# NEGATIVE DECLARATION

The City of Bakersfield's Development Services Department, Planning Division, has completed an initial study (attached) of the possible environmental effects of the following-described project and has determined that a Negative Declaration is appropriate. It has been found that the proposed project, as described and proposed to be mitigated (if required), will not have a significant effect on the environment. This determination has been made according to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the State CEQA Guidelines, and the City of Bakersfield's CEQA Implementation Procedures.

**PROJECT NO. (or Title):** General Plan Amendment/Zone Change No. CGPA-25-0004

**COMMENT PERIOD BEGINS:** July 31, 2026

**COMMENT PERIOD ENDS:** August 31, 2026

**MITIGATION MEASURES** (*included in the proposed project to avoid potentially significant effects, if required)*:

**Air Quality Impact Mitigation Measures:**

1. Prior to grading plan approval, the applicant/developer shall submit documentation to the Planning Division that they are compliant with air quality control measures and rules required by the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District.

2. Prior to grading plan approval, the applicant/developer shall submit proof to the Planning Division that they have complied with the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District's Indirect Source Rule (Rule 9510).

**Biological Resources Impact Mitigation Measures:**

3. Prior to ground disturbance and/or construction activities, the applicant/developer shall consult with and follow all California Department of Fish and Wildlife and United States Fish and Wildlife Service requirements related to listed plant and animal species protected under the Federal Endangered Species Act (FESA) and the California Endangered Species Act (CESA). Applicant/developer shall have a qualified professional biologist conduct and prepare the following:

    a. A biological resource pre-activity clearance survey conducted by a qualified biologist no more than 30-days before the start of construction activities;
    b. Biological resource monitoring during each initial phase of ground disturbance;
    c. Compliance reporting provided to the required oversight agencies for all biological resource field surveys, monitoring, and additional tasks as warranted;
    d. Conduct a Worker Environmental Awareness Program outlining special-status species that may access, use or otherwise transverse the project area will be implemented;
    e. If known or natal SJKF dens are identified at any time during construction, protocols enumerated in the USFWS Standardized Recommendations for Protection of the Endangered San Joaquin Kit Fox prior to or During Ground Disturbance (2011) should be implemented, and the appropriate agencies contacted for guidance;
    f. Vertical sided trenching deeper than 2-feet will include escape ramps at no more than a 1:1 ratio every 100 feet;
    g. Vertical sided holes that are not capable of being ramped should be covered or otherwise secured to the greatest extent practicable;

h. Pipes, conduits and similar material 3 inches or greater should be capped to prevent wildlife from becoming inadvertently trapped in the piping;
i. The project is also within the historic range of Tipton kangaroo rat. The project was not included in the southwest focus area for the species in the previous habitat conservation plan. The most recent habitat suitability modeling (Cypher 2021) does not include the project in any of the four tiers enumerated for suitability. Trapping would be required to confirm small mammal species occupying the project.
j. The protection of bird species that may occur on the project site or vicinity in compliance with the MBTA, should follow the following: If ground-disturbing activities are planned during the nesting season for migratory birds that may nest on or near the project site (generally February 1 though August 31), nesting bird surveys are recommended prior to the commencement of ground disturbance for project activities. If nesting birds are present, no new construction or ground disturbance should occur within an appropriate avoidance area for that species until young have fledged, unless otherwise approved and monitored by a qualified onsite biologist. Appropriate avoidance should be determined by a qualified biologist. In general, minimum avoidance zones for active nests should be implemented as follows:
k. Ground or low-shrub nesting non-raptors – 300 feet (91 meters).
l. Burrowing owl – as appropriate based on nest location, existing surrounding activity, and evaluation of owl behavior. Coordination with CDFW may be warranted.
m. Sensitive raptors (e.g., prairie falcon, golden eagle) – 0.5 miles (0.8 kilometers).
n. Other raptors – 500 feet (152 meters).

**Geology and Soils, Cultural Resources, and Tribal Resources Impacts Mitigation Measures:**

4. Prior to construction and as needed throughout the construction period, a cultural awareness training program shall be provided to all new construction workers within one week of employment at the project site. The training shall be prepared and conducted by a qualified cultural resources specialist.

5. During construction, if paleontological or cultural resources are encountered during construction or ground disturbance activities, all work within 50 feet of the find shall immediately cease and the area cordoned off until a qualified cultural and/or paleontological resource specialist that meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards can evaluate the find and make recommendations. If the specialist determines that the discovery represents a potentially significant cultural resource, additional investigations may be required. These additional studies may include avoidance, testing, and excavation. All reports, correspondence, and determinations regarding the discovery shall be submitted to the California Historical Resources Information System's Southern San Joaquin Valley Information Center at California State University Bakersfield.

6. During construction, if human remains are discovered, further ground disturbance shall be prohibited pursuant to California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5. The specific protocol, guidelines, and channels of communication outlined by the Native American Heritage Commission, in accordance with Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5, Public Resources Code 5097.97, and Senate Bill 447 shall be followed. In the event of the discovery of human remains, at the direction of the county coroner, Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5(c) shall guide Native American consultation.

**Traffic Impact Mitigation Measures:**

7. Prior to the issuance of building permits, the project applicant/developer shall participate in the Regional Transportation Impact Fee (RTIF) program by paying the adopted fees in place for the land use type at time of development.

# INITIAL STUDY
# ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

1. **Project** *(Title & No.)*: General Plan Amendment/Zone Change No. CGPA-25-0004

2. **Lead Agency** *(name and address)*: City of Bakersfield
Development Services Department
1715 Chester Avenue
Bakersfield, California 93301

3. **Contact Person** *(name, title, phone)*: Yazid Alawgarey, Assistant Planner
(661) 326-3191

4. **Project Location:** The project is located at 8339 Buena Vista Road, generally located on the southwest corner of Buena Vista Road and McCutchen Road on approximately 20 acres, [Assessor Parcel Number 524-160-09] Bakersfield, CA 93311

5. **Applicant** *(name and address)*: Cornerstone Engineering Inc
Attn: Patricia Newquist
5509 Young Street
Bakersfield, CA 93311

6. **General Plan Designation:** R-IA (Resource - Intensive Agriculture), R-MP (Resource - Minerals & Petroleum), LR (Low Density Residential)

7. **Zoning:** R-1 (Single-Unit Dwelling), R-1/PUD (Single-Unit Dwelling/Planned Unit Development)

8. **Description of Project** *(describe the whole action involved, including but not limited to later phases of the Project, and any secondary, support, or off-site features necessary for its implementation.)*:

Cornerstone Engineering Inc (applicant), on behalf of Antonio Jimenez Nunez Raymond Villanueva (property owner), has requested a General Plan Amendment to change existing land use designations from R-IA (Resource - Intensive Agriculture), R-MP (Resource - Minerals & Petroleum), and LR (Low Density Residential to LR (Low Density Residential) and MUC ( Mixed Use Commercial) and a zone change from R-1 (Single-Unit Dwelling) and R-1/PUD (Single-Unit Dwelling/Planned Unit Development) to R-1 (Single-Unit Dwelling) and MX-1 (Mixed-Use Neighborhood) on approximately 20 acres [Assessor's Parcel Number 524-160-09].


The project proposes to develop an event venue and commercial development. The event venue will host up to 52 large-scale events (250-300 guests) per year and approximately one to two small-scale events (up to 100 guests) per month utilizing the existing single-family residential structures, develop a 2,500 square-foot fast-food restaurant with a drive-through window, and a convenience store/gas station with 16 vehicle fueling pumps.


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


The proposed project site currently consists of two large contiguous parcels totaling approximately 20 acres, previously utilized for farming operations and a single-family residence. The project includes a single-family residence with four garage structures, a covered patio, a cabana, and a gazebo for a structural total of 15,695 square feet surrounded by almond trees that are a part of an orchard. The project is surrounded by agricultural active farmland on all four sides.

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

| **Agency** | **Approvals and Decisions** |
|---|---|
| **Subsequent City of Bakersfield Approvals** | |
| Development Services Department<br>Public Works Department | • Issue grading permits.<br>• Issue building permits.<br>• Accept public right-of-way dedications.<br>• Approve road improvement plans.<br>• Issue encroachment permits.<br>• Approve proposed sewer connections and improvements. |
| **Other Agencies – Subsequent Approvals and Permits** | |
| Regional Water Quality Control Board | • Issue a Construction Activity General Construction Permit.<br>• Confirm Compliance with National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit and Waste Discharge Requirements. |
| San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District | • Approve Indirect Source Rule compliance. |
| California Water Service Bakersfield District | • Approve proposed water connections and improvements. |


Concurrent General Plan Amendment
25-0004
CITY OF BAKERSFIELD
BARLOW RD
MC CUTCHEN RD
IRONTOOTH
ALCAZAR
QUENTARI
SIXTES RIVER
TATUK
BUENA VISTA RD
CGPA-25-0004
R-1 to MX-1
R-IA, R-MP to MUC
CGPA-25-0004
R-1/PUD to R-1
R-IA, R-MP to LR
AERIAL
BAKERSFIELD
DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
0
309
618
US Feet
2/4/2026


Concurrent General Plan Amendment
25-0004
CITY OF BAKERSFIELD
LR
LR
BARLOW RD
GC
MC CUTCHEN RD
LR
LR
R-MP
R-IA
CGPA-25-0004
R-1 to MX-1
R-IA, R-MP to MUC
GC
LR
HMR
LR
LR
CGPA-25-0004
R-1/PUD to R-1
R-IA, R-MP to LR
BUENA VISTA RD
R-IA
LR
LR
CROWN HEIGHTS
IRONTOOTH
GARRISON
ICEWEB
ALCAZAR
DENMARSH
COLANTA
QUENTARI
NORDEN VALE
LR
SIXES RIVER
TATUK
LAKE TRASIMENO
Land Use
RESIDENTIAL
HMR - High Medium Density Residential: > 7.26 units but ≤ 17.42 dwelling units/net acre
LR - Low Density Residential: ≤ 7.26 dwelling units/net acre
COMMERCIAL
GC - General Commercial
RESOURCE
R-IA - Resource - Intensive Agriculture: 20 acre minimum parcel size
R-MP - Resource - Minerals & Petroleum: 5 acre minimum parcel size
BAKERSFIELD
DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
0
309
618
US Feet
2/4/2026


Concurrent General Plan Amendment
25-0004
CITY OF BAKERSFIELD
R-1/P.U.D.
C-2
MC CUTCHEN RD
R-1
CGPA-25-0004
R-1 to MX-1
R-IA, R-MP to MUC
C-2/P.C.D.
R-2/P.U.D.
CGPA-25-0004
R-1/PUD to R-1
R-IA, R-MP to LR
BUENA VISTA RD
IRONTOOTH
ALCAZAR
QUENTARI
Zoning
Commercial Zone Designations
C-2 Regional Commercial
C-2/P.C.D. Combining
Residential Zone Designations
R-1 One Family Dwelling
R-1/P.U.D. Combining
R-2/P.U.D. Combining
BAKERSFIELD
DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
0
309
618
US Feet
2/4/2026

**ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:**

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

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| □ Aesthetics | □ Agricultural Resources | □ Air Quality |
| □ Biological Resources | □ Cultural Resources | □ Geology / Soils |
| □ Greenhouse Gas Emissions | □ Hazards & Hazardous Materials | □ Hydrology / Water Quality |
| □ Land Use / Planning | □ Mineral Resources | □ Noise |
| □ Population / Housing | □ Public Services | □ Recreation |
| □ Transportation / Traffic | □ Utilities / Service Systems | |
| □ Mandatory Findings of Significance | | |

**ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION:**

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

□ I find that the proposed project **could** not have a significant effect on the environment, and a **negative declaration** will be prepared.

■ I find that although the proposed project **could** have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A **mitigated negative declaration** will be prepared.

□ I find that the proposed project **may** have a significant effect on the environment, and an **environmental impact report** is required.

□ I find that the proposed project **may** have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect has been (1) adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and (2) addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on the attached sheets. An **environmental impact report** is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

□ I find that although the proposed project **could** have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects have been (1) analyzed adequately in an earlier **environmental impact report or negative declaration** pursuant to applicable legal standards, and (2) avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier **environmental impact report or negative declaration**, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Yazid Alawgarey
*Signature*

7/27/2026
*Date*

Yazid Alawgarey
*Printed Name*

## EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

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

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

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

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

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

   a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
   b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
   c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.

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

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

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

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

## Environmental Checklist and Analysis

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

**Discussion**

a. **Less-than-significant impact.** The project is located within City limits on the southwest corner of Buena Vista Road and McCutchen Road. The existing visual environment in the area consists of active farmland with planned commercial development to the north and east per zoning. The project does not conflict with any applicable vista protection standards, scenic resource protection requirements, or design criteria of federal, state, or local agencies. The project site is located within an area having slopes of 0 to 2 % in any direction. The area is not regarded or designated within the Metropolitan Bakersfield General Plan as visually important or "scenic." The construction of commercial mix-uses at the site would be in character and compatible with future urban land uses in the vicinity and is a natural extension of the urban growth occurring in the project area. Therefore, the project would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista, and impacts are less than significant.

b. **No impact.** The project site is surrounded by almond trees, but there are no rock outcrops or historical buildings. No cultural resource were identified on the project site (Hudlow Cultural Resource Associates, December 2025). Additionally, the project site is not located adjacent to or near any officially designated or potentially eligible scenic highways to be listed on the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) State Scenic Highway System (Caltrans 2017). The closest section of highway eligible for state scenic highway designation is State Route (SR) 14 (Caltrans 2017), located in Kern County over 60 miles to the east. Therefore, the project would not substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcrops, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway.

c. **Less-than-significant impact.** Please refer to responses I.a, I.b, and I.d. As described, the project is located within a pre-zoned urbanized area and is contiguous to future developed land uses. There are no local vista protection standards, scenic resource protection requirements, or design criteria that apply to the project. Therefore, the project would not conflict with applicable zoning

and other regulations governing scenic quality in urbanized areas, and impacts are less than significant.

d. **Less-than-significant impact.** This project involves incremental urban growth within the City of Bakersfield's jurisdiction. This project would be required to comply with City development standards, including Bakersfield Municipal Code Title 17 (zoning ordinance), Title 15 (buildings and construction), and California Code of Regulations Title 24 (building code). Together, these local and state requirements oblige compliance with current lighting standards that minimize unwanted light or glare to spill over into neighboring properties. Therefore, the project would not create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area, and impacts are less than significant.

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES:** | | | | |
| In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project: | | | | |
| a. Convert prime farmland, unique farmland, or farmland of statewide importance (farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |
| b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |
| c. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)) or timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526) or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |
| d. Result in the loss of forestland or conversion of forest land to non-forest? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |
| 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? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |

**Discussion**

a. **No impact.** The project site is not designated by the California Department of Conservation as prime farmland, unique farmland, or farmland of statewide importance. Therefore, the project would not result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use.

b. **No impact.** The project site is currently zoned R-1 (Single-Unit Dwelling), R-1/PUD (Single-Unit Dwelling/Planned Unit Development) for residential uses and is not in conflict with existing zoning for an agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract. The project site currently leases several acres of land for almond production to their neighbors. The majority of surrounding parcels are zoned residential and commercial consistent with adjacent properties. The project site does not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract.

c. **No impact.** As discussed in II.b, the project site is zoned for residential uses. No lands within or immediately adjacent to the project site are zoned forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production. Therefore, the project would not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land or timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production.

d. **No impact.** As discussed in II.c, no lands within or immediately adjacent to the project are zoned forest land or timberland and do not contain any forested areas. Therefore, the project would not result in the loss of forestland or conversion of forest land to non-forest.

e. **No impact.** Please refer to responses II.a through II.d. This project proposes residential uses in an area designated for urban development by the General Plan. There are no forestlands in proximity to the project that would experience conflicts in operation due to the proposed development. Therefore, the project would not involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use.

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant 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 may 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 non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| c. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| d. Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |

**Discussion**

a. **Less-than-significant impact with mitigation incorporated.** The project is located within the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD) jurisdiction, in the San Joaquin Valley Air Basin (SJVAB). As such, air quality impacts from the project are controlled through policies and provisions of the SJVAPCD and the General Plan. The SJVAPCD has adopted an Air Quality Attainment Plan (AQAP) and is required to submit a "Rate of Progress" document to the California Air Resources Board ("CARB") that demonstrates past and planned progress toward reaching attainment for all criteria pollutants.

The SJVAB is classified by the state as being in severe nonattainment for the state 1-hour ozone standard as well as in nonattainment for the state particulate matter less than 10 microns ($PM_{10}$) and particulate matter less than 2.5 microns ($PM_{2.5}$). The SJVAB is also classified as extreme nonattainment for the federal 8-hour ozone standard, nonattainment for the federal $PM_{2.5}$ standard, and attainment/maintenance for the federal carbon monoxide (CO) and $PM_{10}$ standards.

The SJVAPCD requires local jurisdictions to design all developments in ways that reduce air pollution from vehicles, which is the largest single category of air pollution in the San Joaquin Valley, and from other stationary sources. The Guide for Assessing and Mitigating Air Quality Impacts (GAMAQI) (SJVAPCD 2015) lists various land uses and design strategies that reduce air quality impacts of new development. Local ordinance and General Plan requirements related to landscaping, sidewalks, street improvements, level of traffic service, energy-efficient heating and cooling, building code requirements, and location of commercial development in proximity to residential development are consistent with these listed strategies. Regulation and policy that will result in the compliance with air quality strategies for the new commercial development include but are not limited to, Title 24 efficiency standards, Title 20 appliance energy efficiency standards, 2005 building energy efficiency standards, Assembly Bill (AB) 1493 motor vehicle standards, and compliance with the MBGP Air Quality Conservation Element as well as the SJVAPCD air quality guidelines and rules.

An Air Quality Impact Analysis, provided by Envirotech Consultants, was completed for the project. The report includes California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) emissions estimates, criteria pollutant analysis, and GHG analysis. The report concluded that mass emissions of criteria pollutants from the construction and operation of the proposed project are below the SJVAPCD's established emissions impact thresholds.

As shown in the table below, the SJVAPCD has established the following specific criteria for pollutant thresholds of significance:

| **SJVAPCD Significance Thresholds for Criteria Pollutants** | |
|---|---|
| **Air Pollutant** | **Tons/Year** |
| Carbon Monoxide (CO) | 100 |
| Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC) | 10 |
| Nitrogen Oxides ($NO_X$) | 10 |
| Sulfur Oxides ($SO_X$) | 27 |
| Particulate Matter, less than 10 microns ($PM_{10}$) | 15 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Particulate Matter, less than 2.5 microns ($PM_{2.5}$) | 15 |

Source: SJVAPCD 2015

Construction of the project would result in air pollutant emissions. Emissions from construction would result from fuel combustion and exhaust from equipment, as well as vehicle traffic, grading, and the use of toxic materials (e.g., lubricants). The following table provides estimated construction emissions from the project. It was assumed in developing construction emission calculations that the implementation of effective and comprehensive dust control measures under Regulation VIII – $PM_{10}$ Fugitive Prohibitions – would be used during construction.

The following table provides the estimated construction emissions from the project:

| **Construction Emissions Summary and Significance Evaluation** | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Criteria Pollutants** | **Unmitigated** | **Mitigated** | **Threshold** | **Significance** |
| | tons/year | tons/year | tons/year | |
| Reactive Organic Gas (VOC) | 0.09 | 0.09 | 10 | Less Than Sig. |
| $NO_X$ | 0.57 | 0.57 | 10 | Less Than Sig. |
| CO | 0.82 | 0.82 | 100 | Less Than Sig. |
| $SO_X$ | 0.02 | 0.02 | 27 | Less Than Sig. |
| $PM_{10}$ | 0.04 | 0.04 | 15 | Less Than Sig. |
| $PM_{2.5}$ | 0.02 | 0.02 | 15 | Less Than Sig. |

Source: Envirotech Consultants Air Quality Impact Analysis 2026

As shown in the above table, construction emissions are not predicted to exceed SJVAPCD significance threshold levels.

Project operations would also result in air pollutant emissions. The main source of emissions would be from vehicular traffic associated with the project site. The following table provides estimated operational emissions from the project:

| **Operational Emissions Summary and Significance Evaluation** | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Criteria Pollutants** | **Unmitigated** | **Mitigated** | **Threshold** | **Significance** |
| | tons/year | tons/year | tons/year | |
| Reactive Organic Gas (VOC) | 2.22 | 2.22 | 10 | Less Than Sig. |
| $NO_X$ | 1.02 | 1.02 | 10 | Less Than Sig. |
| CO | 5.52 | 5.52 | 100 | Less Than Sig. |
| $SO_X$ | 0.02 | 0.02 | 27 | Less Than Sig. |
| $PM_{10}$ | 0.02 | 0.02 | 15 | Less Than Sig. |
| $PM_{2.5}$ | 0.02 | 0.02 | 15 | Less Than Sig. |

Source: Envirotech Consultants Air Quality Impact Analysis 2026

As shown in the above table, operational emissions are not predicted to exceed SJVAPCD significance threshold levels.

With the implementation of Mitigation Measure 1, the project would not conflict with, or obstruct the implementation of, the applicable air quality plan. Mitigation Measure 2 requires that the necessary fees be paid to the SJVAPCD. With the implementation of Mitigation Measures 1 and 2, the project would not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of the applicable air quality plan. Therefore, the project would not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of the applicable air quality plan, and impacts are less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

b. **Less-than-significant impact.** Under the SJVAPCD's GAMAQI, any project that would have individually significant air quality impacts would also be considered to have significant cumulative air quality impacts. Impacts of local pollutants are cumulatively significant when the combined emissions from the project and other planned projects exceed air quality standards. The following table shows the project's contribution to cumulative emissions calculated for both Kern County and the greater SJVAB:

| **Cumulative Emissions** | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Emissions Inventory** | **Pollutants (tons/year)** | | |
| | **ROG** | **$NO_X$** | **$PM_{10}$** |
| Kern County | 20,327 | 8,340 | 14,761 |
| SJVAB | 104,375 | 38,048 | 99,276 |
| Project | 4.28 | 1.28 | 4.42 |
| Project's % of Kern | 0.021% | 0.015% | 0.030% |
| Project's % of SJVAB | 19.47% | 21.92% | 14.87% |

Source: CARB 2025b

As shown in the above table, the project does not pose a significant increase to estimated cumulative emissions for criteria pollutants in nonattainment within Kern County and the greater SJVAB. The project's regional contribution to cumulative impacts would be negligible (well less than 1% for all pollutants under consideration) and does not pose a substantial increase to basin emissions. Therefore, the project's contribution is not cumulatively considerable.

Additionally, the GAMAQI, citing CEQA Guidelines Section15064(h)(3), states on page 66 that "[a] Lead Agency may determine that a project's incremental contribution to a cumulative effect is not cumulatively considerable if the project will comply with the requirements in a previously approved plan or mitigation program, including, but not limited to an air quality attainment or maintenance plan that provides specific requirements that will avoid or substantially lessen the cumulative problem within the geographic area in which the project is located" (SJVAPCD 2015).

This project would also be required, when applicable, to follow air quality control measures and rules required by the SJVAPCD, which include, but are not limited to, SJVAPCD Rule 2010 (Permits Required), SJVAPCD Rule 2201 (New and Modified Stationary Source Review Rule), SJVAPCD Rule 4102 (Nuisance), and SJVAPCD Rule 9510 (Indirect Source Rule), each of which is discussed below.

SJVAPCD Rule 2010 requires any person constructing, altering, replacing, or operating any source operation that emits, may emit, or may reduce emissions to obtain an Authority to Construct or a Permit to Operate from the SJVAPCD Air Pollution Control Officer (APCO). The project will comply

with this rule by obtaining authorization from APCO before commencing construction on the project.

SJVAPCD Rule 2201 requires review and offset of stationary sources of air pollution and no net increase in emissions above specified thresholds from new and modified stationary sources of all nonattainment pollutants and their precursors. This is achieved by using mechanisms as approved by the SJVAPCD, such as emission trade-offs by which a permit to construct or operate any source of pollution is granted. The project will comply with this rule by demonstrating compliance when obtaining authorization from APCO under Rule 2010. For example, compliance with Rule 2201 may include using Best Available Control Technology and providing emission offsets.

SJVAPCD Rule 4102 protects the health and safety of the public by prohibiting discharge from any source whatsoever of air contaminants that cause injury, detriment, nuisance, or other annoyance to any considerable number of people. The project will comply with this rule by not discharging air contaminants or other materials, which cause injury, detriment, nuisance, or other annoyance to any considerable number of people.

SJVAPCD Rule 9510 requires the reduction of emissions of nitrogen oxides ($NO_X$) and particulate matter smaller than ten microns in aerodynamic diameter ($PM_{10}$) associated with construction and operational activities of development projects occurring within the San Joaquin Valley. Rule 9510 applies to new development projects that would equal or exceed specific size limits called applicability thresholds (e.g., developing more than 2,000 square feet of commercial space, 25,000 square feet of multi-family housing space, 10,000 square feet of heavy industrial space, or 50 residential units). The project is subject to SJVAPCD Rule 9510 because it exceeds the applicability threshold for developing more than 25,000 square feet of 50 residential units. Accordingly, the project must reduce a portion of the emissions occurring during construction and operational phases through on-site measures or pay off-site mitigation fees. The objective of this rule is to reduce construction $NO_X$ and $PM_{10}$ emissions by 20% and 45%, respectively, as well as to reduce operational $NO_X$ and $PM_{10}$ emissions by 33.3% and 50%, respectively, when compared to unmitigated projects. The SJVAPCD uses CalEEMOD (California Emission Estimator Model) to estimate emissions of $NO_X$ and $PM_{10}$ for potential land uses. Examples of measures that may be implemented to reduce emissions under this rule include but are not limited to, incorporating energy efficiency beyond Title 24 requirements, providing bicycle lanes throughout a project, using cleaner fleet construction vehicles, providing employee incentives for using alternative transportation, and building in proximity to existing or planned bus stops. When a development project cannot reduce its $NO_X$ and $PM_{10}$ emissions to the level required by Rule 9510, then the difference must be mitigated through the payment of an off-site emissions reduction fee. One hundred percent (100%) of all off-site mitigation fees are used by the SJVAPCD to fund emission reduction projects through its Incentives Programs, achieving emission reductions on behalf of the project.

Because the air quality modeling indicates that the project's regional contribution to cumulative impacts would be negligible, and the project would comply with the requirements of the SJVAPCD attainment plans and rules, the project would not 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. Therefore, based on these anticipated activity levels, the project construction activities would not exceed construction thresholds, and impacts are less than significant.

c. **Less-than-significant impact with mitigation incorporated.** Some groups of people are more affected by air pollution than others. CARB has identified the following people who are likely to be affected by air pollution: children under 14; the elderly over 65; athletes; and people with

cardiovascular and chronic respiratory diseases. These groups are classified as sensitive receptors. Locations that may contain a high concentration of these sensitive population groups include residential areas, hospitals, daycare facilities, elder care facilities, elementary schools, and parks.

The majority of the potential ambient air quality emissions from this proposed project are related to increases in mobile source emissions. The proposed project is not expected to result in localized impacts, such as CO "Hot Spots", and therefore, is not expected to impact nearby sensitive receptors. Therefore, the impact to sensitive receptors is considered less than significant with mitigation.

d. **Less-than-significant impact.** The proposed Project consists of mixed uses that do not include activities listed in Table 6 of the SJVAPCD's GAMAQI. Therefore, the Project would not create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people, and impacts are less than significant.

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES:** Would the project: | | | | |
| a. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or US Fish and Wildlife Service? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |
| c. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |
| d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with an established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites? | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| 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, regional, or state habitat conservation plan? | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |

**Discussion**

a. **Less-than significant with mitigation incorporated.** The project site has the potential to result in significant impacts on some special-status wildlife species, but no listed special-status plant and animal species were found on the site during reconnaissance-level surveys for the project (Pruett Biological Resource Evaluation 2025).

Despite there being no indication of special-status wildlife species use on the project site during the site visit, there is potential for use by special-status species in the future due to the project's overall location within the Central Valley region. A database search of the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB) and the California Native Plant Society's (CNPS) Online Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants revealed several special-status species that occur in the region.

The project is subject to the terms of Section 10(a)(1)(b) and Section 2081 permits issued by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service("USFWS") and the California Department of Fish and Wildlife ("CDFW"), respectively. Terms of these permits require applicants for all development projects within the plan area to comply directly with requests of the USFWS and the CDFW.

Mitigation Measures 3 – 4 require a survey prior to ground disturbance for any special-status wildlife species and compliance with any requirements of the CDFW and USFWS to reduce or avoid significant impacts to biological resources. In addition, Mitigation Measure 3 requires training of on-site personnel to increase awareness of FESA and CESA. Therefore, with the implementation of the mitigation measures the project would not 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 CDFW or USFWS, and impacts are less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

b. **No impact.** There is no riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities located at the site (Pruett Biological Resource Evaluation 2025). This project is not located within, or adjacent to, the Kern River riparian habitat area, nor within the Kern River flood plain, or along a canal that has been identified by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service as a corridor for native resident wildlife species. Therefore, the project would not have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community.

c. **No impact.** There are no wetlands, as defined by Section 404 of the federal Clean Water Act (CWA), located at the project site or within or near the site. Therefore, the project would not have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands.

d. **Less-than-significant with mitigation incorporated.** It was concluded that the project would not interfere with wildlife movement (Pruett Biological Resource Evaluation 2025). The project is not within the Kern River floodplain, or along a canal that has been identified by the USFWS as a corridor for native resident wildlife species. There is the potential during construction to temporarily affect nursery sites such as dens and burrows. Project construction could cause the direct destruction of a nursery site or cause enough of an indirect disturbance to cause special-status wildlife to abandon a nursery site. However, Mitigation Measure 3 requires preconstruction surveys and, if necessary, additional mitigation recommended by a qualified biologist and CDFW to reduce potential impacts on nursery sites. Therefore, with the implementation of Mitigation Measure 3, the project would not interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident, migratory fish, wildlife species, established native residents, migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites, and impacts are less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

e. **Less than significant impact.** It was concluded that the project site does not contain any biological resources that are protected by local policies or ordinances protecting any biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance (Pruett Biological Resource Evaluation 2025). Therefore, the project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources and impacts are less than significant.

f. **Less than significant with mitigation incorporated.** Please refer to responses IV.d, and IV.e. With the implementation of Mitigation Measure 3, the project would not conflict with the provisions of a local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan, and impacts are less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **V. CULTURAL RESOURCES:** Would the project: | | | | |
| a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |
| b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5? | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| c. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |

**Discussion**

a. **No impact.** A Cultural Resources Survey which included a pedestrian field survey was completed for the project site by a qualified cultural resources specialist from Hudlow Cultural Resource Associates. A record search of the project area and the environs within one half-mile was conducted at the Southern San Joaquin Information Center. Scott M. Hudlow conducted the record search on November 5, 2025, AIC# 24-471. The record search revealed that six surveys have been conducted within one half-mile of the project area. Two surveys have been conducted within the current project area (Murphy and Pruett 2004 and Pruett and Murphy 2006). Seven cultural resources have been recorded within one-half mile of the project area. Four of these resources are historic houses, and three additional resources are prehistoric lithic scatters. None of these previously recorded cultural resources are located within the confines of the current project area (Appendix II).Therefore, the project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource.

b. **Less than significant with mitigation incorporated.** It was concluded that the project site has no prehistoric or historic archaeological sites present (Hudlow Phase I Cultural Resource Survey 2025). However, there is still the potential to unearth previously unknown archaeological resources at the site, and grading and other ground-disturbing activities have the potential to damage or destroy such resources. Mitigation Measure 4 requires that construction workers be provided with cultural awareness training. Mitigation Measure 5 requires ceasing work and investigating any discovery if previously unknown archaeological resources are unearthed during construction. With the implementation of Mitigation Measures 4 and 5, the project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource, and impacts are less than significant with mitigations incorporated.

c. **Less than significant with mitigation incorporated.** There are no known human remains present at the Project site (Hudlow Phase I Cultural Resource Survey 2025). The project could inadvertently uncover, or damage, previously unknown human remains. Mitigation Measure 6 requires that if any human remains are found at the site during construction, work will cease, and the remains will be handled pursuant to applicable law. With the implementation of Mitigation Measure 6, the project would not significantly disturb any human remains, and impacts are less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **VI. ENERGY:** Would the project: | | | | |
| a. Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| b. Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |

**Discussion**

a. **Less than significant impact.** Project construction would require temporary energy demands typical of other mixed-use commercial projects that occur throughout the state and this development's construction would not result in inefficient or unnecessary consumption of energy resources beyond typical residential and commercial construction. All new construction within the City must adhere to adopted building standards, including California Code of Regulations Title 24, which outlines energy efficiency standards for new, single-family residential and commercial buildings to ensure that they do not wastefully, inefficiently, or unnecessarily consume energy. Therefore, the project would not result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation, and impacts are less than significant.

b. **Less than significant impact.** There is no adopted plan by the City of Bakersfield for renewable energy or energy efficiency. As mentioned above, all new development projects within the City are required to adhere to adopted building standards related to energy efficiency. Additionally, the City encourages applicants/developers to go beyond the required standards and make their developments even more efficient through programs such as Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED), which is a green building rating system that provides a framework to create healthy, highly efficient, and cost-saving green buildings. Other encouraged programs available to applicants/developers are Title 20 appliance energy efficiency standards and 2005 building energy efficiency standards. Therefore, the project would not conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency, and impacts are less than significant.

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS:** Would the project: | | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| a. Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: | | | | |
| i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map, issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |
| ii. Strong seismic ground shaking? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| iv. Landslides? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |
| b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| 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 where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| f. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |

**Discussion**

a. The following discusses the potential for the project to expose people or structures to substantial adverse effects because of various geologic hazards. The City is within a seismically active area. According to the Metropolitan Bakersfield General Plan, major active fault systems border the southern portion of the San Joaquin Valley. Among these major active fault systems include the San Andreas, Breckenridge-Kern County, Garlock, Pond Poso, and White Wolf faults. There are additional smaller faults suspected of occurring within the Bakersfield area, which may or may not be active. The active faults have a maximum credible Richter magnitude that ranges from 6.0 (Breckenridge-Kern County) to 8.3 (San Andreas). Potential seismic hazards in the planning area involve strong ground shaking, fault rupture, liquefaction, and landslides.

i. **No Impact.** Ground rupture is ground deformation that occurs along the surface trace of a fault during an earthquake. According to the California Department of Conservation's Earthquake Zones of Required Investigation map, the project site is not located within an earthquake fault zone. Therefore, the project would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects involving the rupture of a known earthquake fault.

ii. **Less than significant impact.** The City is within a seismically active area. Future structures proposed on the project site are required by state law and City ordinance to be constructed in accordance with the Uniform Building Code (specifically Seismic Zone 4, which has the most stringent seismic construction requirements in the United States), and to adhere to all modern earthquake construction standards. Therefore, the project would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects involving strong seismic ground shaking, and impacts are less than significant.

iii. **Less than significant impact.** The most common seismic-related ground failure is liquefaction and lateral spreading. In both cases, during periods of ground motion caused by an event such as an earthquake, loose materials transform from a solid state to a near-liquid state because of increased pore water pressure. Such ground failure generally requires a high-water table and poorly draining soil for such this to occur. The project site is relatively flat and level with no major changes in grade. Public supply wells in Kern County are at depths between 600 and 800 feet below land surfaces (USGS 2016), meaning that groundwater levels are not close enough to the surface to result in sufficiently saturated soils suitable for liquefaction. In addition, future structures proposed on the project site are required by state law and City ordinance to be constructed by the Uniform Building Code, including those relating to soil characteristics. Therefore, the project would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects involving seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction, and impacts are less than significant.

iv. **No impact.** In Kern County, the common types of landslides induced by earthquakes occur on steeper slopes found in the foothills and along the Kern River Canyon; in these areas, landslides are generally associated with bluff and stream bank failure, rockslide, and slope slip on steep slopes. The project site is relatively flat and level with no major changes in grade. Therefore, the project would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects involving landslides.

b. **Less than significant impact.** Construction of the site would temporarily disturb soils, which in turn could loosen said soils. However, the proposed development entails paving over these soils with impervious surfaces, meaning the project site would not be particularly susceptible to soil erosion. In addition, the relatively low precipitation that occurs in the project area (on average about 7 to 10 inches/year) results in surface runoff that is intermittent and temporary. The erosion potential at the site, low average rainfall, and the fact that soils are well drained do not make the site susceptible to substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil. Therefore, the project would not result in substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil, and impacts are less than significant.

c. **Less than significant impact.** As discussed above, the soils at the project site would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects involving seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction, lateral spreading, or landslides.

Subsidence is part of the baseline condition in the project area due to historic groundwater pumping and the resultant subsidence that occurs with such activities. The project would not substantially contribute to this baseline condition because the projected water use has been conditionally approved by the California Water Service Company Bakersfield District (the District). The site has been considered by the District against its current Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) and it was concluded that the City has sufficient existing capacity to service the project. Therefore, the project has already been considered in the groundwater analysis in the UWMP and would not exacerbate subsidence in the area beyond the baseline condition.

Collapsible soils consist of loose, dry, low-density materials that collapse and compact under the addition of water or excessive loading. Future structures proposed on the project site are required by state law and City ordinance to be constructed in accordance with the Uniform Building Code, including those relating to soil characteristics. Therefore, the project would not be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable because of the project, and potentially result in an on-site or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse, and impacts are less than significant.

d. **Less-than-significant impact.** The soils identified on or around the project site is Kimberlina fine sandy loam, (0 to 2 percent slopes), which do not have a high potential to be expansive. Additionally, future structures proposed on the site are required by state law and City ordinance to be constructed in accordance with the Uniform Building Code, including those relating to soil characteristics. Therefore, the project would not be located on expansive soil creating substantial risks to life or property, and impacts are less than significant.

e. **No impact.** The project would not require the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems because the project would connect to existing City sewer services in the area. Therefore, there would be no impacts related to soils incapable of adequately supporting septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems.

f. **Less than significant with mitigation incorporated.** Paleontological sensitivity is determined by the potential for a geologic unit to produce scientifically significant fossils. Because paleontological resources typically occur in the substratum soil horizon, surface expressions are often not visible during a pedestrian survey. Paleontological sensitivity is derived from known fossil data collected from the entire geologic unit. The project site is entirely underlain by alluvial fan deposits of the late Holocene age, which presumably transition in the subsurface into older, Pleistocene-age deposits.

Like archeological resources, there is the potential to unearth previously unknown paleontological resources at the site, and grading and other ground-disturbing activities have the potential to damage or destroy such resources. Therefore, with the implementation of Mitigation Measure 5, the project would not directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource site or unique geologic feature, and impacts are less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS:** Would the project: | | | | |
| a. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| b. Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |

**Discussion**

a. **Less than significant impact.** The project would generate an incremental contribution and, when combined with the cumulative increase of all other sources of greenhouse gases (GHG), could contribute to global climate change impacts. Although the project is expected to emit GHGs, the GHG emissions of a single project into the atmosphere are not necessarily an adverse environmental effect. Rather, it is the increased accumulation of GHG emissions from more than one project and many sources in the atmosphere that may result in global climate change. The resultant consequences of climate change can cause adverse environmental effects. A project's GHG emissions would typically be small in comparison to state or global GHG emissions and, consequently, in isolation would have no significant direct impact on climate change. Therefore, a project's GHG emissions and the resulting significance of potential impacts are more properly assessed on a cumulative basis.

On September 27, 2006, Assembly Bill 32 (AB 32), the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 (the Act) was enacted by the State of California. The Act charged the California Air Resources Board ("CARB") with the responsibility to monitor, regulate, and reduce GHG emissions. CARB defined the 1990 baseline emissions for California and adopted that baseline as the 2020 statewide emissions cap at the time. AB 32 required new development projects that are not exempt under CEQA to demonstrate at least a 29% reduction in estimated GHG emissions when compared to the 1990 baseline. Subsequent legislation by the California legislature has included Senate Bill 32 (SB 32), which expanded upon AB 32 to reduce GHG emissions to 40% below the 1990 levels by 2030; AB 197, which increased the legislative oversight of CARB via the addition of two legislatively appointed non-voting members and provided added protections for disadvantaged communities; SB 350, which increased California's renewable energy procurement goal; and SB 100, which established a landmark policy requiring 100% of electrical retail sales to end-use customers and 100% of electricity to serve state agencies to be produced via renewable energy and zero-carbon resources by 2045.

The California Supreme Court's decision in the "Center for Biological Diversity v. California Department of Fish and Wildlife; The Newhall Land and Farming Company, Real Party in Interest, Case No. S217763," determined that the Newhall Ranch project's Environmental Impact Report (EIR) did not substantiate the conclusion that the GHG cumulative impacts would be less than significant. The EIR determined that the project would reduce estimated GHG emissions by 31%, meeting the required 29% reduction, by comparing these emissions to business-as-usual (BAU) levels established through AB 32. The Court determined that the EIR's deficiency stemmed from using this quantitative comparison method developed by the Scoping Plan as a measure of the GHG reduction effort required by the state and attempting to do so, without adjustments, for a purpose substantially different from its original design. The Court's final ruling offered several examples that an agency can use to determine that a project's GHG emissions are less than significant (Center for Biological Diversity v. The Newhall Land and Farming Company, Real Party in Interest, 2015):

1. Lead agencies can use the business-as-usual comparison methodology if they determine what reduction a particular project must achieve to comply with statewide goals;

2. Project design features that comply with regulations to reduce emissions may demonstrate that those components of emissions are less than significant; and

3. Lead agencies could also demonstrate compliance with locally adopted climate plans or could apply specific numerical thresholds developed by some local agencies, to demonstrate emissions are less than significant.

Although the City of Bakersfield has not developed specific thresholds for GHG emissions, the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD), a CEQA Trustee Agency for the project, has developed thresholds. These thresholds entail either implementing Best Performance Standards (BPS) or demonstrating a 29% reduction in estimated GHG emissions when compared to BAU levels of emissions. However, the BAU emissions provided by the SJVAPCD are based on the years 2002 to 2004 and 2020. Since the 2020 project baseline has passed, and at this time no new guidance has been approved by the SJVAPCD for the next target year, the 29% reduction requirement cannot be applied to this project to determine GHG emission significance. Additionally, BPS thresholds have not been established by the SJVAPCD, making the use of BPS on their own an insufficient means of determining significance as well. Lacking any locally adopted climate plans or specific numerical thresholds developed by a local agency at this time, the project relies on design features that comply with state regulations to reduce GHG emissions.

When considering the use of design features that comply with state regulations to reduce GHG emissions, one can look to the argument made by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (AQMD) in their Final Negative Declaration for the Phillips 66 Los Angeles Refinery Carson Plant – Crude Oil Storage Capacity project (South Coast AQMD, 2014). This approach recognizes that consumers of electricity and fuels used for transportation activities are regulated by requiring producers and importers of these resources to participate in programs, such as the GHG Cap-and-Trade program. Each sector-wide state program exists within the framework of AB 32, and its descendant legislation, which all seek to achieve GHG emissions reductions consistent with the AB 32 Scoping Plan.

The main sources of GHG emissions associated with this project are energy use and combustion of gasoline/diesel fuels, each of which is regulated near or at the top of the supply chain. As such, the project will have no choice but to purchase said electricity and fuels that are produced in a way deemed acceptable to the California market. Additionally, the project will abide by California's Building Energy Efficiency Standards and Title 24 requirements, implementing energy conservation features in this proposed development. The project will also implement GHG emission mitigations such as on-site vehicle idling limits and zero emission infrastructure (e.g., electric vehicle charging stations). Therefore, the project's GHG emissions will be consistent with the AB 32 Scoping Plan, and the project's contribution to cumulative global climate change impacts would not be cumulatively considerable, and impacts are less than significant.

b. **Less than significant impact.** CARB is responsible for the coordination and administration of both federal and state air pollution control programs within California. As proposed, the project would not conflict with any statewide policy, regional plan, or local guidance or policy adopted to reduce GHG emissions. The project would not interfere with the implementation of AB 32 and SB 375 because it would be consistent with the GHG emission reduction targets identified by CARB and the Scoping Plan as described in VIII.a. Therefore, the project would not conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions, and impacts are less than significant.

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS:** Would the project: | | | | |
| a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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 handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code §65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |
| e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the Project result in a safety hazard 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? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |

**Discussion**

a. **Less than significant impact.** Construction activities would require the transport, storage, use, and/or disposal of hazardous materials such as fuels and greases for the fueling/servicing of construction equipment and fuel tanks, and there is the potential for upset and accident conditions that could release such material into the environment. Such substances would be stored in temporary storage tanks/sheds that would be located at the site. Although these types of materials are not acutely hazardous, they are classified as hazardous materials and create the potential for accidental spillage, which could expose construction workers. All transport, storage, use, and disposal of hazardous materials used in the construction of the project would be in strict accordance with federal and state laws and regulations. During construction of the 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, non-hazardous construction debris would be generated and disposed of at approved facilities for handling such waste. Also, during construction, waste disposal would be managed using portable toilets located at reasonably accessible on-site locations.

   Day-to-day operational activities may involve routine transport, use of, and/or disposal of hazardous materials as defined by the Hazardous Materials Transportation Uniform Safety Act, namely gasoline transport and storage. The routine transport of gasoline to the project site would have to comply with all laws and regulations related to hazardous material routes and the proper transfer of gasoline to the site. Users should also read product labels for disposal directions to reduce the risk of products exploding, igniting, leaking, mixing with other chemicals, or posing

other hazards on the way to a disposal facility. Therefore, the project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials, and impacts are less than significant.

b. **Less than significant impact.** Please refer to response IX.a. The project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous material into the environment, and impacts are less than significant.

c. **Less than significant impact.** The Air Quality Analysis (AQIA) concluded that the project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations or result in other emissions that would adversely affect a substantial number of people (Envirotech Consultants Air Quality Analysis 2026). As mentioned above, the project would be required to adhere to all applicable federal and state laws and regulations concerning the handling of hazardous materials, and impacts are less than significant.

d. **No impact.** The EnviroStor (DTSC 2023) and Cortese (CalEPA 2023) lists under Government Code (GC) Section 65962.5 were reviewed. No portion of the project site is identified on either list, which provides the location of known hazardous waste concerns. Therefore, the project would not be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to GC Section 65962.5 and, as a result, create a significant hazard to the public or the environment.

e. **No impact.** The project site is not located within the Kern County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan area (Kern County 2012). The closest airport to the site is the Meadows Field Airport, which is located approximately 11 miles northeast. Therefore, the project would not result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area. The project is not located within the specified distance within an airport land use plan, or where such a plan has not been adopted.

f. **Less than significant impact.** Access to the site would be maintained throughout the construction period, and appropriate detours would be provided in the event of potential temporary road closures. The project would not interfere with any local or regional emergency response or evacuation plans because the project would not result in a substantial alteration to the adjacent and area circulation system. The project is typical of urban development in Bakersfield and is consistent with the adopted City of Bakersfield Hazardous Materials Area Plan (Bakersfield 1997). This plan identifies responsibilities and provides coordination of emergency response at the local level to hazardous materials incidents. Therefore, the project would not impair the implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan, and impacts are less than significant.

g. **Less than significant impact.** The project site is not located within a "very high," "high," or "moderate" fire hazard severity zone (CalFire 2022). The site is surrounded by both developed and undeveloped land, and its vicinity is urban and does not possess high fuel loads that have a high potential to cause a wildland fire. The project site would be developed with hardscapes and irrigated landscaping, which would further reduce fire potential at the site. Therefore, the project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands, and impacts are less than significant.

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|---|---|---|---|

**X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY:** Would the project:

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water 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: | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| d. Result in a substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| e. Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| f. 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? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| g. Impede or redirect flood flows? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| h. In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| i. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |

**Discussion**

a. **Less than significant impact.** Construction would include ground-disturbing activities that would temporarily disturb and potentially loosen soils. However, during operation, the soils would be paved over with impervious surfaces such that the soils at the site would not be particularly susceptible to soil erosion.

The City owns and maintains a municipal separate storm sewer system (MS4). The project's operational urban stormwater discharges are covered under the Central Valley Water Quality Control Board ("CVRWQCB") *National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit and Waste Discharge Requirements General Permit for Discharges from Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems* (Order No. R5-2016-0040; NPDES No. CAS0085324) (MS4 Permit) (CVRWQCB 2016). The MS4 Permit mandates the implementation of a stormwater management framework to ensure that water quality is maintained despite operational stormwater discharges throughout the City, including the project site. Therefore, by complying with the MS4 Permit, the project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements, and impacts are less than significant.

b. **Less than significant impact.** Currently, there are no irrigation water rights from a local water district associated with the project site. Potable water for the site would be supplied by City of Bakersfield Water District (the District) which has provided a verification of water service letter for the project, which receives at least a portion of its supplies from groundwater sources. Also, by state law, the current Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) does not need to address the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA) or sustainable groundwater management at this time. It was concluded that the District has sufficient existing capacity to service the project. Therefore, the project would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level, and impacts are less than significant.

c. **Less than significant impact**. The following responses to items X.d. through X.g. discuss whether the project would 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. Therefore, the project would not 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, and impacts are less than significant.

d. **Less than significant impact.** The project site does not contain any blue-line streams or other surface water features; therefore, the proposed development would not alter the course of a river or stream.

   The site would be graded and, as a result, the internal drainage pattern would be altered from the baseline condition. Additionally, the project would increase impervious surfaces on-site (i.e., building pads, sidewalks, asphalt parking area, etc.), which would reduce the percolation of water into the ground and result in greater amounts of stormwater runoff concentrations. If uncontrolled, differences in drainage patterns and increased impervious surfaces could result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site. However, the project would be required to comply with the General Permit during construction and the MS4 Permit during operation. To comply with the MS4 Permit, the City requires compliance with adopted building codes, including complying with an approved drainage plan that avoids on- and off-site flooding, erosion, and siltation problems. Therefore, the project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site, and impacts are less than significant.

e. **Less than significant impact.** Please refer to response X.d. The project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site. Therefore, the project's impacts are less than significant.

f. **Less than significant impact.** To comply with the City's MS4 Permit, the City requires compliance with an approved drainage plan that would avoid on- and off-site flooding. The project would not create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff, and impacts are less than significant.

g. **Less than significant impact.** A review of the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) National Flood Insurance Maps shows the project site is in Zone X, which is a minimal risk area outside the 1-percent and 0.2-percent-annual-chance floodplain. Therefore, the project would not impede or redirect flood flows, and impacts are less than significant.

h. **Less than significant impact.** The City of Bakersfield is located within Central California and is not near a coastal environment that risks flood inundation. In addition, the City is not located within a tsunami zone as identified by the California Department of Conservation's Tsunami Map. As mentioned above, the project site is in Zone X, which is a minimal-risk area outside the 1-percent and 0.2-percent-annual-chance floodplain.

The project site, like most of the City, is located within the Lake Isabella flood inundation area (Kern County 2017), which is the area that would experience flooding if there was a catastrophic failure of the Lake Isabella Dam. There is an approved Lake Isabella Dam Failure Evacuation Plan (Kern County 2009) that establishes processes and procedures for the mass evacuation and short-term support of populations at risk below the Lake Isabella Dam. The City would utilize the Evacuation Plan to support its Emergency Operations Plans. Therefore, due to the project's location and implementation of related emergency safety plans, the project would not likely risk the release of pollutants due to project inundation in flood hazards, tsunami, or seiche zones, and impacts are less than significant.

i. **Less than significant impact.** Please refer to response X.d. There is currently no adopted groundwater management plan for the project site or surrounding area. Therefore, the project would not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan, and impacts are less than significant.

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING:** Would the project: | | | | |
| a. Physically divide an established community? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |
| b. Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |

**Discussion**

a. **No impact.** The project is a continuation of the existing urban development pattern of the City. The project does not include a long and linear feature, such as a freeway, railroad track, block wall, etc., that would have the potential to divide a community. The project consists of the development of a finite, 20-acre infill site that does not impede existing or future movement or development of the City.

b. **No impact.** Upon approval of the general plan amendment and zone change, the project would be consistent with both the Metropolitan Bakersfield General Plan (MBGP) and Zoning Ordinance. The project would not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **XII. MINERAL RESOURCES:** Would the project: | | | | |
| a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be a 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? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |

**Discussion**

a. **No impact.** There are no oil wells located on the project site (DOC 2022b). Therefore, the project would not result in the loss of availability of any known mineral resource of value to the region or the state's residents.

b. **Less than significant impact.** The project site is currently designated R-IA (Resource - Intensive Agriculture), R-MP (Resource - Minerals & Petroleum), and LR (Low Density Residential). The small area to the northwest designated as R-MP (Resource - Minerals & Petroleum) contains a plugged well outside of its boundary (DOC 2022b). Therefore, the project would not result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site that is delineated in a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan and impacts are less than significant.

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **XIII. NOISE:** Would the project result in: | | | | |
| a. Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| b. Generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| c. For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the Project expose people residing or working in the Project area to excessive noise levels? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |

**Discussion**

a. **Less than significant impact.** The project would generate both short-term construction noise and operational noise. The first type of short-term construction noise would result from the transport of construction equipment and materials to the project site, as well as construction worker commutes. The total daily vehicle trips resulting from construction worker commutes would be minimal when compared to existing traffic volumes on the affected streets, and the long-term noise level change would not be perceptible.

The second type of short-term construction noise is related to noise generated during project construction. The site preparation and grading phase, which includes excavation and grading, tends to generate the highest noise levels because earthmoving equipment is the noisiest construction equipment. Construction noise levels during grading would be less than 70 dBA, which would not exceed the hourly noise level standard for the nearest sensitive uses. Construction noise would cease to occur once project construction is completed. The project will also be required to comply with the construction hours specified in the City Noise Ordinance, which states that construction activities are limited to the hours of 6:00 AM and 9:00 PM on weekdays, and between the hours of 8:00 AM and 9:00 PM on weekends.

Project operations would generate sound levels typical of mixed-use development, which would have to comply with the Bakersfield Municipal Code regarding noise. Stationary operational noise levels at all points around the project site would experience noise level impacts that would be less than the daytime and nighttime hourly noise level standards of 55 dBA and 50 dBA, respectively. Project-related operational traffic would have very small noise level increases along roadway segments in the project vicinity. Parking lot noise, including engine sounds, car doors slamming, car alarms, loud music, and people conversing, would also occur at the project site. It was determined that the noise levels at all points around the project site would experience noise level impacts that would be less than the City's daytime and nighttime maximum noise level standards of 75 dBA and 70 dBA.

Therefore, the project would not generate a substantial, temporary, or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project that are in excess of the standards established in the local General Plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies, and impacts are less than significant.

b. **Less than significant impact.** Some ground-borne vibration and noise would originate from earth movement and building activities during the project's construction phase. Ground-borne noise and vibration from construction activity would be mostly low to moderate. The operation of typical construction equipment would generate ground-borne vibrations that would not exceed guidelines that are considered unsafe for any type of building. Operation of the proposed single-family housing use would not generate ground-borne vibration. Therefore, the project would not result in the generation of excessive ground-borne vibrations or ground-borne noise, and impacts are less than significant.

c. **No impact.** The project site is not located within the Kern County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan area or the vicinity of a private airstrip (Kern County 2012). Therefore, the project would not result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area.

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|---|---|---|---|

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING:** Would the project result in: | | | | |
| 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? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |

**Discussion**

a. **Less than significant impact.** The project proposes the development of an event center, fast-food restaurant, and gas station with accompanying convenience store services for residents of Bakersfield. The project will be developed near developing residential uses and is therefore the logical extension of existing urban development. Bakersfield has experienced approximately 13% growth in population (347,483 people in 2010 to 394,328 in 2019) since 2010 (DOF 2019a and DOF 2019b). It is predicted that by 2040, 1,137,676 people will live in Kern County (DOF 2019c). Given that 42.5% of the people in Kern County currently live in Bakersfield (DOF 2019b), and if this trend continues, it is estimated that about 483,512 people would live in Bakersfield in 2040. This means that by 2040, 81,951 additional people would need housing in the Bakersfield area. This Project will be in compliance with the goals and policies of the Metropolitan Bakersfield General Plan and will accommodate the orderly development projected increase in Bakersfield's population by providing services for existing and future residents in Bakersfield. Therefore, the project would not induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly or indirectly, and impacts are less than significant.

b. **No impact.** The project site consists of one large parcel of land. The project would not displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **XV. PUBLIC SERVICES:** Would the project result in: | | | | |
| a. Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the public services: | | | | |
| i. Fire protection? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| ii. Police protection? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| iii. Schools? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| iv. | Parks? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| v. | Other public facilities? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |

**Discussion**

a. The following discusses whether the project would result in substantial adverse physical impacts to public services. The need for additional public service is generally directly correlated to population growth and the resultant additional population's need for services beyond what is currently available.

i. **Less than significant impact.** Fire protection services for the Metropolitan Bakersfield area are provided through a joint fire protection agreement between the City and County of Kern. A potential increase in services can be paid for via property taxes generated by this development. Therefore, the project would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, a need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, to maintain acceptable service ratios, or response times or other performance objectives for fire protection, and impacts are less than significant.

ii. **Less than significant impact.** Police protection for the project would be provided by the Bakersfield Police Department. Potential increases in services can be paid for via property taxes generated by this development. Therefore, the project would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, a need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts. In order to maintain acceptable service ratios, or response times or other performance objectives for police protection, and impacts are less than significant.

iii. **Less than significant impact.** The project is proposed to accommodate existing and future residents and businesses within the City. Therefore, the project would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, or the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for schools, and impacts are less than significant.

iv. **Less than significant impact.** The proposal does not include nor require the construction of recreational facilities. However, park impact fees are required for residential and High Medium Residential land uses only. Therefore, the project would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for parks, and impacts are less than significant.

v. **Less-than-significant impact.** The Project and eventual buildup of this area would result in an increase in maintenance responsibility for the City. Though the Project may necessitate increased maintenance for other public facilities, this potential increase can be paid for by property taxes generated by this development. Therefore, the Project would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, or the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for other public facilities, and impacts are less than significant.

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **XVI. RECREATION:** Would the project result in: | | | | |
| a. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |
| b. Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |

**Discussion**

a. **No impact.** Please refer to response XV.a.iv. The project would not 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. **No impact.** Please refer to response XV.a.iv. The project would not include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment.

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **XVII. TRANSPORTATION:** Would the project result in: | | | | |
| 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 § 15064.3, subdivision (b)? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |

**Discussion**

a. **Less-than-significant impact.** The Project would result in temporary construction-related traffic impacts. Construction workers traveling to and from the project site as well as construction material delivery would result in additional vehicle trips to the area's roadway system. Construction material delivery may require a number of trips for oversized vehicles that may travel at slower speeds than existing traffic and, due to their size, may intrude into adjacent travel lanes. These trips may temporarily degrade level of service on area roadways and at intersections. Additionally, the total number of vehicle trips associated with all construction- related traffic, including construction worker trips, could temporarily increase daily traffic volumes on local roadways and intersections. The Project may require temporary lane closures or the need for flagmen to safely direct traffic on roadways near the Project site.

A Proposed Retail Development Traffic Study was completed and reviewed by the Traffic Engineering Division of the Public Works Department (Provost & Pritchard. Proposed Retail Development Traffic Study. 2026. March). It was determined that the Project has been designed in accordance with City development standards, and appropriate standard conditions of approval have been assigned to the project. The conditions include the dedication and improvement of streets, traffic control measures during construction, pedestrian access, and the payment of impact fees. Therefore, the project would not conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system and impacts are less than significant.

b. **Less-than-significant impact.** Section 15064.3 of the updated California Code of Regulations ("CCR" or CEQA Guidelines), the statewide application came into effect on July 1, 2020. This CCR Section 15064.3(b) states:

> Criteria for Analyzing Transportation Impacts.
>
> (1) Land Use Projects. Vehicle miles traveled (VMT) exceeding an applicable threshold of significance may indicate a significant impact. Generally, projects within one-half mile of either an existing major transit stop or a stop along an existing high-quality transit corridor should be presumed to cause a less than significant transportation impact. Projects that decrease VMT in the project area compared to existing conditions should be presumed to have a less than significant transportation impact.
>
> (2) Transportation Projects. Transportation projects that reduce, or have no impact on, VMT should be presumed to cause a less than significant transportation impact. For roadway capacity projects, agencies have the discretion to determine the appropriate measure of transportation impact consistent with CEQA and other applicable requirements. To the extent that such impacts have already been adequately addressed at a programmatic level, such as in a regional transportation plan EIR, a lead agency may tier from that analysis as provided in Section 15152.

(3) Qualitative Analysis. If existing models or methods are not available to estimate the VMT for the project being considered, a lead agency may analyze the project's VMT qualitatively. Such a qualitative analysis would evaluate factors such as the availability of transit, proximity to other destinations, etc. For many projects, a qualitative analysis of construction traffic may be appropriate.

(4) Methodology. A lead agency has the discretion to choose the most appropriate methodology to evaluate a project's VMT, including whether to express the change in absolute terms, per capita, per household, or in any other measure. A lead agency may use models to estimate a project's VMT and may revise those estimates to reflect professional judgment based on substantial evidence. Any assumptions used to estimate VMT and any revisions to model outputs should be documented and explained in the environmental document prepared for the project. The standard of adequacy in Section 15151 shall apply to the analysis described in this section.

The Kern Council of Governments (Kern COG) Travel Demand Model was used to estimate regional Vehicle Miles Traveled ("VMT") with and without project conditions to determine if the project will have a significant VMT impact. The proposed project is anticipated to generate 181 trips during the AM peak hour and 240 trips during the PM peak hour.

The VMT was found to have less than significant impact, as it is a locally serving retail development with less than 50,000 SF and the event venue is generating fewer than 110 average daily trips. No mitigations were required for VMT. Therefore, the project would not be in conflict or be inconsistent with CCR Section 15064.3(b) and impacts are less than significant.

c. **Less-than-significant impact.** The project would have to comply with all conditions placed on it by the City Traffic Engineering Division to meet accepted traffic engineering standards intended to reduce traffic hazards. The project is within City limits and surrounded by compatible existing and planned land uses and land use designations. Therefore, the project would not substantially increase hazards due to a design feature or incompatible uses, and impacts are less than significant.

d. **Less-than-significant impact**. There is the potential that, during the construction phase, the project would impede emergency access. For projects that require minor impediments of short duration (e.g., pouring a new driveway entrance), the project would be required to obtain a street permit from the Public Works Department. If a project requires lane closures and/or the diversion of traffic, then a Traffic Control Plan, subject to Public Works approval, would be required. During operations, the project would have to comply with all applicable City policies and requirements to ensure adequate emergency access. Therefore, the need for such permits is determined by the Public Works Department during the permitting and construction phases, and impacts are less than significant.

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES:** Would the project result in: | | | | |
| Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code § 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural | | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is: | | | | |
| a. Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k)? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| b. A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code § 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code § 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |

**Discussion**

a. **Less than significant impact.** The project requires a GPA and therefore, request for consultation letters were sent to a list of tribal contacts received from the Native American Heritage Commission in compliance with Senate Bill 18 ("SB 18"). In the letters, the City stated that the applicable tribes may request consultation with the City regarding the preservation of, and/or mitigation of impacts to, California Native American cultural places in connection with the project. To date, none of the tribes have responded to the request. Therefore, the project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource that is listed in the California Register of Historical Resources or in a local register of historical resources, and impacts are less than significant.

b. **Less than significant impact.** There are no tribal cultural resources determined by the lead agency to be of significance onsite. Therefore, the project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource that is determined by the lead agency to be significant, and impacts are less than significant.

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **XVIV. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS:** Would the project result in: | | | | |
| 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, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's Projected | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments? | | | | |
| 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? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |

**Discussion**

a. **Less-than-significant impact**. The project would require the construction of new water, stormwater drainage, sewer facilities; above and/or belowground electrical facilities, natural gas facilities, and telecommunications (e.g., cable, fiber optics, phone, etc.) typical of general manufacturing development. Water, stormwater, and sewer structures would have to be designed to meet the City's *Current Subdivision & Engineering Design Manual* (Bakersfield 1999). Compliance with the Design Manual would ensure that the facilities would not result in significant environmental effects. Electrical, natural gas and telecommunications facilities would be placed by the individual serving utilities; these entities already have in place safety and citing protocols to ensure that placement of new utilities to serve new construction would not have a significant effect on the environment. Therefore, the project would not 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, and impacts are less than significant.

b. **Less-than-significant impact.** The designated water purveyor is the City of Bakersfield Water District ("the District"). The District has provided a letter stating that water service can be supplied in compliance with their current UWMP which accounts for normal, dry, and multiple dry years. Therefore, the project has sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years, and impacts are less than significant.

c. **Less-than-significant impact**. Wastewater produced as a result of the project would be treated at the Waste Water Treatment Plant ("WWTP") No. 2, which is owned and operated by the City. WWTP No. 2 has an overall capacity of 25 MGD and a current available capacity of 13.7 MGD (Bakersfield 2023). WWTP No. 2 has sufficient capacity to serve the project. Therefore, it has been determined that the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the project has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments, and impacts are less than significant.

d. **Less-than-significant impact.** It is assumed that solid waste generated because of the project would be disposed of at the Bena Landfill located at 2951 Neumarkel Road, Bakersfield, CA 93307. By City standards which are designed to achieve state waste stream reduction and recycling goals, the Solid Waste Division of Public Works will conduct a detailed review of the facility at the time of development to incorporate appropriate on-site trash facilities, subject to City approval. Therefore, the project would be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs, and impacts are less than significant.

e. **Less-than-significant impact.** By law, the project would be required to comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations, including those relating to waste reduction, litter control, and solid waste disposal, and impacts are less than significant.

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **XX. WILDFIRES:** Would the project result in: | | | | |
| a. Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| 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? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| 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 instability, or drainage changes? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |

**Discussion**

a. **Less than significant impact.** The project is not located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones. The project is in an urbanized area and access to the site would be maintained throughout the construction period. The project would not interfere with any local or regional emergency response or evacuation plans because the project would not result in substantial alteration to the adjacent and area circulation system. The project is typical of urban development in Bakersfield and is not inconsistent with the adopted City of Bakersfield Hazardous Materials Area Plan (Bakersfield 1997). This plan identifies responsibilities and provides coordination of emergency response at the local level to hazardous materials incidents. Therefore, the project would not substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan, and impacts are less than significant.

b. **Less than significant impact.** As mentioned above, the project is not located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones. Additionally, the project site is relatively flat, not near wildlands, the site and its surroundings do not possess high fuel loads (i.e., lots of vegetation and other burnable material) to exacerbate wildfire risks, and fire-related pollutant concentrations. Therefore, the project would not exacerbate wildfires and expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, and impacts are less than significant.

c. **Less than significant impact.** The project is located within the Metropolitan Bakersfield City limits and the site, as well as the surrounding area, is extensively developed with existing infrastructure such as roads, power lines, utilities, etc., to support the development of this project. Therefore, the

project would not 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, and impacts are less than significant.

d. **Less than significant impact.** The project site is relatively flat, is not within a floodplain, and is not in a moderate-risk to high-risk area for wildfires. Therefore, the project would not expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides because of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes, and impacts are less than significant.

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE:** Would the project result in: | | | | |
| a. Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of life 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 considerable 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 which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |

**Discussion**

a. **Less than significant with mitigation incorporated.** The project, with the implementation of the identified conditions of approval, best management practices, and mitigation measures, would not have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory, and impacts are less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

b. **Less than significant impact.** Under Section 15065(a)(3) of the CEQA Guidelines, a lead agency shall find that a project may have a significant effect on the environment where there is substantial evidence that said project has potential environmental effects "that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable." This section further states that cumulatively considerable means "that the incremental effects of an individual 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."

Past, present, and future projects in proximity to the project were considered and evaluated as part of this Initial Study. Also, in addition to project-specific impacts, this Initial Study considered the project's potential for incremental effects that are cumulatively considerable. As described in the responses above, there is no substantial evidence that there are cumulative effects associated with this project. In addition, any future development projects not identified above would be required to undergo a separate environmental analysis and mitigate any project-specific or site-specific potential impacts, and impacts are less than significant.

c. **Less than significant with mitigation incorporated.** As described in the responses above, the project, with mitigation, would not have environmental effects that would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly, and impacts are less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

**REFERENCE LIST**

Bakersfield (City of Bakersfield). 1997. Hazardous Materials Area Plan. January.

Bakersfield. 1999. Proposed Subdivision & Engineering Design Manual. June.
Available: < https://www.bakersfieldcity.us/943/Subdivision-Engineering-Design-Manual >
Accessed: April 15, 2026.

Bakersfield. 2023. Wastewater Treatment Plants. Available:
<http://www.bakersfieldcity.us/gov/depts/public_works/sewer/wastewater_treatment_plants.htm>.
Accessed: April 22, 2026.

CalEPA (California Environmental Protection Agency). 2023. Cortese List Data Resources. Available:
<https://calepa.ca.gov/sitecleanup/corteselist/>. Accessed: May 4, 2026.

CalFire (Department of Forestry and Fire Protection). 2022. Fire Hazard Severity Zones Maps.
Available: < https://osfm.fire.ca.gov/divisions/community-wildfire-preparedness-and-mitigation/wildland-hazards-building-codes/fire-hazard-severity-zones-maps/ >.
Accessed: May 4, 2026.

Caltrans (California Department of Transportation). 2022. California State Scenic Highway Mapping System. Available:<
https://caltrans.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=465dfd3d807c46cc8e8057116f1aacaa>. Accessed: April 16, 2026.

CBOC (California Burrowing Owl Consortium). 1993. Burrowing Owl Protocol and Mitigation Guidelines. April.

City of Bakersfield Water District. 2025. Verification Of Water Service letter. December.

CVRWQCB. 2016. Order No. R5-2016-0040, NPDES No. CAS0085324, National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit and Waste Discharge Requirements General Permit for Discharges from Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems.
Available:<https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/board_decisions/adopted_orders/general_orders/r5-2016-0040_ms4.pdf>. Accessed: April 21, 2026.

Department of Conservation (DOC). 2022a. Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program.
Available:< https://www.conservation.ca.gov/dlrp/fmmp >. Accessed: May 4, 2026.

Department of Conservation (DOC). 2022b. Well Finder CalGEM GIS.
Available: < https://www.conservation.ca.gov/dlrp/fmmp>. Accessed: May 4, 2026.

DTSC (Department of Toxic Substance Control). 2023. EnviroStor.
Available:<https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/>. Accessed: April 21, 2026

Envirotech Consultants. 2026. Air Quality Impact Analysis. January.

Findlaw. 2015. Center for Biological Diversity v. The Newhall Land and Farming Company, Real Party in Interest. Available: < https://caselaw.findlaw.com/court/ca-supreme-court/1719578.html >.
Accessed: April 29, 2026.

Hudlow Cultural Resource Associates. 2025. Hudlow Phase I Cultural Resource Survey. December.

Kern County. 2009. Lake Isabella Dam Failure Evacuation Plan. Available:< https://kerncountyfire.org/jsp-uploads/Isabella-Dam-Failure-Plan.pdf >. Accessed: April 29, 2026.

Kern County. 2012. Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan. November.

Kern County. 2017. Lake Isabella Flood Area. Available:< https://kernpublicworks.com/building-and-code/floodplain-management/lake-isabella-flood-area/>. Accessed: April 29, 2026.

Pruett. 2025. Biological Resource Evaluation. February.

Provost & Pritchard. Proposed Retail Development Traffic Study. 2026. March.

SJVAPCD (San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District). 2025. Guide for Assessing and Mitigating Air Quality Impacts. March.

South Coast Air Quality Management District. 2014. Final Negative Declaration For Phillips 66 Los Angeles Refinery Carson Plan – Crude Oil Storage Capacity Project. Available: < http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/ceqa/documents/permit-projects/2014/phillips-66-fnd.pdf >. Accessed: April 29, 2026.