenberry, Fig (Fresh & Dry), Jujube, Kiwi, Kumquat, Lime, Olive, Peach (Fresh & Processed), Pear, Pecan, Persimmon, Plumcot, Pluot, Pomegranate (Fresh & Juice), Prune, Raspberry, Strawberry, and Quince.



KERN COUNTY 2016 CROP REPORT SUMMARY

	YEAR	HARVESTED <u>A</u> <u>CRES</u>	RANGE	<u>TOTAL</u>
Fruit & Nut Crops	2016	530,238		\$ 4,900,990,000
	*2015	525,398		\$ 4,593,866,000
Field Crops & Rangeland	2016	271,303	1,444,000	304,712,000
	2015	286,010	1,449,000	340,618,000
Vegetable Crops	2016	81,578		836,670,000
	2015	66,170		654,165,000
Nursery Crops	2016	1,688		102,317,890
	2015	2,087		83,264,690
Industrial & Wood Crops	2016			9,045,000
	2015			12,838,000
Seed Crops	2016	1,150		9,410,450
	2015	1,390		11,251,000
Livestock & Poultry	2016			326,508,000
	2015			370,376,000
Livestock & Poultry Products	2016			609,513,000
	2015			652,917,000
Apiary Products	2016			88,778,000
	2015			82,772,000
Totals	2016	885,957	1,444,000	\$ 7,187,944,340
	*2015	881,055	1,449,000	\$ 6,802,067,690
Total Value without Timber	2016			\$ 7,187,882,340
	*2015			\$ 6,801,904,690





KERN COUNTY 2016 CROP REPORT

TOP 20 CROPS

	<u>COMMODITY</u>	VALUE	<u>2015 RANKING</u>
1.	Grapes, All	\$ 1,659,431,000	*revised 1
2.	Almonds. Including By-Products	1.296.023.000	2
3.	Citrus. Fresh & Processing	824.530.000	3
4.	Pistachios	769.258.000	7
5.	Milk, Market & Manufacturing	579,714,000	4
6.	Carrots, Fresh & Process	438,976,000	6
7.	Cattle & Calves	308,924,000	5
8.	Potatoes, Fresh & Processing	109,811,000	12
9.	Cherries	105,794,000	19
10.	Pomegranates, Fresh & Processing	102,660,000	9
11.	Alfalfa	91,931,000	8
12.	Silage & Forage	91,704,000	10
13.	Apiary	88,778,000	11
14.	Nursery, Fruit and Nut Trees & Vines	72,709,000	14
15.	Tomato, Fresh & Processing	68,089,000	13
16.	Garlic, Fresh & Processing	63,637,000	20
17.	Cotton, Including Processed Cottonseed	61,389,000	17
18.	Bell Peppers, Fresh & Processing	41,076,000	18
19.	Onion, Fresh & Processing	34,901,000	16
20.	Blueberries	32,785,000	25



Farmland Conversion Study Report FinalMcIntosh & Associates Project No. 004-157-000

	•	I UIL C		oropa	LU		
CROP	YEAR	HARVESTED	PRODUCTION	TOTAL	UNIT	UNIT	TOTAL
		ACRES	PER ACRE	PRODUCTION		VALUE	VALUE
Almonds	2016	217,000	1.19	a/259,000	Ton	\$4,920.00	\$1,275,520,000
	2015	210,000	0.94	a/197,000	Ton	\$7,380.00	\$1,453,855,000
Almond	2016			282,000	Ton	73.00	20,503,000
By- Products	2015			300,000	Ton	113.00	33,934,000
Apples	2016	1,030	1.81	1,860	Ton	900.00	1,674,000
	2015				Ton		
Apricots	2016	210	9.76	2,050	Ton	1,090.00	2,242,000
	2015	192	6.82	1,310	Ton	1,910.00	2,496,000
Blueberries	2016	865	5.13	4,440	Ton	7,380.00	32,785,000
	2015	669	4.11	2,750	Ton	6,310.00	17,354,000
Cherries	2016	4,690	5.93	27,800	Ton	3,810.00	105,794,000
	2015	5,290	1.70	8,990	Ton	4,710.00	42,368,000
Citrus, All	2016	62,173	16.30	1,013,600	Ton		824,530,000
	2015	65,217	17.08	1,113,900	Ton		927,694,000
Grapefruit	2016	853	13.01	11,100	Ton	853.00	9,465,000
	2015	927	16.18	15,000	Ton	794.00	11,913,000
Lemons	2016	3,740	14.73	55,100	Ton	1,330.00	73,162,000
	2015	3,290	16.69	54,900	Ton	1,280.00	70,455,000
Oranges,	2016	30,300	13.76	417,000	Ton	725.00	301,896,000
Navels	2015	31,000	12.61	391,000	Ton	776.00	303,162,000
Oranges,	2016	5,380	14.20	76,400	Ton	702.00	53,634,000
Valencia	2015	5,300	16.23	86,000	Ton	749.00	64,397,000
Tangerine &	2016	21,900	9.95	218,000	Ton	1,580.00	345,454,000
Tangelo	2015	24,700	11.13	275,000	Ton	1,600.00	441,289,000
Processing,	2016			236,000	Ton	173.00	40,919,000
All Citrus	2015			292,000	Ton	125.00	36,478,000
Grapes, All	2016	106,900	11.18	1,194,790	Ton		1,659,431,000
	2015	106,200	11.36	1,205,910	Ton		1,643,103,000
Raisin Variety	b/2016	13,400	15.70	210,390	Ton		68,171,000
	b/2015	15,200	15.84	240,810	Ton		118,859,000
Fresh Market	2016			10,900	Ton	1,490.00	16,287,000
	2015			25,800	Ton	1,700.00	43,786,000
Raisins	c/2016			41,800	Ton	1,100.00	46,012,000
	c/2015			43,000	Ton	1,600.00	68,763,000
Processing	2016			5,190	Ton	568.00	2,950,000
	2015			6,110	Ton	536.00	3,272,000
Crushed	2016			15,400	Ton	\$ 190.00	\$2,922,000
	2015			20,100	Ton	\$ 151.00	\$3,038,000
Table Variety	2016	63,800	11.78	751,400	Ton		1,521,701,000
	2015	61,000	11.58	706,100	Ton		1,445,700,000
Fresh Market	2016			676,000	Ton	2,230.00	1,510,387,000
	2015			654,000	Ton	2,200.00	1,437,885,000
Crushed	2016			75,400	Ton	150.00	11,314,000
	2015			52,100	Ton	150.00	7,815,000

Fruit & Nut Crops 2016



Farmland Conversion Study Report Final

McIntosh & Associates Project No. 004-157-000

		i uit o	(INUL V	Slob2	20	10	
CROP	YEAR	HARVESTED	PRODUCTION	TOTAL	UNIT	UNIT	TOTAL
		ACRES	PER ACRE	PRODUCTION		VALUE	VALUE
Wine Variety	2016	29,700	7.85	233,000	Ton		69,559,000
	2015	30,000	8.63	259,000	Ton		78,544,000
Crushed	2016			233,000	Ton	299.00	69,559,000
	2015			259,000	Ton	303.00	78,544,000
Pistachios	2016	110,000	1.62	d/178,200	Ton	4,320.00	769,258,000
	2015	108,300	0.36	d/39,300	Ton	6,240.00	245,174,000
Plums	2016				Acre		
	2015	40	7.75	310	Acre	1,800.00	557,000
Tomatoes,	2016				Acre		
Fresh	2015	760	15.92	12,100	Acre	752.00	9,094,000
Tomatoes,	2016	13,900	46.40	645,000	Acre	72.50	46,760,000
Processed	2015	14,500	45.72	663,000	Acre	80.00	53,012,000
Walnuts	2016	1,070	1.50	d/1,600	Ton	2,030.00	3,249,000
	2015	1,330	2.08	d/2,760	Ton	2,440.00	6,723,000
Miscellaneous	e/2016	12,400		181,000	Ton		159,244,000
	*f/2015	12,900		166,000	Ton		158,502,000
Totals	2016	530,238		3,791,340	Ton		\$ 4,900,990,000
	*2015	525,398		3,713,330	Ton		\$ 4,593,866,000

Fruit & Nut Crops 2016

*revised

Note: Organic commodities included

a/ Almond production stated in terms of Nut Meat Equivalents.

b/ Total production includes raisins on a Fresh Equivalent basis.

c/ A combined value reflecting free tonnage and reserve tonnage: Dry Ratio: 2016-4.28 to 1 015-4.39 to 1 d/ Pistachio and Walnut production stated in terms of In-Shell Equivalents.

e/ Includeds: Apricot (Processed), Avocado, Blackberry, Cactus Pear, Cherry (Processed), Chestnut, Fig (Fresh & Dry), Jujube, Kiwi, Kumquat, Lime, Nectarines, Olive (Fresh & Processed), Peach (Fresh & Processed), Pear, Pecan, Persimmon, Plum, Plumcot, Pomegranate (Fresh & Juice), Prune, Raspberry, Strawberry, Tomato (Fresh) and Quince.

f/ Includes: Apple (Fresh & Processed), Apricots, Avocado, Blackberry, Blueberry (Processed), Boysenberry, Cherry (Processed), Fig (Fresh & Dry), Jujube, Kiwi, Kumquat, Lime, Nectarine, Olive, Peach (Fresh & Processed), Pear, Pecan, Persimmon, Pomegranate (Fresh & Juice), Raspberry, Strawberry and Quince.



Farmland Conversion Study Report Final McIntosh & Associates Project No. 004-157-000

KERN COUNTY 2017 CROP REPORT SUMMARY

COMMODITY Fruit & Nut Crops	<u>YEAR</u> 2017	HARVESTED <u>A</u> <u>CRES</u> 546,290	<u>RANGE</u>	<u>TOTAL</u> \$ 4,802,164,000
	2016	530,238		\$ 4,900,990,000
Field Crops & Rangeland	2017	248,021	1,446,000	303,075,000
	2016	271,303	1,444,000	304,712,000
Vegetable Crops	2017	86,830		916,636,000
	2016	81,578		836,670,000
Nursery Crops	2017	2,230		113,705,000
	2016	1,688		102,317,890
Industrial & Wood Crops	2017			10,764,000
	2016			9,045 ,000
Seed Crops	2017	1,200		14,932,000
	2016	1,150		9,410,450
Livestock & Poultry	2017			332,978,000
	2016			326,508,000
Livestock & Poultry Products	2017			666,421,000
	2016			609,513,000
Apiary Products	2017			93,493,000
	2016			88,778,000
Totals	2017	884,571	1,446,000	\$ 7,254,168,000
	2016	885,957	1,444,000	\$ 7,187,944,340
Total Value without Timber	2017			\$ 7,254,005,000
	2016			\$ 7,187,882,340





KERN COUNTY 2017 CROP REPORT

TOP 20 CROPS

	<u>COMMODITY</u>	VALUE	2016 RANKING
1.	Grapes, All	1,747,529,000	1
2.	Almonds, Including By-Products	1,261,738,000	2
3.	Citrus, Fresh & Processing	942,926,000	3
4.	Milk, Market & Manufacturing	618,845,000	5
5.	Pistachios	555,524,000	4
6.	Carrots, Fresh & Process	424,432,000	6
7.	Cattle & Calves	318,019,000	/
8.	Potatoes, Fresh & Processing	112,853,000	8
9.	Alfalfa	101,200,000	11
10.	Apiary	93,493,000	13
11.	Cherries	88,493,000	9
12.	Nursery, Fruit and Nut Trees & Vines	83,074,000	14
13.	Cotton, Including Processed Cottonseed	74,394,000	17
14.	Silage & Forage	70,505,000	12
15.	Tomato, Fresh & Processing	67,433,000	15
16.	Garlic, Fresh & Processing	63,051,000	16
17.	Onion, Fresh & Processing	60,902,000	19
18.	Pomegranates, Fresh & Processing	60,633,000	10
19.	Eggs & Egg Products	41,409,000	21
20.	Watermelon	40,587,000	23



Farmland Conversion Study Report FinalMcIntosh & Associates Project No. 004-157-000

			K INUL V	oropa	LU	• •	
CROP	YEAR	HARVESTED ACRES	PRODUCTION PER ACRE	TOTAL PRODUCTION	UNIT	UNIT VALUE	TOTAL VALUE
Almonds	2017	214,000	1.23	a/264,000	Ton	4,680.00	\$1,234,724,000
	2016	217,000	1.19	a/259,000	Ton	4,920.00	\$1,275,520,000
Almond	2017			341,000	Ton	79.00	27,014,000
By- Products	2016			282,000	Ton	73.00	20,503,000
Apples	2017				Ton		
	2016	1,030	1.81	1,860	Ton	900.00	1,674,000
Apricots	2017				Ton		
	2016	210	9.76	2,050	Ton	1,090.00	2,242,000
Blueberries	2017	1,090	4.32	4,710	Ton	6,560.00	30,885,000
	2016	865	5.13	4,440	Ton	7,380.00	32,785,000
Cherries	2017	4,630	4.21	19,500	Ton	4,530.00	88,430,000
	2016	4,690	5.93	27,800	Ton	3,810.00	105,794,000
Citrus, All	2017	64,460	16.04	1,033,800	Ton		942,926,000
	2016	62,173	16.30	1,013,600	Ton		824,530,000
Grapefruit	2017	770	13.51	10,400	Ton	913.00	9,498,000
	2016	853	13.01	11,100	Ton	853.00	9,465,000
Lemons	2017	4,010	13.02	52,200	Ton	1,310.00	68,334,000
	2016	3,740	14.73	55,100	Ton	1,330.00	73,162,000
Oranges,	2017	30,400	13.75	418,000	Ton	836.00	349,871,000
Navels	2016	30,300	13.76	417,000	Ton	725.00	301,896,000
Oranges,	2017	5,380	17.51	94,200	Ton	918.00	86,440,000
Valencia	2016	5,380	14.20	76,400	Ton	702.00	53,634,000
Tangerine &	2017	23,900	9.62	230,000	Ton	1,710.00	394,311,000
Tangelo	2016	21,900	9.95	218,000	Ton	1,580.00	345,454,000
Processing,	2017			229,000	Ton	151.00	34,472,000
All Citrus	2016			236,000	Ton	173.00	40,919,000
Grapes, All	2017	115,600.	11.04	1,276,120	Ton		1,747,529,000
	2016	106,900	11.18	1, 194, 790	Ton		1,659,431,000
Raisin Variety	b/2017	13,700	16.96	232,420	Ton		112,110,000
	b/2016	13,400	15.70	210,390	Ton		68, 171,000
Fresh Market	2017			16,100	Ton	1,670.00	1,670.00
	2016			10,900	Ton	1,490.00	1,490.00
Raisins	c/2017			44,900	Ton	1,800.00	80,893,000
	c/2016			41,800	Ton	1,100.00	46,012,000
Processing	2017			4,820	Ton		1,700,000
	2016			5,190	Ton	568.00	2,950,000
Crushed	2017			10,800	Ton	248.00	2,682,000
	2016			15,400	Ton	190.00	2,922,000
Table Variety	2017 6	9,700	11.00	766,700	Ton		1,549,210,000
	2016 6	3,800	11.78	751,400	Ton		1,521,701,000

Fruit & Nut Crops 2017



Farmland Conversion Study Report Final

McIntosh & Associates Project No. 004-157-000

Fruit & Nut Crops 2017

CROP	YEAR	HARVESTED	PRODUCTION	TOTAL	UNIT	UNIT	TOTAL
		ACRES	PER ACRE	PRODUCTION		VALUE	VALUE
Fresh Market	2017			677,000	Ton	2,270.00	1,533,690,000
	2016			676,000	Ton	2,230 .00	1,510,387,000
Crushed	2017			89,700	Ton	173.00	15,520,000
	2016			75,400	Ton	150.00	11,314,000
Wine Variety	2017	32,200	8.60	277,000	Ton		86,209,000
	2016	29,700	7.85	233,000	Ton		69,559,000
Crushed	2017			277,000	Ton	311.00	86,209,000
	2016			233,000	Ton	299.00	69,559,000
Pistachios	2017	122,000	1.17	d/143,100	Ton	3,880.00	555,524,000
	2016	110,000	1.62	d/178,200	Ton	4,320 .00	769,258 ,000
Plums	2017				Acre		
	2016				Acre		
Tomatoes,	2017				Acre		
Fresh	2016				Acre		
Tomatoes,	2017	8,600	51.28	441,000	Acre	70.60	31,121,000
Processed	2016	13,900	46.40	645,000	Acre	72.50	46 ,760,000
Walnuts	2017	610	1.90	d/1,160	Ton	2,520.00	2,924,000
	2016	1,070	1.50	d/1,600	Ton	2,030.00	3,249,000
Miscellaneous	e/2017	₇ 15,300		201,000	Ton		141,087,000
	f/2016	, 12,400		181,000	Ton		159,244,000
Totals	2017	546,290		3,725,390	Ton		\$ 4,802,164,000
	2016	530,238		3,791,340	Ton		\$ 4,900,990,000

Note: Organic commodities included

a/Almond production stated in terms of Nut Meat Equivalents.

b/Total production includes raisins on a Fresh Equivalent basis.

c/A combined value reflecting free tonnage and reserve tonnage:

Dry Ratio: 2017-4.47 to 1 2016-4.28 to 1

d/Pistachio and Walnut production stated in terms of In-Shell Equivalents.

e/ Includeds: Apples (Fresh & Processed), Apricot (Fresh & Processed), Avocado, Blackberry, Blueberry (Processed), Cactus Pear, Cherry (Processed), Chest- nut, Fig (Fresh & Dry), Jujube, Nectarines, Olive (Fresh & Processed), Peach (Fresh & Processed), Pear, Pecan, Persimmon, Plum, Plumcot, Pomegranate (Fresh & Juice), Prune, Raspberry, Strawberry, Tomato (Fresh) and Quince.

f/ Includes : Apricots (Processed), Avocado, Blackberry, Cactus Pear, Cherry (Processed), Chestnut, Fig (Fresh & Dry), Jujube, Kiwi, Kumquat, Lime, Nectarines, Olive (Fresh & Processed), Peach (Fresh & Processed), Pear, Pecan, Persimmon, Plum, Plumcot, Pomegranate (Fresh & Juice), Prune, Raspberry, Strawberry, Tomato (Fresh) and Quince.



Farmland Conversion Study Report Final McIntosh & Associates Project No. 004-157-000

KERN COUNTY 2018 CROP REPORT SUMMARY

	<u>YEAR</u>	HARVESTED <u>A</u> <u>CRES</u>	RANGE	TOTAL
Fruit & Nut Crops	2018	551,495		\$ 5,147,712,000
	2017	546,290		\$ 4,802,164,000
Field Crops & Rangeland	2018	236,831	1,430,000	331,573,000
	2017	248,021	1,446,000	303,075,000
Vegetable Crops	2018	74,160		770,301,000
	2017	86,830		916,636,000
Nursery Crops	2018	2,532		122,473,000
	2017	2,230		113,705,000
Industrial & Wood Crops	2018			14,925,000
	2018			10,764,000
Seed Crops	2018	795		7,876,000
	2017	1,200		14,932,000
Livestock & Poultry	2018			272,181,000
	2017			332,978,000
Livestock & Poultry Products	2018			687,292,000
	2017			666,421,000
Apiary Products	2018			111,819,000
	2017			93,493,000
Totals	2018	865,813	1,430,000	\$ 7,466,152,000
	2017	884,571	1,446,000	\$ 7,254,168,000
Total Value without Timber	2018			\$ 7,465,847,000
	2017			\$ 7,254,005,000





KERN COUNTY 2018 CROP REPORT

TOP 20 CROPS

COMMODITY	VALUE	<u>2017 RANKING</u>
1. Grapes	\$1,512,473,000	1
2. Almond, Including By-Products	1,235,158,000	2
3. Pistachios	1,143,972,000	5
4. Citrus, Fresh & Processing	1,063,063,000	3
5. Milk, Market & Manufacturing	591,895,000	4
6. Carrots, Fresh & Processing	398,286,000	6
7. Cattle & Calves	254,995,000	7
8. Alfalfa	114,991,000	9
9. Apiary	111,819,000	10
10. Nursery, Fruit and Nut Trees & Vines	96,641,000	12
11. Eggs & Egg Products	91,115,000	19
12. Silage & Forage	87,538,000	14
13. Potatoes	87,477,000	8
14. Pomegranates, Fresh & Processing	74,019,000	18
15. Garlic, Fresh & Processing	71,392,000	16
16. Cotton, Including Processed Cottonseed	67,634,000	13
17. Tomato, Fresh & Processing	51,792,000	15
18. Bell Peppers, Fresh & Processing	41,674,000	21
19. Onions	38,249,000	17
20 Pasture, All	38,048,000	23



Farmland Conversion Study Report FinalMcIntosh & Associates Project No. 004-157-000

		I MIL G	ITML	OI OPS			
CROP	YEAR	HARVESTED ACRES	PRODUCTION PER ACRE	TOTAL PRODUCTION	UNIT	UNIT VALUE	TOTAL VALUE
Almonds	2018	223,000	1.15	a/256,000	Ton	\$4,690.00	\$1,200,514,000
	2017	214,000	1.23	a/264,000	Ton	\$4,680.00	\$1,234,724,000
Almond	2018			309,000	Ton	112.00	36,644,000
By- Products	2017			341,000	Ton	79.00	27,014,000
Apples	2018	675	3.64	2,460	Ton	771.00	1,896,000
	2017				Ton		
Blueberries	2018	1,260	0.94	1,190	Ton	6,620.00	7,883,000
	2017	1,090	4.32	4,710	Ton	6,560.00	30,885,000
Cherries	2018	3,810	1.23	4,700	Ton	7,370.00	34,640,000
	2017	4,630	4.21	19,500	Ton	4,530.00	88,430,000
Citrus, All	2018	66,720	15.12	1,008,700	Ton		1,063,063,000
	2017	64,460	16.04	1,033,800	Ton		942,926,000
Grapefruit	2018	910	12.86	11,700	Ton	907.00	10,615,000
	2017	770	13.51	10,400	Ton	913.00	9,498,000
Lemons	2018	4,130	13.44	55,500	Ton	1,380.00	76,766,000
	2017	4,010	13.02	52,200	Ton	1,310.00	68,334,000
Oranges,	2018	30,500	12.82	391,000	Ton	1,000.00	391,579,000
Navels	2017	30,400	13.75	418,000	Ton	836.00	349,871,000
Oranges,	2018	5,380	16.26	87,500	Ton	962.00	84,208,000
Valencia	2017	5,380	17.51	94,200	Ton	918.00	86,440,000
Tangerine &	2018	25,800	10.62	274,000	Ton	1,720.00	469,912,000
Tangelo	2017	23,900	9.62	230,000	Ton	1,710.00	394,311,000
Processing,	2018			189,000	Ton	159.00	29,983,000
All Citrus	2017			229,000	Ton	151.00	34,472,000
Grapes, All	2018	109,400	12.39	1,355,710	Ton		1,512,473,000
	2017	115,600	11.04	1,276,120	Ton		1,747,529,000
Raisin Variety	b/2018	17,500	18.62	325,810	Ton		166,096,000
	b/2017	13,700	16.96	232,420	Ton		112,110,000
Fresh Market	2018			28,100	Ton	1,120.00	31,499,000
	2017			16,100	Ton	1,670.00	26,835,000
Raisins	c/2018			59,800	Ton	2,150.00	128,480,000
	c/2017			44,900	Ton	1,800.00	80,893,000

Fruit & Nut Crops 2018



Fruit & Nut Crops 2018

CROP	YEAR	HARVESTED ACRES	PRODUCTION PER ACRE	TOTAL PRODUCTION	UNIT	UNIT VALUE	TOTAL VALUE
	2017			4,820	Ton	353.00	1,700,000
Crushed	2018			14,400	Ton	214.00	3,075,000
	2017			10,800	Ton	248.00	2,682,000
Table Variety	2018	62,700	12.02	753,900	Ton		1,263,854,000
	2017	69,700	11.00	766,700	Ton		1,549,210,000
Fresh Market	2018			653,000	Ton	1,910.00	1,244,817,000
	2017			677,000	Ton	2,270.00	1,533,690,000
Crushed	2018			100,900	Ton	189.00	19,037,000
	2017			89,700	Ton	173.00	15,520,000
Wine Variety	2018	29,200	9.45	276,000	Ton		82,523,000
	2017	32,200	8.60	277,000	Ton		86,209,000
Crushed	2018			276,000	Ton	299.00	82,523,000
	2017			277,000	Ton	311.00	86,209,000
Pistachios	2018	128,000	2.00	d/256,100	Ton	4,470.00	1,143,972,000
	2017	122,000	1.17	d/143,100	Ton	3,880.00	555,524,000
Tomatoes,	2018	6,000	61.67	370,000	Acre	79.00	29,246,000
Processed	2017	8,600	51.28	441,000	Acre	70.60	31,121,000
Walnuts	2018	730	1.99	d/1,450	Ton	1,300.00	1,881,000
	2017	610	1.90	d/1,160	Ton	2,520.00	2,924,000
Miscellaneous	e/2018	11,900		184,000	Ton		117,500,000
	f/2017	15,300		201,000	Ton		141,087,000
Totals	2018	551,495		3,749,310	Ton		\$ 5,147,712,000
	2017	546,290		3,725,390	Ton		\$ 4,802,164,000

Note: Organic commodities included

a/ Almond Production stated in terms of Nut Meat Equivalents.

b/ Total production includes raisins on a Fresh Equivalent basis.

c/ A combined value reflecting free tonnage and reserve tonnage: Dry Ratio:

2018-4.65 to 1 2017-4.47 to 1

d/ Pistachio and Walnut production stated in terms of In-Shell Equivalents.

e/ Includeds: Apricot (Fresh & Processed), Avocado, Blackberry, Chestnut, Fig (Fresh & Dry), Jujube, Kiwi, Kumquat, Lime, Nectarines, Olive (Fresh & Pro- cessed), Peach (Fresh & Processed), Pear, Pecan, Persimmon, Plum, Plumcot, Pomegranate (Fresh & Juice), Prune, Strawberry, Tomato (Fresh) and Quince. f/ Includes: Apples (Fresh & Processed), Apricots (Fresh & Processed), Avocado, Blackberry, Blueberry (Processed), Cactus Pear, Cherry (Processed), Chest- nut, Fig (Fresh & Dry), Jujube, Nectarines, Olive (Fresh & Processed), Peach (Fresh & Processed), Pear, Pecan, Persimmon, Plum, Plumcot, Pomegranate (Fresh & Juice), Prune, Raspberry, Strawberry, Tomato (Fresh) and Quince.

Farmland Conversion Study Report Final McIntosh & Associates Project No. 004-157-000

APPENDIX F

Figures





Farmland Conversion Study Report Final McIntosh & Associates Project No. 004-157-000



PROPOSED PROJECT

Portions of Sections 24 & 25, Township 28 South, Range26 East & Portions of Sections 29 & 30, Township 28 South, Range 27 East County of Kern, State of California

Adjacent Crops – 2013 Figure F-1





PROPOSED PROJECT

Portions of Sections 24 & 25, Township 28 South, Range26 East & Portions of Sections 29 & 30, Township 28 South, Range 27 East County of Kern, State of California

Adjacent Crops – 2014 Figure F-2





PROPOSED PROJECT

Portions of Sections 24 & 25, Township 28 South, Range26 East & Portions of Sections 29 & 30, Township 28 South, Range 27 East County of Kern, State of California

Adjacent Crops – 2015 Figure F-3





PROPOSED PROJECT

Portions of Sections 24 & 25, Township 28 South, Range26 East & Portions of Sections 29 & 30, Township 28 South, Range 27 East County of Kern, State of California

Adjacent Crops – 2016 Figure F-4





PROPOSED PROJECT

Portions of Sections 24 & 25, Township 28 South, Range26 East & Portions of Sections 29 & 30, Township 28 South, Range 27 East County of Kern, State of California

Adjacent Crops – 2017 Figure F-5





PROPOSED PROJECT

Portions of Sections 24 & 25, Township 28 South, Range26 East & Portions of Sections 29 & 30, Township 28 South, Range 27 East County of Kern, State of California

Adjacent Crops – 2018 Figure F-6

Farmland Conversion Study Report Final McIntosh & Associates Project No. 004-157-000

APPENDIX G

Figures







Source: Environmental Data Resources, Inc.

PROPOSED PROJECT

Portions of Sections 24 & 25, Township 28 South, Range26 East & Portions of Sections 29 & 30, Township 28 South, Range 27 East County of Kern, State of California

Aerial Photograph - 1937 Figure G-1





Source: Environmental Data Resources, Inc.

PROPOSED PROJECT

Portions of Sections 24 & 25, Township 28 South, Range26 East & Portions of Sections 29 & 30, Township 28 South, Range 27 East County of Kern, State of California

Aerial Photograph - 1937 Figure G-2





Source: Environmental Date Resources, Inc.

PROPOSED PROJECT

Portions of Sections 24 & 25, Township 28 South, Range26 East & Portions of Sections 29 & 30, Township 28 South, Range 27 East County of Kern, State of California

Aerial Photograph - 1950 Figure G-3





Source: Environmental Data Resources, Inc.

PROPOSED PROJECT

Portions of Sections 24 & 25, Township 28 South, Range26 East & Portions of Sections 29 & 30, Township 28 South, Range 27 East County of Kern, State of California

Aerial Photograph - 1952 Figure G-4





Source: Environmental Data Resources, Inc.

PROPOSED PROJECT

Portions of Sections 24 & 25, Township 28 South, Range26 East & Portions of Sections 29 & 30, Township 28 South, Range 27 East County of Kern, State of California

Aerial Photograph - 1968 Figure G-5




Source: Environmental Data Resources, Inc.

PROPOSED PROJECT

Portions of Sections 24 & 25, Township 28 South, Range26 East & Portions of Sections 29 & 30, Township 28 South, Range 27 East County of Kern, State of California

Aerial Photograph - 1962 Figure G-6





Source: Environmental Data Resources, Inc.

PROPOSED PROJECT

Portions of Sections 24 & 25, Township 28 South, Range26 East & Portions of Sections 29 & 30, Township 28 South, Range 27 East County of Kern, State of California

Aerial Photograph - 1994 Figure G-7





Source: Environmental Data Resources, Inc.

PROPOSED PROJECT

Portions of Sections 24 & 25, Township 28 South, Range26 East & Portions of Sections 29 & 30, Township 28 South, Range 27 East County of Kern, State of California

Aerial Photograph - 1994 Figure G-8



McIntosh & Associates Project No. 004-157-000



Source: Environmental Data Resources, Inc.

PROPOSED PROJECT

Portions of Sections 24 & 25, Township 28 South, Range26 East & Portions of Sections 29 & 30, Township 28 South, Range 27 East County of Kern, State of California

Aerial Photograph - 2005 Figure G-9



McIntosh & Associates Project No. 004-157-000



Source: Environmental Data Resources, Inc.

PROPOSED PROJECT

Portions of Sections 24 & 25, Township 28 South, Range26 East & Portions of Sections 29 & 30, Township 28 South, Range 27 East County of Kern, State of California

Aerial Photograph – 2005





Source: Environmental Data Resources, Inc.

PROPOSED PROJECT

Portions of Sections 24 & 25, Township 28 South, Range26 East & Portions of Sections 29 & 30, Township 28 South, Range 27 East County of Kern, State of California

Aerial Photograph - 2012 Figure G-11





Source: Environmental Data Resources, Inc.

PROPOSED PROJECT

Portions of Sections 24 & 25, Township 28 South, Range26 East & Portions of Sections 29 & 30, Township 28 South, Range 27 East County of Kern, State of California

Aerial Photograph - 2012 Figure G-12





Source: Google Earth August, 2013

PROPOSED PROJECT

Portions of Sections 24 & 25, Township 28 South, Range26 East & Portions of Sections 29 & 30, Township 28 South, Range 27 East County of Kern, State of California

Aerial Photograph - 2013





Source: Google Earth April, 2014

PROPOSED PROJECT

Portions of Sections 24 & 25, Township 28 South, Range26 East & Portions of Sections 29 & 30, Township 28 South, Range 27 East County of Kern, State of California

Aerial Photograph - 2014





Source: Google Earth March, 2015

PROPOSED PROJECT

Portions of Sections 24 & 25, Township 28 South, Range26 East & Portions of Sections 29 & 30, Township 28 South, Range 27 East County of Kern, State of California

Aerial Photograph - 2015





Source: Google Earth October, 2016

PROPOSED PROJECT

Portions of Sections 24 & 25, Township 28 South, Range26 East & Portions of Sections 29 & 30, Township 28 South, Range 27 East County of Kern, State of California

Aerial Photograph - 2016





Source: Google Earth September, 2017

PROPOSED PROJECT

Portions of Sections 24 & 25, Township 28 South, Range26 East & Portions of Sections 29 & 30, Township 28 South, Range 27 East County of Kern, State of California

Aerial Photograph - 2017 Figure G-17





Source: Google Earth August, 2018

PROPOSED PROJECT

Portions of Sections 24 & 25, Township 28 South, Range26 East & Portions of Sections 29 & 30, Township 28 South, Range 27 East County of Kern, State of California

Aerial Photograph - 2018

Farmland Conversion Study Report Final McIntosh & Associates Project No. 004-157-000

APPENDIX H

Figures







PROPOSED PROJECT

Portions of Sections 24 & 25, Township 28 South, Range26 East & Portions of Sections 29 & 30, Township 28 South, Range 27 East County of Kern, State of California

Proposed Project Photo Index

Figure H-1



McIntosh & Associates Project No. 004-157-000



IMAGE 1 LOOKING NORTH AT SACO RD. & IMPERIAL AVE



IMAGE 2 LOOKING SOUTH DOWN SACO RD.



IMAGE 3 LOOKING EAST DOWN IMPERIAL AVE.



McIntosh & Associates Project No. 004-157-000



IMAGE 4 - LOOKING NORTH FROM IMPERIAL AVE.



IMAGE 5 - LOOKING WEST ALONG IMPERIAL AVE.



IMAGE 6 - LOOKING EAST ALONG IMPERIAL AVE.





McIntosh & Associates Project No. 004-157-000



IMAGE 7 -LOOKING NORTH FROM IMPERIAL AVE.



IMAGE 8 - LOOKING WEST ALONG IMPERIAL AVE.



IMAGE 9 - LOOKING EAST ALONG IMPERIAL AVE.





McIntosh & Associates Project No. 004-157-000



IMAGE 10 -LOOKING NORTH



IMAGE 11 - LOOKING SOUTH



McIntosh & Associates Project No. 004-157-000



IMAGE 12 -LOOKING EAST



IMAGE 13 - LOOKING WEST



McIntosh & Associates Project No. 004-157-000



IMAGE 14 -LOOKING NW, CONCRETE LOADING DOCK



IMAGE 15 - NW OF IMAGE 14, IRRIGATON PUMP





IMAGE 16 -LOOKING NORTH



IMAGE 17 - LOOKING SOUTH



McIntosh & Associates Project No. 004-157-000



IMAGE 18 -LOOKING EAST



IMAGE 19 - LOOKING WEST



McIntosh & Associates Project No. 004-157-000



IMAGE 20 -LOOKING SOUTH



IMAGE 21 – LOOKING EAST



IMAGE 22 - LOOKING WEST



McIntosh & Associates Project No. 004-157-000



IMAGE 23 -LOOKING SOUTHWEST, WATER STORAGE TANK & IRRIGATION PUMP



IMAGE 24 - LOOKING SOUTH, WEST OF IMAGE 23, IRRIGATION PUMP



McIntosh & Associates Project No. 004-157-000



IMAGE 25 - LOOKING NORTH



IMAGE 26 – LOOKING SOUTH



McIntosh & Associates Project No. 004-157-000



IMAGE 27 – LOOKING EAST



IMAGE 28 – LOOKING WEST



McIntosh & Associates Project No. 004-157-000



IMAGE 29 – LOOKING SOUTHEAST, IRRIGATION POND

Photo Index Point 'G'

Figure H-8



McIntosh & Associates Project No. 004-157-000



IMAGE 30 - LOOKING NORTH



IMAGE 31 – LOOKING SOUTH



McIntosh & Associates Project No. 004-157-000



IMAGE 32 – LOOKING WEST



IMAGE 33 – LOOKING WEST, WATER STORAGE & SILO



McIntosh & Associates Project No. 004-157-000



IMAGE 34 – LOOKING NORTHWEST, IRRIGATION FILTER SYSTEM



IMAGE 35 – LOOKING WEST-SOUTHWEST, METAL SHOP



McIntosh & Associates Project No. 004-157-000



IMAGE 36 – LOOKING WEST, WEST OF IMAGE 35 HAZARDOUS CHEMICAL STORAGE UNIT



IMAGE 37 – LOOKING NORTHWEST, NORTH OF IMAGE 36 WOOD & METAL AG REPAIR SHOP

Photo Index Point 'H'

Figure H-9





IMAGE 38 – LOOKING NORTH, NORTH OF IMAGE 37 WOOD OFFICE BUILDING



IMAGE 39 – LOOKING NORTH AG STORAGE YARD



McIntosh & Associates Project No. 004-157-000



IMAGE 40 – LOOKING EAST, ACROSS FROM IMAGE 38 UNLEADED FUEL STORAGE TANK



IMAGE 41 – LOOKING EAST, STANDING SOUTH OF IMAGE 41 PROPANE STORAGE TANK



McIntosh & Associates Project No. 004-157-000



IMAGE 42 – LOOKING WEST, NORTH OF IMAGE 38 WOOD SHADE PARKING STRUCTURE



IMAGE 43 – LOOKING EAST, WEST OF IMAGE 43 SEWER SEPTIC MANHOLES & ABANDONED WELL PAD





IMAGE 44 - LOOKING SOUTH, IRRIGATION RISER


McIntosh & Associates Project No. 004-157-000



IMAGE 45 - LOOKING SOUTH, IRRIGATION PUMP & STANDPIPE

Photo Index Point 'J' Figure H-11



McIntosh & Associates Project No. 004-157-000



IMAGE 46 - LOOKING NORTH



IMAGE 47 – LOOKING SOUTH

Photo Index Point 'K' Figure H-12



McIntosh & Associates Project No. 004-157-000



IMAGE 48 – LOOKING EAST



IMAGE 49 – LOOKING WEST

Photo Index Point 'K' Figure H-12



McIntosh & Associates Project No. 004-157-000



IMAGE 50 - LOOKING SOUTHWEST, IRRIGATION PUMP & ELECTRICAL PANEL



IMAGE 51 – LOOKING NORTHWEST, CAWELO PUMP STATION 'B'

Photo Index Point 'K' Figure H-12



McIntosh & Associates Project No. 004-157-000



IMAGE 52 – LOOKING NORTH



IMAGE 53 – LOOKING SOUTH

Photo Index Point 'L' Figure H-13



McIntosh & Associates Project No. 004-157-000



IMAGE 54 – LOOKING EAST



IMAGE 55 – LOOKING WEST

Photo Index Point 'L' Figure H-13



McIntosh & Associates Project No. 004-157-000



IMAGE 56 – LOOKING NORTH



IMAGE 57 – LOOKING SOUTH



IMAGE 58 – LOOKING WEST





McIntosh & Associates Project No. 004-157-000



IMAGE 59 – LOOKING NORTH



IMAGE 60 – LOOKING SOUTH

Photo Index Point 'N' Figure H-15



McIntosh & Associates Project No. 004-157-000



IMAGE 61 – LOOKING WEST, IRRIGATION PUMP, COVERED CONCRETE LOADING DOCK & ELECTRICAL PANEL



IMAGE 62 – LOOKING NORTHWEST, NORTH OF IMAGE 61, IRRIGATION FILTRATION SYSTEM

Photo Index Point 'N' Figure H-15





IMAGE 63 – LOOKING NORTHWEST, NORTH OF IMAGE 62, IRRIGATION STORAGE POND





McIntosh & Associates Project No. 004-157-000



IMAGE 64 – LOOKING EAST, ELECTRICAL TRANSFORMER



IMAGE 65 – LOOKING EAST, NORTH OF IMAGE 64

Photo Index Point 'O' Figure H-16





IMAGE 66 – LOOKING NORTH



IMAGE 67 – LOOKING SOUTH Photo Index Point 'P' Figure H-17





IMAGE 68 – LOOKING EAST



IMAGE 69 – LOOKING WEST, IRRIGATION STANDPIPE







IMAGE 70 - LOOKING NORTHWEST ALONG HWY 99



IMAGE 71 – LOOKING SOUTHEAST ALONG HWY 99





McIntosh & Associates Project No. 004-157-000



IMAGE 72 – LOOKING EAST

Photo Index Point 'Q'



McIntosh & Associates Project No. 004-157-000



IMAGE 73 – LOOKING SOUTHEAST, DRAINAGE POND

Photo Index Point 'R'



McIntosh & Associates Project No. 004-157-000



IMAGE 74 – LOOKING NORTHWEST, DRAINAGE POND



IMAGE 75 – LOOKING EAST

Photo Index Point 'S' Figure H-20



McIntosh & Associates Project No. 004-157-000



IMAGE 76 - LOOKING SOUTHEAST, DRAINAGE POND

Photo Index Point 'T'



McIntosh & Associates Project No. 004-157-000



IMAGE 77 – LOOKING EAST, NON-POTABLE WATER CONTROL VALVE

Photo Index Point 'U'



McIntosh & Associates Project No. 004-157-000



IMAGE 78 – LOOKING WEST, IRRIGATION PUMP & PIPELINE

Photo Index Point 'V'



McIntosh & Associates Project No. 004-157-000



IMAGE 79 – LOOKING WEST, CULVERT CROSSING HWY 99 (CURRENTLY UNDERGOING REPAIRS)

Photo Index Point 'W'

Farmland Conversion Study Report Final McIntosh & Associates Project No. 004-157-000

APPENDIX I

Figures





McIntosh & Associates Project No. 004-157-000



Kern County GIS Dairy Locations 2020

PROPOSED PROJECT

Portions of Sections 24 & 25, Township 28 South, Range26 East & Portions of Sections 29 & 30, Township 28 South, Range 27 East County of Kern, State of California

Dairy Location Map Figure I-1

Kern County Dairy List

Existing Dairies (existing or under construction)

Dairy Name	Location & Zone Map	Herd Size ¹	Mailing Address
1** Affentranger & Sons	Sec. 8 T.29S.R.25E. (Zone Map 100)	1100 milk cows	18107 Kratzmeyer
Marie Affentranger & Sons	18107 Kratzmeyer Rd.	NO CUP - Predates zoning	Bakersfield, CA 93312
2 AJB Ranch	Sec. 32,T.29S.R.25E. (Zone Map 100)	3400 milk cows	100908 Ramsgate
AJ Boss & John Boss	28724 Stockdale Highway	CUP 25 Map 100	Bakersfield, CA 93311
3 Devries #3	Sec. 3, T.26S.R.25E. (Zone Map 33)	930 milk cows	11265 Paulsen Way
	30586 Elmo Highway	CUP 2 Map 33	Bakersfield
4** Ansonea Dairy	Sec. 2 T.31S.,R.28E. (Zone Map 143)	1500 milk cows	8762 Kimball Avenue
(Echeverria Bros)	5250 Digorgio Road, Arvin	NO CUP - Predates zoning	Chino, CA 91710
5 Bear Mountain Dairies	Sec. 26 T.31S.R.27E. (Zone Map 142)	2100 milk cows	8762 Kimball Avenue
Ramon & Eduardo Echeverria	4551 Bear Mountain Blvd.	CUP 35 Map 142	Chino, CA 91710
6** Cardoza Dairy	Sec. 4 T.26S., R.25E. (Zone Map 33)	380 milk cows	12421 Melcher Road
Franklin Cardoza	12421 Melcher Rd., McFarland	NO CUP-Predates zoning	McFarland, CA. 93250
7** T & J Dairy (John Weistheim)	Sec. 26 T.30S., R.28E. (Zone Map 124)	1200 milk cows	14500 Chander
(Old Tjarda Dairy)	6219 East Panama Lane	NO CUP - Predates zoning	Corona, CA 91720
8 H & P Dairy	Sec. 26 T.31S.R.27E. (Zone Map 143)	1050 milk cows	5021 E. Bear Mtn. Blvd.
David Haagsma & Jack Pinheiro	5021 E. Bear Mtn. Blvd.	CUP 22 Map 143	Bakersfield, CA 93307
9** T & W Dairy	Sec. 13, T.31S.R.27E. (Zone Map 142)	720 milk cows	5962 Houghton Road
Brian Wynn/Maynard Troost	5961 Houghton Road	NO CUP-Predates zoning	Bakersfield, CA 93313
10 Peter De Boer Dairy #2.	Sec. 26 T.30S., R.28E. (Zone Map 124)	1600 milk cows	7524 S. Fairfax Rd.
Peter De Boer	7524 S. Fairfax Road	CUP 32 Map 124	Bakersfield, CA 93307
11 J & R Dairy	Sec. 26 T.31S.R.27E. (Zone Map 142)	2100 milk cows	4403 Bear Mtn. Blvd.
Javier Echeverria	4403 Bear Mtn. Blvd.	CUP 34 Map 142	Bakersfield, CA 93313

¹Note: Herd size does not include support stock

12**	Kootstra Dairy	Sec. 16 T.31S.,R.28E. (Zone Map 143)	1650 milk cows	13628 Adobe Rd.
	Dewey Kootstra	13628 Adobe Rd.	NO CUP-Predates zoning	Bakersfield, CA 93307
13**	Larsen_s Dairyland	Sec. 33 T.29S.R.25E. (Zone Map 100)	970 milk cows	4949 Buckley Way, Suite 108
	Norm Larsen	25820 Stockdale Highway	NO CUP-Predates zoning	Bakersfield, CA 93309
14**	O & L Dairy	Sec. 10 T.26S., R.25E. (Zone Map 33) Heit Avenue, McFarland	560 milk cows NO CUP - predates zoning	Rt. 1 Box 238 McFarland, CA 93250
15**	McFarland Dairy	Sec. 25 T.25S., R.25E. (Zone Map 33)	520 milk cows	31348 Hanawalt Ave.
	Wes Verhoeven	31348 Hanawalt Ave.	NO CUP	McFarland, CA 93250
16**	O & L Dairy #3	Sec. 2 T.25S. R.25E. (Zone Map 33)	700 milk cows	12750 Avenue 160
	(Old Menodsa Dairy)	w/ of Garzoli on Peterson	NO CUP - predates zoning	Tipton, CA 93272
17	Oasis Holsteins	Sec. 14 T.28S., R.24E. (Zone Map 78)	1530 milk cows	18041 Palm Avenue
	Pete DeJohn	18041 Palm Avenue	CUP 5 Map 78	Shafter, CA 93263
18**	Palla Rosa Dairy #1	Sec. 10 T.31S. R.27E. (Zone Map 142)	830 milk cows	4921 Houghton Rd.
	Livio Palla	4921 Houghton Rd	NO CUP - predates zoning	Bakersfield, CA 93313
19**	Palla Rosa Dairy #2	Sec. 22 T.31S. R.27E. (Zone Map 142)	920 milk cows	6404 Shafter Road
	Livio Palla	4714 E. Bear Mtn. Blvd.	NO CUP - predates zoning	Bakersfield, CA 93313
20	Palla Rosa Dairy #3 Livio Palla	Sec. 25 T.31S. R.26E. (Zone Map 141)	2200 milk cows CUP 5 Map 141	4921 Houghton Rd. Bakersfield, CA 93313
21	Petrissans Dairy	Sec. 27 T.31S. R.27E. (Zone Map 142)	1000 milk cows	3404 Sierra Meadows
	Petrissans Brothers	5111 Bear Mtn. Blvd.	Map 142	Bakersfield, CA 93313
22	Jer=Z-Boys II	Sec. 27, T.25S. R.25E. (Zone Map 9) 11699 Stradley Road McFarland	1000 milk cows CUP 1 Map 9	2412 Avenue 360 Kingsburg, CA 93631
23**	Riverbend Dairy	Sec. 12 T.31 S. R.26E. (Zone Map 141)	2700 milk cows	11663 Buena Vista Rd.
	Lance Mouw	11663 Buena Vista Rd.	NO CUP - predates zoning	Bakersfield, CA 93311
24	Ralph Te Velde Dairy	Sec. 28S. T.31S. R.27E. (Zone Map 142)	1150 milk cows	5921 Bear Mtn. Blvd.
	Ralph & Carolyn TeValde	6921 Bear Mtn. Blvd.	CUP 26 Map 142	Bakersfield, CA 93309
25**	Reyneveld Dairy	Sec. 33 T.32S. R.29E. (Zone Map 162)	800 milk cows	26101 Edison Rd.
	Bill Reyneveld	26101 Edison Rd.	NO CUP - predates zoning	Arvin, CA 93203

** Designates dairy which predates zoning * Designates dairy approved under "by right" provision

26	Wasco Dairy	Sec. 7 T.26S., R.23E (APN 059-050-19) (Map 31)	4785 milk cows	13350 Haven
	Harvey Boschma	NW Corner McCoy & Sherwood	NO CUP - predates zoning	Ontario, CA 91761
27	Richmar Farms Dairy	Sec. 26 T.31S. R.28E. (Zone Map 143) 5259 E. Bear Mtn. Blvd.	1500 milk cows Cup 22 Map 143	6848 Archibald Street Corona, CA 91720
28	Richmar Farms (New)	Sec. 20 T.31S. R28E. (Zone Map 143)	2400 milk cows	6848 Archibald, Street
	Rich Tillema	NE Corn. So Union & Bear Mtn.	CUP 32 Map 143	Corona, CA 91720
29	Miersma Dairy	Sec. 26 T.30S R.28E (Zone Map 124)	1700 milk cows	5829 E. Panama
	(Old Rodney Palla Farms)	5829 East Panama Lane	No CUP - Predates zoning	Bakersfield, CA 93307
30**	V B Dairy	Sec. 18, T.26S., R.26E. (Zone Map 34)Taylor	2200 milk cows	Rt. 1 Box 168
	Jes Visser & Sons	Avenue, McFarland (APN 201-200-10)	NO CUP - predates zoning	McFarland, CA 93260
31**	Skyview Dairy	Sec. 14 T.31S. R.27E. (Zone Map 142)	900 milk cows	13714 Stine Rd.
	Brian VanderPoel	13714 Stine Road	NO CUP-"by right"	Bakersfield, CA 93313
32	Wilgenburg Dairy	Sec. 7, T.31S. R.26E. (Zone Map 141)	2750 milk cows	11701 Old River Road
	Ed Wilgenburg	11701 Old River Rd.	CUP 27 Map 142	Bakersfield, CA 93311
33	Maple Farms Dairy	Sec. 27 T.31S. R.26E. (Zone Map 141)	6000 milk cows	10908 Ramsgate
	John Bos	S/si. Bear Mountain W/I-5	CUP 9 Map 141	Bakersfield, CA 93311
<mark>34</mark>	Goyenetche Dairy	Sec. 10, T.29S. R.24E. (Zone Map 99) Brandt & Sullivan	2600milk cows CUP 12, Map 99	11265 Paulsen Way Bakersfield, CA 93312
35	Newhouse Dairy	Sec. 21 T.31S., R.26E. (Zone Map 141)	3200 milk cows	16130 Bear Mountain Blvd.
	Rodney Palla	N/si. Bear Mtn. Blvd. W/I-5	CUP 7 Map 141	Bakersfield 93311
<mark>36*</mark>	Tjaarda Dairy	NE/4 Sec. 34, T.28S. R.24E. (Zone Map 78)	2700 milk cows	19087 Magnolia Avenue
	Perry Tjaarda	W/si. Magnolia 1/2 mil n/Seventh Standard	NO CUP - "By right"	Shafter, CA 93263
<mark>37*</mark>	Lewis Aukeman	Sec. 15, T.28S., R.24E (Zone Map 78)	2200 milk cows	12391 Schliesman
	Lewis Aukeman	NW Corner Riverside & Magnolia	NO CUP-"by right"	Mira Loma, CA 91752
38*	Candido Costa	Sec. 31 T.25S. R.24E. (Zone Map 8)	2300 milk cows	7316 Schaeffer
	Inland Empire Calf Company	SW corner Pond & Jumper	NO CUP-"by right"	Chino, CA 91719

39*	Whiteside Dairy (New)	Sec. T.27S. R.24E. (Zone Map 55)	1584 milk cows	16461 Scofield
	Jon VanderPoel	S/Si. Schofield 1300' S/Kimberlina	NO CUP-"by right"	Wasco, CA.
<mark>40</mark>	Vermeer & Goedhart 088-160-15	Sec. 22 T28S R.24E (Zone Map 78) NW corner Burbank & Magnolia	3000 milk cows NO CUP-"by right"	Accomodators, Inc.
41	Western Sky Dairy	Sc. 31 T.31S R.27E. (Zone Map 141) NW Corner Millux & Old River	4500 milk cows CUP 47 Map 141	George Plangenga 6500 Hamner Ave Corona CA 91720
42	Poso Creek Family Dairy LLC	Sec. 17 T.26S. R.23E (Zone Map 31)	4275 milk cows	Peter Bouma
	059-130-06	Hanawalt Ave _ mi. W/of GunClubRd	NO CUP-"by right"	99 North Tower Square Tulare, CA 93274
44*	J & R Dairy	Sec. 24 T.28S. R.23E. (Zone Map 77)	3400 milk cows	Javier Echeveria 8762 Kimball Ave.
	087-120-08	SW Corner Riverside & Wildwood	NO CUP-"by right"	Chino CA 91710
45*	West Star Dairy	Sec. 19 T.28S. R.24E. (Zone Map 78)	4352 milk cows	Ben Slegers
	088-170-13	SE Corner Riverside & Wildwood	NO CUP-"by right"	10401 Riverside; Ontario CA 91761
46* (CarlosEtcheverria&SonsDairy	Sec. 6 T.32S. R.27E. (Zone Map 160)	4320 milk cows	Felix Echeverria
	295-080-22	W/si. Old River N/Herring	NO CUP-"by right"	14320 Cleveland Ave. Ontario, CA 91761
47*	JDS Ranch	W/2 Sec. 17, T.25S.R.24E. (Zone Map 8) SE Corner Garces & Jumper	3822 milk cows NO CUP-"by right"	Harry Samarin 6225 Ridgetop Terrrace, Bakersfield 93306
48	Palla Rosa B.V. Dairy	Sec. 28 T.31S. R.26E (Zone Map 141)	3500 milk cows	Rodney Palla
	Dairy #2	S/si. Bear Mtn.	CUP 7 Map 141	6404 Shafter Rd. Bakersfield 93313
49	T & W Farms	Section 32, T.31S., R.27E. (Zone Map 142)	4000 milk cows CUP 48, Map 142	T & W Farms 8545 Pine Ave. Chino, CA 91710
50	James Borba	Sec. 10 T.31S. R.26E. (Zone Map 141) S/si. 119 E/si I-5	7000 milk cows CUP 13 Map141	Joseph & Doleen Borba 2339 N. Euclid Upland, CA 91784
51	George Borba	Sec. 2 T.31S. R.26E. (Zone Map 141) S/si. 119 1/mi. W/Buena Vista	7000 milk cows CUP 13 Map 141	George Borba and Son Dairy 7955 Eucalyptus Ave. Chino, CA 91710
52*	Southern Cross Dairy	Sec. 13 T.28S.R.23E (Zone Map 77)	6000 milk	George De Boer
	087-090-03	Lerdo Hwy - 1 mi/E of Rowlee Rd.	NO CUP-"by right"	9155 Riverside Drive; Ontario, CA 91761

** Designates dairy which predates zoning * Designates dairy approved under "by right" provision

53	Lakeview Dairy	Sec. 20 T.31S. R.26E (Zone Map 141)	3500 milk cows	Rodney Palla
	Dairy #3	S/si. Bear Mtn.	CUP 7 Map 141	6404 Shafter Rd. Bakersfield 93313
54	Bidart Dairy	S/2 Sec. 5, T.32S., R.27E. (Zone Map 159)	7000 milk cows	Michael Bidart
	Michael Bidart	E/si Old River, South of Millux	"By right"	640 Indian Hills Blvd., Claremont, CA 91711
55*	J.G. Boswell	Sec. 16 T.32S. R.25E (Zone Map 158)	2400 milk cows	JG Boswell
	220-120-26	1 mi. n/Southlake Rd.	NO CUP-"by right"	101 W. Walnut - Pasadena CA 91103
56	Rodney Palla Farms	S/si. Bear Mtn (Zone Map 141)	3500 milk cows	Rodney Palla
	Dairy #4	.Sec. 19 T.31S. R.26E	CUP 7 Map 141	6404 Shafter Rd. Bakersfield 93313
57	Vanderham Dairy	Sec. 24, T.28S., R.24E.	1500+ milk cows	Rick Vanderham
	Corrie & Rick Vanderham	(Zone Map 78)	CUP 9 Map 78 - In litigation	4860 Wineville Mira Loma, CA 91752
58	Solo Farms	Sec. 20 T.25S. R.24E (Zone Map 8) SE Corner Garces & Wildwood	3822 milk cows NO CUP-"by right"	Harry Samarin 6225 Ridgetop Terrrace, Bakersfield 93306
59. F	Petrissans Dairy- Map 142	South of Bear Mtn. Blvd, 1/2 mi. west of Stine Rd.	1585 milk 3100 total	George & Marie Petrissans
18	4-450-56	E/2 of the NW/4 of Sec. 27, T31S, R27E	CUP 50 Map 142	3404 Sierra Meadow, BFL 93313

