

US EPA ARCHIVE DOCUMENT

NEGATIVE DECLARATION/NEPA Supplement

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN:

Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970 (CEQA),* the State CEQA Guidelines,** and the Kern County CEQA Implementation Document and State CEQA Guidelines,*** the Kern County Planning Department has made an Initial Study of possible environmental impacts of the following-described project:

APPLICANT: Kern County Engineering and Survey Services Department (PP02218)

APPLICATION: EA MWH 1-01; Rexland Acres Wastewater System

LOCATION: The community of Rexland Acres located at the intersection of South Union Avenue and East Pacheco Road, south of Bakersfield, approximately bordered by Gary Place and Brenda Place on the west, Rexland Avenue and Garden Drive on the north, Kern Island Canal on the east, and Buckley Avenue on the south; being a portion of Section 20, T30S, R28E, MDB&M, County of Kern, State of California. A sewer force main line will connect this area to the Kern Sanitation Authority Wastewater Treatment Plant in Section 3, via Sections 20, 21, 22, 15, 10, and 3, all in T30S, R38E, MDB&M.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED PROJECT: The project is the construction of sewer lines within the rural community of Rexland Acres and connecting to the Kern Sanitary Authority Wastewater Treatment Plant located approximately four miles northeasterly of Rexland Acres on Kimber Avenue, near Oswell Street, south of State Highway 58. The force main alignment includes the construction of approximately 26,200 lineal feet of eight-inch-diameter force main line between the Rexland Acres community to the Kern Sanitation District Wastewater Treatment Plant. Two lift stations operating in series are included; one at Fairview Road immediately west of Kern Island Canal (Lift Station No. 1) and a second lift station in the vicinity of Bakersfield Wastewater Treatment Plant No. 2 (Lift Station No. 2), the approximate half-way point. System requirements call for an average daily flow of 180 gallons per minute (gpm), with a peak flow of 360 gpm. After construction of the force main system, all aboveground facilities and disturbances will be restored to their previously existing condition or better. The system will be sized to provide sewer service to 688 developed lots serving 746 dwelling units that are included in the service area. Identified residential dwellings will then be connected to the newly installed sewer systems and the individual septic systems abandoned. The system is being proposed to remedy a high rate of septic system failures and to prevent potential degradation of groundwater in the Rexland Acres community. The project is proposed for funding by the U.S. Department of Agriculture Rural Utilities Service Financing Program and other sources. United States Department of Housing and Community Development Block Grant Funds may also be provided for the project. The formation of an assessment district and County Service Area Zone of Benefit will also be required.

MITIGATION MEASURES Included in the Proposed Project to Avoid Potentially Significant Effects (if required):

- (1) Construction activities within, or within 1/4 mile of, the existing residential neighborhood shall be limited to normal working hours from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. The Kern County Engineering and Survey Services Department will include this requirement in any contracts entered into with the County for performing any of the required work associated with this project.
- (2) During construction activities, all requirements of the San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District's Regulation VIII Fugitive Dust Rules (in particular Rule 8020 - Construction, Demolition, Excavation, Extraction) shall be implemented. The Kern County Engineering and Survey Services Department will include this requirement in any contracts entered into with the County for performing any of the required work associated with this project.

- (3) Should any cultural materials be discovered during grading or development, all work shall be halted and a qualified archaeologist/historian contacted to assess the finds and impose mitigation measures, if necessary, prior to resumption of construction. The Kern County Engineering and Survey Services Department will include this requirement in any contracts entered into with the County for performing any of the required work associated with this project.
- (4) If, during grading or construction activities, any plugged or abandoned or unrecorded wells are uncovered or damaged, the Department of Conservation/Division of Oil, Gas, and Geothermal Resources shall be contacted to inspect and approve any remediation required.

INCLUSION OF MITIGATION MEASURES AS PART OF PROJECT:

I, as applicant/authorized agent, have reviewed the mitigation measures noted above and agree to include said measures as part of this project.

Signed: _____ -S- _____ Dated: _____

FINDINGS: It has been found that this project, as described and proposed to be mitigated herein, will not have a significant effect on the environment and that an environmental impact report (EIR) is, therefore, not required. A brief statement of reasons supporting such findings is as follows:

- (1) Proposed project does not appear to have a substantial demonstrable negative aesthetic effect.
- (2) There does not appear to be a substantial body of opinion that considers or will consider the various anticipated environmental effects resulting from the proposed action to be adverse.
- (3) Proposed project would not appear to cause substantial flooding, erosion, or siltation.
- (4) Proposed project would not appear to substantially affect a rare or endangered species of animal or plant or habitat of such species. Proposal would not diminish habitat for fish, wildlife, or plants.
- (5) Proposed project would not appear to have any potential for disruption or alteration of (1) an archaeological site over 200 years old, (2) a historic site of record, or (3) a paleontological site.


PUBLIC INQUIRY: Any person may object to dispensing with such EIR or respond to the findings herein. Information relating to the proposed project is on file in the office of the Planning Department at the address shown below. Any person wishing to examine or obtain a copy of that information or this document, or seeking information as to the time and manner to so object or respond, may do so by inquiring at said office during regular business hours.

A copy of the Initial Study is attached hereto.

PROPOSED NEGATIVE DECLARATION DATE: August 25, 2004
NEGATIVE DECLARATION REVIEW PERIOD ENDS: September 24, 2004

TED JAMES, AICP, Director
Planning Department

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


By David B. Rickels, AICP
Planning Division Chief

AGENCY CONSULTATION REQUIRED: Yes No

AGENCIES CONSULTED: Kern County Planning Department/Planning Operations; County Clerk; Bakersfield; EPA; Fish & Wildlife/Ventura; Soil Conservation/Bak; KC Agriculture; KCAPCD; Community Development; ESS/Floodplain; ESS/Survey; KC Environmental Health; KC Fire; KC Roads; KC Waste Management; Kern County Water Agency; Pacific Bell/Fresno; PG&E/Bak; So. Cal Edison/Bak; So. San Joaquin Arch Info. Center; State Clearinghouse; Division of Oil & Gas/Bak; Fish & Game/Fresno; Health Services/Fresno; Historical Preservation; CRWQCB/Central; State Water Resources/Fresno; USDA-RD

STATE CLEARINGHOUSE NUMBER (if required):

INITIAL STUDY PREPARED BY: Lorelei H. Oviatt, AICP, Supervising Planner/Planning Department

DATE POSTED: _____ **DATE OF NOTICE TO PUBLIC:** August 25, 2004

- * Public Resources Code, Section 21000, et seq.
- ** Title 14, Division 6, California Administrative Code, as amended
- *** Resolution No. 2004-163, adopted June 1, 2004

LHO:paw:ma (8/24/04 - 5190BB.ND)

Attachment

NEGATIVE DECLARATION

NOTICE OF AVAILABILITY FOR PUBLIC REVIEW

This is to advise that the Kern County Planning Department has prepared a Negative Declaration for the project identified below. As mandated by State law, the minimum public review period for this document is 30 days. The document and documents referenced in the draft Negative Declaration are available for review at the Planning Department, 2700 "M" Street, Suite 100, Bakersfield, CA 93301.

The Kern County Engineering and Survey Services Department has scheduled a public hearing with the Kern County Board of Supervisors to receive comments on the document on: **September 28, 2004**, at 2:00 p.m. or soon thereafter, Chambers of the Board of Supervisors, First Floor, Kern County Administrative Center, 1115 Truxtun Avenue, Bakersfield, California

The comment period for this document closes on **September 24, 2004**. Testimony at future public hearings may be limited to those issues raised during the public review period either orally or submitted in writing by 5:00 p.m. the day the comment period closes.

Project Title: EA MWH 1-01; Rexland Acres Wastewater System (Kern County Engineering and Survey Services Department (PP02218))

Project Location: The community of Rexland Acres located at the intersection of South Union Avenue and East Pacheco Road, south of Bakersfield, approximately bordered by Gary Place and Brenda Place on the west, Rexland Avenue and Garden Drive on the north, Kern Island Canal on the east, and Buckley Avenue on the south; being a portion of Section 20, T30S, R28E, MDB&M, County of Kern, State of California. A sewer force main line will connect this area to the Kern Sanitation Authority Wastewater Treatment Plant in Section 3, via Sections 20, 21, 22, 15, 10, and 3, all in T30S, R38E, MDB&M.

Project Description: The project is the construction of sewer lines within the rural community of Rexland Acres and connecting to the Kern Sanitary Authority Wastewater Treatment Plant located approximately four miles northeasterly of Rexland Acres on Kimber Avenue, near Oswell Street, south of State Highway 58. The force main alignment includes the construction of approximately 26,200 lineal feet of eight-inch-diameter force main line between the Rexland Acres community to the Kern Sanitation District Wastewater Treatment Plant. Two lift stations operating in series are included; one at Fairview Road immediately west of Kern Island Canal (Lift Station No. 1) and a second lift station in the vicinity of Bakersfield Wastewater Treatment Plant No. 2 (Lift Station No. 2), the approximate half-way point. System requirements call for an average daily flow of 180 gallons per minute (gpm), with a peak flow of 360 gpm. After construction of the force main system, all aboveground facilities and disturbances will be restored to their previously existing condition or better. The system will be sized to provide sewer service to 688 developed lots serving 746 dwelling units that are included in the service area. Identified residential dwellings will then be connected to the newly installed sewer systems and the individual septic systems abandoned. The system is being proposed to remedy a high rate of septic system failures and to prevent potential degradation of groundwater in the Rexland Acres community. The project is proposed for funding by the U.S. Department of Agriculture Rural Utilities Service Financing Program and other sources. United States Department of Housing and Community Development Block Grant Funds may also be provided for the project. The formation of an assessment district and County Service Area Zone of Benefit will also be required.

For further information, please contact Lorelei H. Oviatt, AICP, Supervising Planner ((661) 862-8866).

TED JAMES, AICP, Director
Planning Department

LHO:paw:ma (8/24/04)

cc: County Clerk (2) (with fee)
Environmental Status Board
Sierra Club/Kern Kaweah Chapter
Communities for a Better Environment

California Native Plant Society/Kern Chapter
Kern County Archaeological Society
Native American Heritage Pres. Council/Kern County
Supervisorial District No. 5 - Parra

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

Environmental Factors Potentially Affected:

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

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

DETERMINATION. (To be completed by the Lead Agency.)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

Lorelei H. Oviatt, AICP
Signature

8-26-04
Date

Lorelei H. Oviatt, AICP
Printed Name

Kern County Planning Department
For

KERN COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT

INITIAL STUDY REVIEW

SECTION I. PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND SETTING

PROPOSED PROJECT: EA MWH 1-01; Rexland Acres Wastewater System (Kern County Engineering and Survey Services Department (PP02218))

LOCATION: The community of Rexland Acres located at the intersection of South Union Avenue and East Pacheco Road, south of Bakersfield, approximately bordered by Gary Place and Brenda Place on the west, Rexland Avenue and Garden Drive on the north, Kern Island Canal on the east, and Buckley Avenue on the south; being a portion of Section 20, T30S, R28E, MDB&M, County of Kern, State of California. A sewer force main line will connect this area to the Kern Sanitation Authority Wastewater Treatment Plant in Section 3, via Sections 20, 21, 22, 15, 10, and 3, all in T30S, R38E, MDB&M.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The project is the construction of sewer lines within the rural community of Rexland Acres and connecting to the Kern Sanitary Authority Wastewater Treatment Plant located approximately four miles northeasterly of Rexland Acres on Kimber Avenue, near Oswell Street, south of State Highway 58. The force main alignment includes the construction of approximately 26,200 lineal feet of eight-inch-diameter force main line between the Rexland Acres community to the Kern Sanitation District Wastewater Treatment Plant. Two lift stations operating in series are included; one at Fairview Road immediately west of Kern Island Canal (Lift Station No. 1) and a second lift station in the vicinity of Bakersfield Wastewater Treatment Plant No. 2 (Lift Station No. 2), the approximate half-way point. System requirements call for an average daily flow of 180 gallons per minute (gpm), with a peak flow of 360 gpm. After construction of the force main system, all aboveground facilities and disturbances will be restored to their previously existing condition or better. The system will be sized to provide sewer service to 688 developed lots serving 746 dwelling units that are included in the service area. Identified residential dwellings will then be connected to the newly installed sewer systems and the individual septic systems abandoned. The system is being proposed to remedy a high rate of septic system failures and to prevent potential degradation of groundwater in the Rexland Acres community. The project is proposed for funding by the U.S. Department of Agriculture Rural Utilities Service Financing Program and other sources. United States Department of Housing and Community Development Block Grant Funds may also be provided for the project. The formation of an assessment district and County Service Area Zone of Benefit will also be required.

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING: The project site is a rural community located in an unincorporated County area on the outskirts of Bakersfield. The community consists of 886 lots, 840 of which are developed with single-family dwellings. The remaining lots are developed with multiple family dwellings (67 units), commercial, and institutional uses. Residential lots range in size from under 6,000 square feet to 2 1/2 acres, with an average lot ranging in size between 6,000 square feet and 15,000 square feet. Water to the community is provided by the California Water Service Company served by two groundwater wells. Existing well water quality meets State standards although increased levels of nitrates in recent years have been detected. The community of Rexland Acres has experienced an increasing failure rate on septic tank uses. In 2001, the California Regional Water Quality Control Board/Central Valley Region adopted

Resolution 5-01-073 approving and accepting the Kern County Health Officer's Declaration of Potential Water Pollution and urged the State Water Resources Control Board to place the "Discharger" (Rexland Acres) in Priority Class B for Small Community Grant program funding. The area is not subject to flooding according to the published Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRM). The collection system, lift station, and force main will all be constructed in existing rights-of-way, on existing roads (paved and unpaved), or on previously disturbed areas. No undisturbed native habitat exists within the scope of the project. The areas where the sewer force main will be constructed consist either of County road right-of-way or land that is in agricultural production. Construction of the force main will not require the removal or relocation of existing buildings.

LHO:paw:ma (8/21/04 – 5190BB.122)

Evaluation of Environmental Impacts:

- (1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- (2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- (3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- (4) “Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less Than Significant Impact.” The lead agency must describe the mitigation measure and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section XVII, “Earlier Analyses,” may be cross-referenced).
- (5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or Negative Declaration, Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - (a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - (b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist 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.

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

- (b) The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance.

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	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 outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?
- c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?
- d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

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 Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:

- a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to nonagricultural use?
- b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act Contract?
- c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to nonagricultural use?

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) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? (Minor amounts of dust may be generated during construction) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

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 Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species, or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: | | | | |
| i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42. (No map is issued for the area. No active fault in the immediate vicinity) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| ii. Strong seismic groundshaking? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| iv. Landslides? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIAL. Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within 1/4 mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on site or off site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

- d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on site or off site?
- e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?
- f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?
- g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?
- h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?
- i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?
- j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:

- a) Physically divide an established community?
- b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?
- c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?

X. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

- a) Result in the loss of availability of a know mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?
- b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?

XI. NOISE. Would the project result in:

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Exposure of persons to, or generation of, noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance or applicable standards of other agencies? (Temporary noise during trenching and construction)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Exposure of persons to, or generation of, excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? (Temporary noise during trenching and construction)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:

a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES.

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

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

Fire Protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Police Protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Other Public Facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

XIV. RECREATION.

- 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?

a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

XV. TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC. Would the project:

- a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?
- b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?
- c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?
- d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?
- e) Result in inadequate emergency access?
- f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?

a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

- g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?

XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:

- a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?
- b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? (No significant impacts have been identified)
- c) Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?
- d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?
- e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments? (Adequate capacity exists)
- f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?
- g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.

- a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

IDENTIFICATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS
(Additional Remarks to Matrix)

- I. AESTHETICS.** Refer to Matrix.
- II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES.** The project will involve trenching within existing road right-of-way and approximately 5 1/4 miles of undeveloped property currently devoted to agricultural crop production. Sewer lines will follow section and midsection lines. Much of the proposed alignment lies within, or adjacent to, farm roads. Some construction will occur within areas devoted to crop production. No farmland will be converted as the ground surface will be restored to its original grade and condition immediately following the laying of sewer lines. Minor disruptions of agricultural production may occur during construction. Force main lines will be constructed along the boundaries of existing farm roads where feasible. The County will coordinate with farm owners to ensure any disruption to farming operations will be minimized. No significant disruptions to agricultural operations are anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required to reduce impacts to farmland as they are minimal and, therefore, less than significant.
- III. AIR QUALITY.** The proposed project is located within the administrative boundaries of the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (District). The District's attainment status is shown below:

Air Quality Requirement Attainment Status by Pollutant							
State Ozone	Federal Ozone	State PM ₁₀	Federal PM ₁₀	State CO	Federal CO	State NO ₂	Federal NO ₂
N	N	N	A	U	U	A	A
A=Attainment N=Nonattainment U=Unclassified							

The pollutants that could be generated from implementation of the project include temporary increases in emissions of PM₁₀, ozone, CO, and NO₂ from construction equipment and grading activities. Compliance with existing Regulation VIII Fugitive Dust Rules (in particular Rule 8020 – Construction, Demolition, Excavation, Extraction) will ensure that air quality impacts are less than significant.

- IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.** Refer to Matrix.
- V. CULTURAL RESOURCES.** The construction of sewer line will take place in existing road rights-of-way and on property under active agricultural production. The project does not require the removal any building. The project does involve removing dwellings from septic systems and connecting them to the wastewater treatment systems line. Connection to the wastewater treatment system will be through the lines to existing septic systems or through new lines. All conversion will take place at or below the foundation line and will not involve alteration of the architectural design of any building. Although the project area is not included within an archaeological sensitive area, if any historic or archaeological artifacts are uncovered during trenching, all work will be stopped at the affected location, and a qualified archaeologist will be called in to evaluate the find before work resumes. No significant impacts are anticipated.

- VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS.** Refer to Matrix.
- VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.** Potential unknown oil wells could be uncovered during excavation activities. A mitigation measures has been imposed to assure consultation and direction from the Department of Conservation/Division of Oil, Gas, and Geothermal Resources.
- VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY.** Refer to Matrix.
- IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING.** Refer to Matrix.
- X. MINERAL RESOURCES.** Refer to Matrix.
- XI. NOISE.** Temporary noise from construction activities will occur. Construction hours near existing dwellings will be limited to normal working hours between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. No significant impacts are anticipated.
- XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING.** Refer to Matrix.
- XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES.** Refer to Matrix.
- XIV. RECREATION.** Refer to Matrix.
- XV. TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC.** Construction activities could temporarily impact normal traffic movements. Construction within existing County rights-of-way will be coordinated with the Kern County Roads Department to ensure that significant disruptions to vehicular movements do not occur.
- XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS.** The Kern Waste Authority Wastewater Treatment Plant is currently operating well below design capacity and can accommodate the increased volume of waste flows anticipated without requiring any expansion of existing treatment facilities.
- XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.**

- (a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

No. Based on the foregoing evaluation, the proposed project is not expected to significantly impact biological or cultural resources in a manner which cannot be reduced to a level of insignificance through implementation of regulatory requirements.

- (b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)

No. Cumulative impacts as a result of the project have not been identified. Implementation of adopted ordinances and compliance with existing rules and regulations will ensure that no-term impacts accrue from the project.

- (c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

No. Implementation of adopted ordinances and compliance with existing rules and regulations will ensure that the project has no adverse consequences for human health, safety, or welfare.

MITIGATION MEASURES

- (1) Construction activities within, or within 1/4 mile of, the existing residential neighborhood shall be limited to normal working hours from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. The Kern County Engineering and Survey Services Department will include this requirement in any contracts entered into with the County for performing any of the required work associated with this project.
- (2) During construction activities, all requirements of the San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District's Regulation VIII Fugitive Dust Rules (in particular Rule 8020 - Construction, Demolition, Excavation, Extraction) shall be implemented. The Kern County Engineering and Survey Services Department will include this requirement in any contracts entered into with the County for performing any of the required work associated with this project.
- (3) Should any cultural materials be discovered during grading or development, all work shall be halted and a qualified archaeologist/historian contacted to assess the finds and impose mitigation measures, if necessary, prior to resumption of construction. The Kern County Engineering and Survey Services Department will include this requirement in any contracts entered into with the County for performing any of the required work associated with this project.
- (4) If, during grading or construction activities, any plugged or abandoned or unrecorded wells are uncovered or damaged, the Department of Conservation/Division of Oil, Gas, and Geothermal Resources shall be contacted to inspect and approve any remediation required.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- (1) Kern County Planning Department and City of Bakersfield Planning Department, "Metropolitan Bakersfield General Plan" (2002)
- (2) Kern County Planning Department, "Year 2000 General Plan Master Environmental Impact Report/Master Environmental Assessment" (1982)
- (3) Kern County Planning Department, "Zoning Ordinance" (2003)
- (4) Kern County Planning Department, "Zoning Maps 124-17" (1967)
- (5) Kern County Planning Department/Kern County Council of Governments, "Seismic Hazard Atlas - Lamont Quad" (1975)
- (6) Kern County Planning Department, "Floodplain Map 124" (1986)
- (7) California Environmental Agency/Department of Toxic Substances Control, "Hazardous Waste and Substances Sites List" (2002)
- (8) Boyle Engineering Consultants, "Rexland Acres Committee Wastewater System Preliminary Engineering Report of January 2000" (updated August 2001)
- (9) Quad Knopf, Inc., "Rexland Acres Committee Wastewater System Preliminary Engineering Report Supplement of June 2003"
- (10) Kern County Planning Department, "Negative Declaration for Pipeline Franchise Application for Naftex Holding, LTD" (November 17, 1997)
- (11) Kern County Planning Department, "Negative Declaration for Rexland Acres Committee Wastewater System" (October 8, 2001)
- (12) U. S. Department of Agriculture/Soil Conservation Service, "General Soils Map and Report" (September 1967)"
- (13) U. S. Department of Agriculture/Soil Conservation Service, "Soil Survey of Kern County, Southeastern Part" (1982)
- (14) Kern County Engineering and Survey Services Department, "Randy Smith, Project Coordinator – Information Relating to Capacity of the Kern Sanitation Authority Wastewater Treatment Plant"
- (15) Munger Map Book, 38th "Mountain View Oil Field" (1994)

National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)

Supplement

Rexland Acres Wastewater System

1.0 PROJECT'S PURPOSE AND NEED:

This project consists of construction new sewer lines from an existing wastewater treatment facility to serve the rural community of Rexland Acres, which has a documented problem with a high incidence of septic system failures. A more complete project description is contained in the Negative Declaration (copy attached).

2.0 ALTERNATIVES:

The preliminary engineering study, prepared for the County by Boyle Engineering Corporation, analyzed various options to provide sewer service to Rexland Acres. The alternative collection alternatives evaluated included: 1) the continued operation of individual septic systems (i.e. no project), 2) a complete sewer system installation, and 3) a partial sewer system installation. Alternative force main connections to the City of Bakersfield, the Lamont Public Utility District and to the Kern Sanitation Authority were also evaluated by the preliminary engineering study and a supplemental engineering report (June 3, 2003). The chosen alternative, a partial sewer system installation serving the majority of the Rexland Acres community connecting to the existing Kern Sanitation Authority wastewater treatment plant, was the alternative recommended by the consultant. This project will not create impacts to any environmental resource requiring public notice.

3.0 AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES:

3.1 USDA Important Farmlands

The project will involve trenching within existing road right-of-way and approximately 5½ miles of undeveloped property currently devoted to agricultural crop production. Sewer lines will follow section and mid-section lines. Much of the proposed alignment lies within or adjacent to existing farm roads. Some construction will occur within areas devoted to crop production. No farmland will be converted as the ground surface will be restored to its original grade and condition immediately following the laying of sewer lines. No significant disruptions to agricultural operations are anticipated and no mitigation measures are required to reduce impacts to farmland, as those impacts will be minimal.

3.2 Floodplains

Neither the community of Rexland Acres nor most of the sewer line route are located within flood hazard areas. One alternative for a main route line identifies a possible route along the East Panama Lane alignment to the SE corner of Section 22, T.30S. R.28E. That portion of Section 22 lying southeasterly of the Arvin-Edison Canal is located in a

Zone "A" area. Although underground facilities will not impact ground surface hydrology, above ground appurtenances within this area, if any, would be required to be reviewed for flood protection purposes by the Floodplain Management Section of the Engineering and Survey Services Department. Although four lift stations will be required, two of which lie in close proximity to the Arvin-Edison Canal, none of the lift stations is proposed within the designated Zone "A" area and any lines through the affected area will result in only temporary surface disturbance. Any disturbed area within the floodplain will be restored to its pre-disturbance grade and condition immediately upon completion of construction activities. No mitigation measures have been identified as being necessary.

3.3 Wetlands

Based upon Kern County Water Agency shallow groundwater maps, aerial photographs, and field observations, there are no wetlands present within the project area. The US Fish and Wildlife Service and State Department of Fish and Game were sent copies of the "early consultation package" and the draft Negative Declaration and neither agency provided any comments. No wetlands will be affected by this project.

3.4 Historic and Cultural Resources

This area is not considered to be sensitive to possible historic and cultural resources. Very limited amounts of surface disturbance will be required and those areas consist of County road rights-of-way, farm roads, or planted crop land. The "early consultation package" and draft Negative Declaration were sent to both the State Office of Historic Preservation and the Southern San Joaquin Archaeological Information Center. Neither agency provided any comments. The project area is not located near any property listed by the National Register of Historic Places or any State Historical Monument. The USDA-Rural Development has requested that the County furnish that agency with necessary documentation to request comments from the State Office of Historic Preservation.

At the request of the USDA-Office of Rural Development, an evaluation of the buildings in the project area was performed to consider whether or not the project would have any potential impact on historical buildings. A review of building permit history of all buildings within the project area was performed in January of 2002. The result of that research indicated that 49 dwellings (and one church) were constructed prior to January of 1952. Digitized photos of the 49 buildings have been taken. The vast majority of these 49 buildings were built between 1949 and 1951, when the Rexland Acres first began developing. A second building phase took place in the mid to late 1950's. The last phase of building took place in the mid-1970's, although there has been sporadic development of a few vacant lots in more recent years. The exact date of the church could not be ascertained through building records, but is estimated to have been constructed between 1945 and 1949. None of the structures surveyed is a local or State recognized historical landmark and none of the buildings appear to have significant historical value. Additionally, the construction of sewer lines and laterals is unlikely to have any impact on the physical appearance or integrity of any the buildings included in the project area.

3.5 Biological Resources

The project will not affect any listed endangered or threatened species or critical habitat. The sewer lines will be constructed entirely on disturbed ground surfaces, either within existing road rights-of-way, on existing farm roads or on property planted with agricultural crops. The entire project lies within the boundaries of an approved Habitat Conservation Plan. No portion of the site lies within a designated "critical habitat area", as defined by the Federal Endangered Species Act, for any protected species. No comments were received from the State Department of Fish and Game or the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service. The Kern County Board of Supervisors adopted a finding, in adopted the Negative Declaration, that the project is "de minimus" in it's impact on biological resources.

3.6 Water Quality Issues

The California Regional Water Quality Control Board has indicated that implementation of this project will enhance water quality efforts by reducing the threat to groundwater arising from failed septic tank systems. The site is not located in an USEPA "sole source" aquifer. The site lies within the Buena Vista Lake watershed area of the Southern San Joaquin Groundwater Basin.

3.7 Coastal Resources

Not applicable

3.8 Socio-Economic and Environmental Justice Issues

No adverse impacts to minority and low-income populations will result from the proposed sewer lines. No potential adverse effects to human health have been identified. Once connections to sewer lines have been provided, existing septic systems will be properly abandoned under permit from the Kern County Engineering and Survey Services Department-Building Inspection Division.

3.9 Air Quality

Minor amounts of dust could be created during excavation. The San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District reviewed this project and had no comments. Compliance with Regulation VIII Fugitive Dust Rules will ensure that air quality impacts from PM-10 will be less than significant.

3.10 Classified Lands

The project does not lie with a Coastal Zone Management Area or a Wild and Scenic River (or watershed) area. The site is not located within or proximate to National Forest Land or National Parks. The site is not proximate to any Designated National Monument.

3.11 Miscellaneous Issues.

No significant miscellaneous impacts have been identified in the adopted Negative Declaration. Because some of the sewer line construction will take place within an

established rural residential neighborhood, trenching and other construction activities will be limited to normal working hours, from 8:00 am to 5:00 pm. The Department of Conservation indicated that there are four abandoned oil wells in close proximity to the construction project. The location of these wells has been provided and the County will plot their location on construction plans.

3.12 Housing and Urban Development Requirements

No funds from the California Department of Housing and Community Development have been identified for project construction. The project will not involve explosive or flammable substances nor involve the use of toxic chemical or radioactive materials.

4.0 SUMMARY OF MITIGATION MEASURES

- (1) Construction activities within, or within 1/4 mile of, the existing residential neighborhood shall be limited to normal working hours from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. The Kern County Engineering and Survey Services Department will include this requirement in any contracts entered into with the County for performing any of the required work associated with this project.
- (2) During construction activities, all requirements of the San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District's Regulation VIII Fugitive Dust Rules (in particular Rule 8020 - Construction, Demolition, Excavation, Extraction) shall be implemented. The Kern County Engineering and Survey Services Department will include this requirement in any contracts entered into with the County for performing any of the required work associated with this project.
- (3) Should any cultural materials be discovered during grading or development, all work shall be halted and a qualified archaeologist/historian contacted to assess the finds and impose mitigation measures, if necessary, prior to resumption of construction. The Kern County Engineering and Survey Services Department will include this requirement in any contracts entered into with the County for performing any of the required work associated with this project.
- (4) If, during grading or construction activities, any plugged or abandoned or unrecorded wells are uncovered or damaged, the Department of Conservation/Division of Oil, Gas, and Geothermal Resources shall be contacted to inspect and approve any remediation required.

5.0 SUMMARY OF CORRESPONDENCE


Pertinent correspondence has been referenced in this assessment and has been included in the Final Negative Declaration.

6.0 EXHIBITS




Rexland Acres Wastewater System
 Kern County Engineering and Survey Services
 Sections 3, 9, 10, 15, 16, 17, 20, and 21, T 30S, R 28E, MDB&M


Kern County



Rexland Acres Wastewater System
Kern County Engineering and Survey Services
Sections 3, 9, 10, 15, 16, 17, 20, and 21, T 30S, R 28E, MDB&M



Rexland Acres Wastewater System
 Kern County Engineering and Survey Services
 Sections 3, 9, 10, 15, 16, 17, 20, and 21, T 30S, R 28E, MDB&M



HIGHWAY 58

MT. VERNON AVENUE

CASA LOMA DRIVE

BAKERSFIELD AIR PARK PLAZA

BAKERSFIELD WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT



LIFT STATION NO. 2


WHITE LANE

PACHECO ROAD

FAIRVIEW ROAD

LIFT STATION NO. 1





EXCERPT – Full text available during normal business hours at the Kern County Engineering and Survey Service Department 2700 M Street Suite 500, Bakersfield, Cal 93301

Rexland Acres Community Wastewater System

Preliminary Engineering Report Supplement

Submitted to:
Charles Lackey, Director
Engineering and Survey Services
County of Kern



Submitted by:



Quad Knopf
5500 Ming Avenue
Suite 410
Bakersfield, CA 93309
(661) 835-8300

June 3, 2003

3. Crossing private property from the east end of Planz Road and ending at City of Bakersfield Wastewater Treatment Plant No. 2 property.
4. Crossing City of Bakersfield Wastewater Treatment Plant No. 2 property from the east edge of said private property to KSA property.

Cottonwood Road and Planz Road are both County right-of-way. It is assumed that an easement will not be required for the portion of force main located within the KSA sewage farm.

Construction Problems

Potential construction problems could occur during the construction of onsite sewer mains in Rexland Acres due to potential high ground water, particularly where the mains are deep. High ground water may also be encountered as well at Lift Station No. 1 due to its proximity to the Kern Island Canal.

At the canal crossing, there may be an issue with the canal authority in terms of timing and construction methods. Generally in earthen canals, utility crossings are installed in open cut ditches and backfilled to the canal authority's requirements. The option to open cut usually occurs during a specific tight time frame. Coordinating with the canal authority will be an important aspect of this project. If construction occurs when the canal is in use, a bore and jack crossing will be required.

All of the collection sewers and nearly half of the offsite force main will be within frequently traveled streets. Traffic control, existing utility avoidance and restoration of pavement and other above ground facilities will be part of the project.

Lift Station Design for the City of Bakersfield Force Main Route

The Bakersfield disposal alternative is depicted on Figure 3. Based on our review of the PER, we concur that a triplex lift station and 6-inch diameter force main to Monitor Street would work. Based on our hydraulic analysis, however, the use of a duplex VSD system would merit further consideration. For purposes of this study, we will use the duplex lift pump station cost data for comparison.

The long force main will cause significant transient surges (water hammer) during pump starts and stops. A detailed analysis of pressure transients will be completed during the design phase of the project. Control of transient pressures is one reason for recommending VSD pumps. The pump(s) will operate continuously, with small incremental velocity changes, thereby mitigating transient pressure waves. VSD pumps will not mitigate for pressure transients resulting from a power failure and sudden stopping of the pump(s). In the event of a power outage or some other condition that causes surge, a surge arresting system may be necessary and will be investigated as part of the design.

Since the force mains are so long, and will need to be carefully maintained to reduce blockage, the lift stations will be equipped with pig launchers and pressure cleanouts. A pig launcher will be provided at each lift station.

The long force main (26,200 lf) and resulting long detention time will create anaerobic conditions in the sewage leading to potential odor emissions. Fortunately, Lift Station No. 2 will be located in an area where odor impacts are minimal. However, final design of the lift station will incorporate measures to prevent the release of odors through turbulence. If necessary, odor scrubbers will be included in the design.

Environmental Impacts

The collection system, lift station and force main will all be constructed in existing rights-of-way, on existing roads (paved and unpaved) or on previously disturbed areas. No undisturbed native habitat exists within the scope of the project.

Odor: Odor control will be included in the design of each lift station. If odor is determined to be a problem, the station(s) odor mitigation will be included in the design.

Restoration of existing features: Disturbance of surface features including paved roadways, unpaved roadways and fields will result in the construction of the force main, cleanouts, manholes and lift stations. After construction of the force main system, all above ground facilities will be restored to their previously existing condition or better.

Land Requirements

The following easements for construction and permanent utility access and service will be needed. For clarity, the list of requirements begins at Lift Station No. 1 and ends at the connection to KSA Wastewater Treatment Plant. Please refer to Figure 1:

1. Crossing of the Kern Island Canal.
2. Crossing of private property beginning at the Kern Island Canal and ending at Cottonwood Road. (Fairview Road alignment.)

The location of the proposed lift stations also minimizes the cost of connecting utility power service. They are both located adjacent to overhead power. With lack of overhead power along the entire route, adding further lift stations would result in additional cost to extend utility power. The two lift stations are conveniently located on all-weather paved access roads for service by KSA personnel. With more than two thirds of the force main route located on dirt roads (not all-weather access), this is a major benefit. Finally, Lift Station No. 2's location allows for a possible emergency connection to Bakersfield Plant No. 2, thus removing the need for emergency standby power at that location.

Lift Station Conceptual Design along the KSA Route

Conceptually, both lift stations along the KSA route will be designed as duplex submersible variable speed drive (VSD) pumps, each rated at the peak design flow of 400 gpm. With the duplex station design, each pump will be rated at 15 to 20 horsepower, depending on final pump selection. VSD's are recommended to reduce the impact of on/off peak flow at the treatment plant, to lower transient pressure forces (water hammer surge) on the stations and piping system and to reduce energy costs. The lift stations will be programmed to run at full speed (400 gpm) periodically to produce velocities high enough to efficiently move solids.

Triplex pumps, each rated at 50 percent of station capacity (i.e. 200 gpm each) were initially considered. However, because of the long force main and resulting high friction head loss, there was not a significant benefit in using three pumps. Two pumps together would need to pump 400 gpm at a total dynamic head of 71 feet. A single pump, operating at 200 gpm would have a total dynamic head of approximately 44 feet. Because each pump would need to meet the operating point for a combined 400 gpm flow, when operating individually, they would pump approximately 350 gpm.

Each duplex pump system will operate in an alternating lead lag operation for even pump wear. A pre-determined depth (set point) in each wet-well will control the operation of the pumps. The VSD pumps will maintain that set level as incoming flows vary. In rare instances, when the depth increases to a level above the normal operating level, the second pump will come on and operate until the liquid reaches the set point. If both pumps are unable to keep up with incoming flow, as may be the case during a utility power outage, an alarm will activate. The alarm activation may include any combination of the following:

1. An auto dial feature that calls KSA.
2. A flashing beacon.
3. An annunciator.

no more than two lift stations (vs. four in the PER) and has one canal crossing vs. three. The revised alignment requires minor modifications to the sewer collection system because of the revised location of the Rexland Acres lift station, at the east end of Fairview Road (See Figure 2).

The PER proposed a force main to the KSA WWTP that followed an alignment with 36,300 feet of 6-inch diameter force-main with three canal crossings and four lift stations. Four lift stations were required because of the high friction head losses occurring in the 6-inch force main over its nearly seven-mile length. Multiple lift stations were required to keep the friction head losses within the range of available head for sewage pumps.

The proposed new force main alignment, shown on Figure 1, requires 26,200 feet of 8-inch diameter force-main with one canal crossing and two lift stations. The lift station design is also modified. A description of the new force main (treatment) Alternative 3 follows.

Description of Force Main (Treatment) Alternative No. 3 – Connection to KSA WWTP

The new force main alignment includes the construction of 26,200 lineal feet of 8-inch diameter force main between Rexland Acres and the KSA WWTP (See Figures 1 and 2) The alignment is shown in Photo Plates in Appendix 1. Two lift stations operating in series are included; one at Fairview Road immediately west of Kern Island Canal (Lift Station No. 1), and a second lift station in the vicinity of Bakersfield Wastewater Treatment Plant No. 2, (Lift Station No. 2), the approximate half-way point. The surface elevation difference between Lift Station No. 1 and the connection to KSA is approximately eighteen (18) feet. The total static lift in Lift Station No. 1 is approximately 30 feet. The total static lift at Lift Station No. 2 is assumed at approximately 20 feet.

An 8-inch diameter force main was selected to keep friction head loss at a minimum so that fewer lift stations would be required. The total dynamic head for Lift Station No. 1, at a pumping rate of 400 gpm, is approximately 71 feet with a 13,100 lf 8-inch force main vs. 168 feet for a 6-inch force main. (See Appendix 2 for hydraulic calculations.) A 30-hp sewage pump is required for the 6-inch force main vs. an 18-hp pump for an 8-inch force main. Sewage pumps are generally not available for high head applications such as would be required for the 6-inch diameter force main. The 8-inch force main will reduce energy costs and will reduce capital costs if fewer lift stations are required.

It may be possible to use a single lift station if an 8-inch diameter force main is utilized. The total dynamic head for an 8-inch diameter, 26,200 lf force main is approximately 105 feet. (Appendix 2). A preliminary pump selection indicates that it may be possible to find a sewage pump with these characteristics. However, additional detailed analysis during final design is required to evaluate other design factors such as surge suppression and odor control.

Rexland Acres Community Wastewater System

Supplemental Engineering Report

Purpose of Supplemental Report

This report is a supplement to the Preliminary Engineering Report (PER) prepared by Boyle Engineering titled, Rexland Acres Committee Wastewater System, dated August 2001 (See Appendix 3). This supplement updates the PER with a new force main alignment to the Kern Sanitation Agency (KSA) Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP) and updates costs for the alternatives presented.

Background

In the referenced PER, there were three collection system alternatives and three force main, "treatment" alternatives considered. The three collection system alternatives included:

1. Status Quo. Continued operation of individual septic systems with on-site leachfield disposal (no project).
2. Installation of a complete sewage collection system in Rexland Acres.
3. Installation of partial sewage collection system in Rexland Acres. The partial collection system included only the higher density (small lot) areas.


The force main ("treatment") alternatives included:

1. Connection to City of Bakersfield sewer system at Fairview Road and Monitor Street.
2. Connection to Lamont Public Utility District WWTP.
3. Connection to Kern Sanitation Authority (KSA) WWTP.

Descriptions of the above stated alternatives and associated costs are provided in the referenced PER. Alternatives remaining under consideration include the partial sewer system (collection system Alternative 3 above) in combination with connection to City of Bakersfield (force main Alternative 1) or connection to KSA (force main Alternative 3) through one of two force main alignments.

Revised KSA Force Main Alternative

A revised force main alignment to the KSA WWTP ("treatment" Alternative 3) is under consideration in this report. The revised alignment is shorter and more direct, requires



E. PANAMA LN.

1044

DATE: 06/30/98
 REPORT: R0050/2-3

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
 DRINKING WATER PROGRAM

PAGE: 18

DRINKING WATER NEIGHBORS SOURCE REPORT
 ALL SAMPLES FOR SELECTED MONITORED CONSTITUENTS - ALL RESULTS
 FOR PERIOD OF 19840101 THRU 19980630

TARGET SYSTEM: 1510003 NAME: CALIFORNIA WATER SERVICE - BAK
 TARGET SOURCE: 130 NAME: WELL 161-01
 BOUNDARIES IN MINUTES - S: 2117, N: 2121, E: 7135, W: 7141

COUNTY: KERN
 PSCODE: 30S/28E-20C01 M LAT: 2119 LNG: 7140
 BOUNDARIES IN MILES - S: 02, N: 02, E: 03, W: 01

GROUP IDENTIFICATION

CONSTITUENT IDENTIFICATION

CONSTITUENT IDENTIFICATION	SAMPLE DATE	RESULT	MCL	DLR	UNIT
71850 NITRATE (AS NO3)	03/16/1995	27.0000	45.0000	2.0000	MG/L
71850 NITRATE (AS NO3)	06/08/1995	23.0000	45.0000	2.0000	MG/L
71850 NITRATE (AS NO3)	06/08/1995	23.0000	45.0000	2.0000	MG/L
71850 NITRATE (AS NO3)	09/18/1995	22.0000	45.0000	2.0000	MG/L
71850 NITRATE (AS NO3)	12/13/1995	21.0000	45.0000	2.0000	MG/L
71850 NITRATE (AS NO3)	06/03/1996	21.0000	45.0000	2.0000	MG/L
71850 NITRATE (AS NO3)	11/19/1997	17.0000	45.0000	2.0000	MG/L

TARGET SOURCE

SYSTEM: 1510003 NAME: CALIFORNIA WATER SERVICE - BAKERSFIELD COUNTY: KERN
 SOURCE: 130 NAME: WELL 163-01 PSCODE: 30S/28E-20C01 M LAT: 2119 LNG: 7140
 NI NITRATE/NITRITE

CONSTITUENT IDENTIFICATION	SAMPLE DATE	RESULT	MCL	DLR	UNIT
00620 NITRITE (AS N)	06/05/1995	1,000.0000	400.0000	400.0000	UG/L
71850 NITRATE (AS NO3)	01/23/1989	31.0000	45.0000	2.0000	MG/L
71850 NITRATE (AS NO3)	01/29/1992	38.0000	45.0000	2.0000	MG/L
71850 NITRATE (AS NO3)	04/13/1993	42.0000	45.0000	2.0000	MG/L
71850 NITRATE (AS NO3)	06/11/1993	45.0000	45.0000	2.0000	MG/L
71850 NITRATE (AS NO3)	09/21/1993	41.0000	45.0000	2.0000	MG/L
71850 NITRATE (AS NO3)	12/07/1993	40.0000	45.0000	2.0000	MG/L
71850 NITRATE (AS NO3)	02/24/1994	37.0000	45.0000	2.0000	MG/L
71850 NITRATE (AS NO3)	09/21/1994	40.0000	45.0000	2.0000	MG/L
71850 NITRATE (AS NO3)	12/13/1994	38.0000	45.0000	2.0000	MG/L
71850 NITRATE (AS NO3)	03/13/1995	43.0000	45.0000	2.0000	MG/L
71850 NITRATE (AS NO3)	06/03/1995	34.0000	45.0000	2.0000	MG/L
71850 NITRATE (AS NO3)	06/05/1995	36.0000	45.0000	2.0000	MG/L
71850 NITRATE (AS NO3)	06/05/1995	37.0000	45.0000	2.0000	MG/L
71850 NITRATE (AS NO3)	09/14/1995	35.0000	45.0000	2.0000	MG/L
71850 NITRATE (AS NO3)	12/13/1995	34.0000	45.0000	2.0000	MG/L

DATE: 06/30/98
REPORT: R0050/2-3

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DRINKING WATER PROGRAM

DRINKING WATER NEIGHBORS SOURCE REPORT

ALL SAMPLES FOR SELECTED MONITORED CONSTITUENTS - ALL RESULTS
FOR PERIOD OF 19840101 THRU 19980630

TARGET SYSTEM: 1510003 NAME: CALIFORNIA WATER SERVICE - BAK COUNTY: KERN
TARGET SOURCE: 130 NAME: WELL 163-01 PSCODE: 30S/28E-20C01 M LAT: 2119 LNG: 7140
BOUNDARIES IN MINUTES - S: 2117, N: 2121, E: 7135, W: 7141 BOUNDARIES IN MILES - S: 02, N: 02, E: 03, W: 01

GROUP IDENTIFICATION

CONSTITUENT IDENTIFICATION

SAMPLE DATE	RESULT	MCL	DLR	UNIT
06/03/1996	34.0000	45.0000	2.0000	MG/L
11/20/1996	31.0000	45.0000	2.0000	MG/L
12/08/1996	25.0000	45.0000	2.0000	MG/L
03/31/1997	32.0000	45.0000	2.0000	MG/L
06/23/1997	30.0000	45.0000	2.0000	MG/L
09/09/1997	32.0000	45.0000	2.0000	MG/L
11/18/1997	23.0000	45.0000	2.0000	MG/L

SYSTEM: 1510003 NAME: CALIFORNIA WATER SERVICE - BAKERSFIELD COUNTY: KERN

SOURCE: 131 NAME: WELL 164-01

PSCODE: 30S/28E-20F01 M LAT: 2118 LNG: 7140

CONSTITUENT IDENTIFICATION

SAMPLE DATE	RESULT	MCL	DLR	UNIT
00620 NITRATE (AS N)		1,000.0000	400.0000	UG/L
06/05/1995	18.0000	45.0000	2.0000	MG/L
01/23/1989	20.0000	45.0000	2.0000	MG/L
01/30/1992	22.0000	45.0000	2.0000	MG/L
06/10/1993	24.0000	45.0000	2.0000	MG/L
02/24/1994	24.0000	45.0000	2.0000	MG/L
09/20/1994	24.0000	45.0000	2.0000	MG/L
12/13/1994	25.0000	45.0000	2.0000	MG/L
03/14/1995	24.0000	45.0000	2.0000	MG/L
06/05/1995	24.0000	45.0000	2.0000	MG/L
06/05/1995	29.0000	45.0000	2.0000	MG/L
09/21/1995	24.0000	45.0000	2.0000	MG/L
12/14/1995	26.0000	45.0000	2.0000	MG/L
10/28/1997				

SYSTEM: 1510003 NAME: CALIFORNIA WATER SERVICE - BAKERSFIELD COUNTY: KERN

SOURCE: 143 NAME: WELL 177-01

PSCODE: 30S/28E-18N01 M LAT: 2119 LNG: 7141

Rexland Acres Wells

statewellno	textwellname	dtmsamplingdate	INO3	Ca	TDS	Ca	SEC	SO4
Between Rexland & Bryant Streets								
30S/28E-20C01	163-01	17-Jul-74	10.5	23	217	33	370	
30S/28E-20C01	163-01	24-Jun-76	13	33	250	39	430	
30S/28E-20C01	163-01	22-Oct-79	20	35	290	46	490	
30S/28E-20C01	163-01	21-Jun-83	18	30	264	37	433	47
30S/28E-20C01	163-01	29-Jan-92	38	38	314	46	510	39
30S/28E-20C01	163-01	05-Jun-95	74	84	684	92	1074	94
NW Corner of Sperry & Don Streets								
30S/28E-20F01	164-01	17-Jul-74	10.5	23	217	33	370	
30S/28E-20F01	164-01	27-Jul-77	10	29	234	38	419	
30S/28E-20F01	164-01	06-Sep-83	11	26	265	35	422	48
30S/28E-20F01	164-01	30-Jan-92	20	31	274	40	425	45
30S/28E-20F01	164-01	05-Jun-95	48	70	590	80	924	92
SW Corner of Burchfield & Garber Streets								
30S/28E-20M01		17-Jul-74	8.7	25	204	24	350	
30S/28E-20M01		06-Oct-76	8	28	217	33	359	
30S/28E-20M01		28-Jan-77	5	22	210	33	371	
30S/28E-20M01		06-Jul-78	11	26	242	37	388	
30S/28E-20M01		04-Sep-80	10	24	245	38	410	
30S/28E-20M01		02-Nov-82	13	27	252	38	457	40
30S/28E-20M01		09-May-84	11	29	265	38	420	49

**COMMENTS FROM
EARLY
CONSULTATION**



California Regional Water Quality Control Board

Central Valley Region



Winston H. Hickox
Secretary for
Environmental
Protection

Robert Schneider, Chair

Fresno Branch Office

Internet Address: <http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/~rwqcb5>
3614 East Ashlan Avenue, Fresno, California 93726
Phone (559) 445-5116 • FAX (559) 445-5910

Gray Davis
Governor

9 November 2001

Mr. James E. Ellis, AICP
Planning Operations Division Chief
Kern County Planning Department
Bakersfield, CA 93301-2323

PROPOSED NEGATIVE DECLARATION FOR EA JE 1-01, REXLAND ACRES WASTEWATER SYSTEM (SCH # 2001102078), KERN COUNTY

The above project is the construction of sewer lines that will connect the community of Rexland Acres to the Kern Sanitation Authority's Wastewater Treatment Plant. The system will be sized to provide sewer service to 688 existing lots serving 746 dwelling units, currently served by individual septic tank systems. Over half of these septic systems have failed or in threat of failure and need frequent pumping to minimize surface ponding of sewage. The Kern County Public Health Officer, through its deputy, the Kern County Health Services Director, declared on 6 December 2000 that these conditions pose a public health and safety hazard. Kern County has proposed to remedy the situation and developed an action plan and schedule. On 15 March 2001, the Central Valley Regional Water Resources Control Board adopted a resolution approving and accepting the Kern County Health Officer's declaration of public health concern and a time schedule for compliance.

We reviewed the proposed negative declaration and concur with its findings. The project, once completed, will result in a net improvement in groundwater quality in the Rexland Acres area.

If you have any questions regarding this matter, please call me at (559) 445-5035

JO ANNE KIPPS
Senior Engineer
RCE No. 49278

cc: State Clearinghouse, Sacramento

California Environmental Protection Agency



OFFICE MEMORANDUM ** COUNTY OF KERN
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM DEPARTMENT

DATE: August 30, 2001
TO: Jim Ellis, Planning Operations
CC: Bill Mungary, Director
Barry Jung, Senior Planner
FROM: Grace Coan, Associate Planner *GC*
SUBJECT: Rexland Acres Wastewater System; EAJEI-01

The following comments are provided in response to the Responsible Agency Review request submitted by your department for the above-referenced project:

In the event that U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development Community Development Block Grant Funds are requested and approved for the above-referenced project, it is recommended that the following language be added to the project description and the public notice:

"U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development Community Development Block Grant Funds may also be provided for the project. "

With this additional language, the CEQA/NEPA document being prepared for the project may be used for HUD Environmental Clearance if that becomes necessary. Thank you.



DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

VIA FACSIMILE

September 17, 2001

■ ■ ■

801 K STREET
SACRAMENTO
CALIFORNIA
95814

PHONE
916/322-1080

FAX
916/445-0732

TDD
916/324-2555

INTERNET
consrv.ca.gov

■ ■ ■

GRAY DAVIS
GOVERNOR

Mr. Jim Ellis
Kern County Planning Department
2700 M Street, Suite 100
Bakersfield, CA 93301

Dear Mr. Ellis:

Subject: EA JE 1-01 - Rexland Acres Wastewater System (Kern County Engineering and Survey Services [PP02218])

The Department of Conservation's Division of Oil, Gas and Geothermal Resources (Division) has reviewed the early assessment notice for the referenced project. The Division supervises the drilling, maintenance, and plugging and abandonment of oil, gas and geothermal wells in California. We offer the following comments for your consideration.

The southwestern portion of the Rexland Acres neighborhood lies within the administrative boundaries of the abandoned Kernsumner oil field. In fact, there are three plugged and abandoned wells in the proximity of the project site. Also, a portion of the 6-inch sewer line near "Lift Station #3" is within the administrative boundaries of the Mountain View oil field. As proposed, the 6-inch sewer line will pass near the "Tenneco-Mountain View" 1-15 abandoned well. The four subject wells are as follows:

<u>Operator</u>	<u>Lease/Well</u>	<u>Location</u>
ARCO Western Energy	"KCY-Signal 2" 16X-20	1,850' N & 478' E fr. SW cor. sec. 20
Occidental Petroleum Corp.	"Fairview Unit A" 1	2,135' N & 1,482' E fr. SW cor. sec. 20
Petroleum Investment Co.	"P. I. Unit" 1-16X	1,750' N & 330' E fr. SW cor. sec. 20
Channel Exploration Co.	"Tenneco-Mountain View" 1-15	2,100' N & 2,500' E fr. SW cor. sec. 15

Mr. Jim Ellis
September 17, 2001
Page 2


The Division recommends that all wells within or in close proximity to project boundaries be accurately plotted on detailed development maps. If site development will result in the construction of a structure within the proximity of a well, the district office in Bakersfield must be contacted to determine the well's mechanical integrity. Depending on the well's condition, remedial operations may be required

The Division recommends against building over or in the proximity of a plugged and abandoned well. If avoidance is not possible, it may be necessary to plug or re-plug the well to current Division specifications. Also, please note that the State Oil and Gas Supervisor is authorized to order the reabandonment of a previously plugged and abandoned well when construction over or in the proximity of the well could result in a hazard (Section 3208.1 of the Public Resources Code). If reabandonment becomes necessary, the cost of operations will be the responsibility of the owner of the property upon which the structure will be located. Finally, if construction over a plugged and abandoned well is unavoidable, an adequate gas venting system should be installed over the well.

If excavation or grading operations uncover a previously unrecorded well, the Division district office in Bakersfield must be notified; such wells may require remedial operations

Thank you for the opportunity to comment during the early consultation period for this project. If you have questions, please contact Joseph A. Austin at the Bakersfield district office: 4800 Stockdale Highway, Suite 417, Bakersfield, California (93309); or, phone (661) 322-4031. You may also call me at (916) 445-8733.

Sincerely,



Kenneth E. Trott
Environmental Coordinator

cc: Joseph A. Austin
Division of Oil, Gas, and Geothermal Resources, Bakersfield

Linda Campion
Division of Oil, Gas, and Geothermal Resources, Sacramento

Kern County Planning Department
Attn: Jim Ellis
2700 M Street, Suite 100
Bakersfield, California 93301

August 24, 2001

Telephone: (661) 862-8620
FAX: (661) 862-8601

RESPONSIBLE AGENCY REVIEW

PURPOSE: The purpose of this form is to aid responsible agencies, trustee agencies, and agencies or individuals with a particular expertise in reviewing the described project. This preliminary analysis will aid us in determining whether the effects of the project will require preparation of an environmental impact report (EIR) or a Negative Declaration. If any of the effects of a project may have a substantial adverse effect on the environment, then an EIR must be prepared, unless mitigation measures to modify the project are proposed and agreed to by the applicant (Section 21080, Public Resources Code). Pursuant to Section 21081.6, Public Resources Code, any mitigation measure shall be monitored by a program to ensure compliance. Should your agency recommend a mitigation measure, this Department requests you include a monitoring program to ensure implementation.

INSTRUCTIONS: Based upon your area of expertise and concern, please evaluate environmental impacts of the project. Sections 21080(d) & (e), of the Public Resources Code, require that a request for an EIR contain substantial evidence in the record to show significant effect; therefore, the reasons for such a recommendation need to be justified by separate documentation. Please complete the following and return this page.

Check One

EIR

Date: August 30, 2001

Reviewing Agency:

Negative
Declaration

Grace Coan, Associate Planner
Contact:

Mitigated
Negative
Declaration

Kern County Community Development Program Department

SEE ATTACHED MEMORANDUM FOR COMMENTS

TECHNICAL REPORTS WILL NOT BE REDISTRIBUTED

Please Reply by September 14, 2001

PROPOSED PROJECT: Rexland Acres Wastewater System; EA JE1-01; Kern County Engineering and Survey Services-Applicant (pp02218)

LOCATION: The community of Rexland Acres located at the intersection of South Union Avenue and E. Pacheco Road, in South Bakersfield, approximately bordered by Gary Place and Brenda Place on the west, Rexland Avenue and Garden Drive on the north, Kern Island Canal on the east and Buckly Avenue on the south; Section 20, T. 30 S. R. 28 E. MDB&M in Kern County, California

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The project is the construction of sewer lines within the community of Rexland Acres and connecting to the Kern Sanitary Authority Wastewater Treatment Plant located on Kimber Avenue near Oswell Street, south of State Highway 99. Approximately 50,000 feet of 8" PVC pipe and 125,000 feet of 6" pipe.

Kern County Planning Department
Attn: Jim Ellis
2700 M Street, Suite 100
Bakersfield, California 93301

August 24, 2001

Telephone: (661) 862-8620
FAX: (661) 862-8601

RESPONSIBLE AGENCY REVIEW

PURPOSE: The purpose of this form is to aid responsible agencies, trustee agencies, and agencies or individuals with a particular expertise in reviewing the described project. This preliminary analysis will aid us in determining whether the effects of the project will require preparation of an environmental impact report (EIR) or a Negative Declaration. If any of the effects of a project may have a substantial adverse effect on the environment, then an EIR must be prepared, unless mitigation measures to modify the project are proposed and agreed to by the applicant (Section 21080, Public Resources Code). Pursuant to Section 21081.6, Public Resources Code, any mitigation measure shall be monitored by a program to ensure compliance. Should your agency recommend a mitigation measure, this Department requests you include a monitoring program to ensure implementation.

INSTRUCTIONS: Based upon your area of expertise and concern, please evaluate environmental impacts of the project. Sections 21080(d) & (e), of the Public Resources Code, require that a request for an EIR contain substantial evidence in the record to show significant effect; therefore, the reasons for such a recommendation need to be justified by separate documentation. Please complete the following and return this page.

Check One

EIR

Date: 8-29-01

Reviewing Agency:

Negative Declaration

Contact:

Roads

Mitigated Negative Declaration

Don Turkal

TECHNICAL REPORTS WILL NOT BE REDISTRIBUTED

Please Reply by September 14, 2001

PROPOSED PROJECT: Rexland Acres Wastewater System; EA JE1-01; Kern County Engineering and Survey Services-Applicant (pp02218)

LOCATION: The community of Rexland Acres located at the intersection of South Union Avenue and E. Pacheco Road, in South Bakersfield, approximately bordered by Gary Place and Brenda Place on the west, Rexland Avenue and Garden Drive on the north, Kern Island Canal on the east and Buckley Avenue on the south; Section 20, T. 30 S. R. 28 E. MDB&M in Kern County, California

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The project is the construction of sewer lines within the community of Rexland Acres and connecting to the Kern Sanitary Authority Wastewater Treatment Plant located on Kimber Avenue near Oswell Street, south of State Highway 58. Approximately 50,000 feet of 8" PVC trunk line and 35,000 feet of a 6" force main will connect the community to the wastewater treatment plant. The system will also require the construction of four lift stations. System requirements call for an average daily flow of 180 gpm with a peak flow of 360 gpm. The system will be sized to provide sewer service to 688 existing lots serving 746 dwelling units that are included in the service area. The system is being proposed to remedy a high rate of septic system failures and to prevent potential degradation of groundwater in the Rexland community. The project is proposed for funding by the USDA Rural Utilities Service Financing program and the formation of an assessment district and County Service Area Zone of Benefit will also be required.

Kern County Planning Department
Attn: Jim Ellis
2700 M Street, Suite 100
Bakersfield, California 93301

August 24, 2001

Telephone: (661) 862-8620
FAX: (661) 862-8601

RESPONSIBLE AGENCY REVIEW

PURPOSE: The purpose of this form is to aid responsible agencies, trustee agencies, and agencies or individuals with a particular expertise in reviewing the described project. This preliminary analysis will aid us in determining whether the effects of the project will require preparation of an environmental impact report (EIR) or a Negative Declaration. If any of the effects of a project may have a substantial adverse effect on the environment, then an EIR must be prepared, unless mitigation measures to modify the project are proposed and agreed to by the applicant (Section 21080, Public Resources Code). Pursuant to Section 21081.6, Public Resources Code, any mitigation measure shall be monitored by a program to ensure compliance. Should your agency recommend a mitigation measure, this Department requests you include a monitoring program to ensure implementation.

INSTRUCTIONS: Based upon your area of expertise and concern, please evaluate environmental impacts of the project. Sections 21080(d) & (e), of the Public Resources Code, require that a request for an EIR contain substantial evidence in the record to show significant effect; therefore, the reasons for such a recommendation need to be justified by separate documentation. Please complete the following and return this page.

Check One

EIR

Date: 8-28-01

Reviewing Agency:

Negative Declaration

DHS - DWFOB
Contact:

Mitigated Negative Declaration

Jim Ellis

TECHNICAL REPORTS WILL NOT BE REDISTRIBUTED

Please Reply by September 14, 2001

PROPOSED PROJECT: Rexland Acres Wastewater System; EA JE1-01; Kern County Engineering and Survey Services-Applicant (pp02218)

LOCATION: The community of Rexland Acres located at the intersection of South Union Avenue and E. Pacheco Road, in South Bakersfield, approximately bordered by Gary Place and Brenda Place on the west, Rexland Avenue and Garden Drive on the north, Kern Island Canal on the east and Buckley Avenue on the south; Section 20, T. 30 S. R. 28 E. MDB&M in Kern County, California

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The project is the construction of sewer lines within the community of Rexland Acres and connecting to the Kern Sanitary Authority Wastewater Treatment Plant located on Kimber Avenue near Oswell Street, south of State Highway 58. Approximately 50,000 feet of 8" PVC trunk line and 35,000 feet of a 6" force main will connect the community to the wastewater treatment plant. The system will also require the construction of four lift stations. System requirements call for an average daily flow of 180 gpm with a peak flow of 360 gpm. The system will be sized to provide sewer service to 688 existing lots serving 746 dwelling units that are included in the service area. The system is being proposed to remedy a high rate of septic system failures and to prevent potential degradation of groundwater in the Rexland community. The project is proposed for funding by the USDA Rural Utilities Service Financing program and the formation of an assessment district and County Service Area Zone of Benefit will also be required.


ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH SERVICES DEPARTMENT

KERN COUNTY

Office Memorandum

Date: August 31, 2001

To: Ted James, Director
Planning Department
Attention: Jim Ellis

 **From:** Steve McCalley, Director
Environmental Health Services Department
By: Thomas Hardy, Environmental Health Specialist III

Re: Environmental Consultation for Rexland Acres Wastewater System

The Environmental Health Services Department submits the following comment for your consideration:

- Once connected to the Kern Sanitary Authority Wastewater Treatment Plant, each septic tank should be properly abandoned under permit with the Kern County Building Inspection Division.

TH:dt

Kern County Planning Department
Attn: Jim Ellis
2700 M Street, Suite 100
Bakersfield, California 93301

August 24, 2001

Telephone: (661) 862-8620
FAX: (661) 862-8601

RESPONSIBLE AGENCY REVIEW

01 - 23 P 3: 36

PURPOSE: The purpose of this form is to aid responsible agencies, trustee agencies, and agencies or individuals with a particular expertise in reviewing the described project. This preliminary analysis will aid us in determining whether the effects of the project will require preparation of an environmental impact report (EIR) or a Negative Declaration. If any of the effects of a project may have a substantial adverse effect on the environment, then an EIR must be prepared, unless mitigation measures to modify the project are proposed and agreed to by the applicant (Section 21080, Public Resources Code). Pursuant to Section 21081.6, Public Resources Code, any mitigation measure shall be monitored by a program to ensure compliance. Should your agency recommend a mitigation measure, this Department requests you include a monitoring program to ensure implementation.

INSTRUCTIONS: Based upon your area of expertise and concern, please evaluate environmental impacts of the project. Sections 21080(d) & (e), of the Public Resources Code, require that a request for an EIR contain substantial evidence in the record to show significant effect; therefore, the reasons for such a recommendation need to be justified by separate documentation. Please complete the following and return this page.

Check One

- EIR
- Negative Declaration
- Mitigated Negative Declaration

Date: 08/28/01

Reviewing Agency:

Kern County Fire Dept

Contact:

This office has no comments/requirements (661) 862-5007

TECHNICAL REPORTS WILL NOT BE REDISTRIBUTED

Please Reply by September 14, 2001

PROPOSED PROJECT: Rexland Acres Wastewater System; EA JE1-01; Kern County Engineering and Survey Services-Applicant (pp02218)

LOCATION: The community of Rexland Acres located at the intersection of South Union Avenue and E. Pacheco Road, in South Bakersfield, approximately bordered by Gary Place and Brenda Place on the west, Rexland Avenue and Garden Drive on the north, Kern Island Canal on the east and Buckley Avenue on the south; Section 20, T. 30 S. R. 28 E. MDB&M in Kern County, California

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The project is the construction of sewer lines within the community of Rexland Acres and connecting to the Kern Sanitary Authority Wastewater Treatment Plant located on Kimber Avenue near Oswell Street, south of State Highway 58. Approximately 50,000 feet of 8" PVC trunk line and 35,000 feet of a 6" force main will connect the community to the wastewater treatment plant. The system will also require the construction of four lift stations. System requirements call for an average daily flow of 180 gpm with a peak flow of 360 gpm. The system will be sized to provide sewer service to 688 existing lots serving 746 dwelling units that are included in the service area. The system is being proposed to remedy a high rate of septic system failures and to prevent potential degradation of groundwater in the Rexland community. The project is proposed for funding by the USDA Rural Utilities Service Financing program and the formation of an assessment district and County Service Area Zone of Benefit will also be required.

August 24, 2001

Telephone: (661) 862-8620
FAX: (661) 862-8601

RESPONSIBLE AGENCY REVIEW

PURPOSE: The purpose of this form is to aid responsible agencies, trustee agencies, and agencies or individuals with a particular expertise in reviewing the described project. This preliminary analysis will aid us in determining whether the effects of the project will require preparation of an environmental impact report (EIR) or a Negative Declaration. If any of the effects of a project may have a substantial adverse effect on the environment, then an EIR must be prepared, unless mitigation measures to modify the project are proposed and agreed to by the applicant (Section 21080, Public Resources Code). Pursuant to Section 21081.6, Public Resources Code, any mitigation measure shall be monitored by a program to ensure compliance. Should your agency recommend a mitigation measure, this Department requests you include a monitoring program to ensure implementation.

INSTRUCTIONS: Based upon your area of expertise and concern, please evaluate environmental impacts of the project. Sections 21080(d) & (e), of the Public Resources Code, require that a request for an EIR contain substantial evidence in the record to show significant effect; therefore, the reasons for such a recommendation need to be justified by separate documentation. Please complete the following and return this page.

Check One

EIR

Date: 8-24-01

Reviewing Agency:

Negative Declaration

DHS - DWFOB
Contact:

Mitigated Negative Declaration

Jim Steer

TECHNICAL REPORTS WILL NOT BE REDISTRIBUTED

Please Reply by September 14, 2001

PROPOSED PROJECT: Rexland Acres Wastewater System; EA JE1-01; Kern County Engineering and Survey Services-Applicant (pp02218)

LOCATION: The community of Rexland Acres located at the intersection of South Union Avenue and E. Pacheco Road, in South Bakersfield, approximately bordered by Gary Place and Brenda Place on the west, Rexland Avenue and Garden Drive on the north, Kern Island Canal on the east and Buckley Avenue on the south; Section 20, T. 30 S. R. 28 E. MDB&M in Kern County, California

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The project is the construction of sewer lines within the community of Rexland Acres and connecting to the Kern Sanitary Authority Wastewater Treatment Plant located on Kimber Avenue near Oswell Street, south of State Highway 58. Approximately 50,000 feet of 8" PVC trunk line and 35,000 feet of a 6" force main will connect the community to the wastewater treatment plant. The system will also require the construction of four lift stations. System requirements call for an average daily flow of 180 gpm with a peak flow of 360 gpm. The system will be sized to provide sewer service to 688 existing lots serving 746 dwelling units that are included in the service area. The system is being proposed to remedy a high rate of septic system failures and to prevent potential degradation of groundwater in the Rexland community. The project is proposed for funding by the USDA Rural Utilities Service Financing program and the formation of an assessment district and County Service Area Zone of Benefit will also be required.

STEVE McCALLEY, R.E.H.S., Director
2700 "M" STREET, SUITE 300
BAKERSFIELD, CA 93301-2370
Voice: (661) 862-8700
Fax: (661) 862-8701
TTY Relay: (800) 735-2929
e-mail: eh@co.kern.ca.us



DAVID PRICE III, RMA DIRECTOR
Community Development Program Department
Engineering & Survey Services Department
Environmental Health Services Department
Planning Department
Roads Department

April 15, 1999

Mr. Dan Johnson
Community Development Manager
USDA/Rural Development - Bakersfield
1601 New Stine Road, Suite 280
Bakersfield CA 93309-3698

SUBJECT: Rexland Acres Septic System Problems

Dear Mr. Johnson:

This Department has reviewed the results of the Septic Tank Performance survey conducted by the Rexland Acres Committee and Self-Help Enterprises. This community has over 900 properties with septic systems and responses were received from 84% of the occupied properties. Survey results show that 228 (32%) of the systems had their septic tanks pumped two or more times in the last three years and 150 (22%) of the systems had their septic tanks pumped at least yearly or oftener. These pumping rates are higher than the normal pumping frequency of once every three to five years.

Forty percent of those surveyed indicated that they are surreptitiously running laundry grey-water onto the surface of the ground in their yards to keep from overloading their septic systems. Above ground disposal of grey-water is a violation of public health regulations.

Failing septic systems create public health problems and the potential for groundwater pollution in the area. Nitrate levels in the two community wells have doubled in the last twenty years.

In the southern half of Rexland Acres, most of the lots are too small to allow for leach field replacement. The failing septic systems, above ground grey-water disposal, and increasing contamination of groundwater supplies pose a public health and safety hazard. A community sewer system would remedy these public health problems.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Steve McCalley".

Steve McCalley, Director

SMc:jg

cc: Pete Parra, Member, Kern County Board of Supervisors
Rosa Martinez & San Juana Hernandez, Members, Rexland Acres Committee
Dave Warner, Self-Help Enterprises
Guy Shaw, EHS IV, Environmental Health Services

**COMMENTS
RECEIVED
REGARDING
PROPOSED
NEGATIVE
DECLARATION**

Notice of Completion & Environmental Document Transmittal

SCH # 2001102078

Mail to: State Clearinghouse, PO Box 3044, Sacramento, CA 95812-3044 916/445-0613

Project Title: EA MWH 1-01 Rexland Acres Wastewater System (Kern County Engineering and Survey Services Dept)

Lead Agency: Kern County Planning Department Contact Person: Lorelei H Oviatt, AICP
Mailing Address: 2700 M Street Suite 100 Phone: (661) 862-8866
City: Bakersfield, Ca Zip: 93301 County: Kern

Project Location:

County: Kern City/Nearest Community: Bakersfield
Cross Streets: South Union Avenue and East Pacheco Road Zip Code: Total Acres:
Assessor's Parcel No. Section: Twp. Range: Base:
Within 2 Miles: State Hwy #: 58 Waterways:
Airports: Railways: Schools:

Document Type:

CEQA: [] NOP [] Supplement/Subsequent EIR NEPA: [] NOI Other: [] Joint Document
[] Early Cons [] (Prior SCH No.) [] EA [] Final Document
[X] Neg Dec [] Other [] Draft EIS [] Other
[] Draft EIR [] FONSI

Local Action Type:

[] General Plan Update [] Specific Plan [] Rezone [] Annexation
[] General Plan Amendment [] Master Plan [] Prezone [] Redevelopment
[] General Plan Element [] Planned Unit Development [] Use Permit [] Coastal Permit
[] Community Plan [] Site Plan [] Land Division (Subdivision, etc.) [X] Other Sewer Main

Development Type:

[] Residential: Units Acres
[] Office: Sq.ft. Acres Employees
[] Commercial: Sq.ft. Acres Employees
[] Industrial: Sq.ft. Acres Employees
[] Educational
[] Recreational
[] Water Facilities: Type MGD
[] Transportation: Type
[] Mining: Mineral
[] Power: Type Watts
[X] Waste Treatment: Type Main line sewer and connctions
[] Hazardous Waste: Type
[] Other:

Funding (approx.): Federal \$ State \$ Total \$

Project Issues Discussed in Document:

[] Aesthetic/Visual [] Flood Plain/Flooding [] Schools/Universities [X] Water Quality
[X] Agricultural Land [] Forest Land/Fire Hazard [X] Septic Systems [] Water Supply/Groundwater
[X] Air Quality [] Geologic/Seismic [X] Sewer Capacity [] Wetland/Riparian
[X] Archeological/Historical [] Minerals [] Soil Erosion/Compaction/Grading [] Wildlife
[] Coastal Zone [X] Noise [] Solid Waste [] Growth Inducing
[] Drainage/Absorption [] Population/Housing Balance [] Toxic/Hazardous [X] Landuse
[] Economic/Jobs [X] Public Services/Facilities [X] Traffic/Circulation [] Cumulative Effects
[] Fiscal [X] Recreation/Parks [] Vegetation [] Other

Present Land Use/Zoning/General Plan Designation:

Existing Road right of way/ Agricultural Land

Project Description:

Construction of sewer lines in the rural community of Rexland Acres ,connecting to the Kern Sanitation Authority Wastewater Treatment Plant . Approx. 26,200 feet of the eight-inch force-main line to connect community to the wastewater treatment plant proposed to remedy a high rate of septic system failures to prevent potential degradation of groundwater in the Rexland Acres community.

Reviewing Agencies Checklist

Form A, continued

KEY
S = Document sent by lead agency
X = Document sent by SCH
 ✓ = Suggested distribution

- ___ Resources Agency
- ___ Boating & Waterways
- ___ Coastal Commission
- ___ Coastal Conservancy
- ___ Colorado River Board
- ___ Conservation
- ___ Fish & Game
- ___ Forestry & Fire Protection
- SU** Office of Historic Preservation
- ___ Parks & Recreation
- ___ Reclamation Board
- ___ S.F. Bay Conservation & Development Commission
- ___ Water Resources (DWR)

Business, Transportation & Housing

- ___ Aeronautics
- ___ California Highway Patrol
- ___ CALTRANS District # _____
- ___ Department of Transportation Planning (headquarters)
- ___ Housing & Community Development

Food & Agriculture

Health & Welfare

- ___ Health Services _____

State & Consumer Services

- ___ General Services
- ___ OLA (Schools)

Environmental Protection Agency

- ___ Air Resources Board
- ___ California Waste Management Board
- ___ SWRCB: Clean Water Grants
- ___ SWRCB: Delta Unit
- ___ SWRCB: Water Quality
- ___ SWRCB: Water Rights
- ___ Regional WQCB # _____ (_____)

Youth & Adult Corrections

- ___ Corrections

Independent Commissions & Offices


- ___ Energy Commission
- ___ Native American Heritage Commission
- ___ Public Utilities Commission
- ___ Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy
- ___ State Lands Commission
- ___ Tahoe Regional Planning Agency

___ Other _____

Public Review Period (to be filled in by lead agency)

Starting Date August 26, 2004

Ending Date September 24, 2004

Signature 

Date 8-25-04

Lead Agency (Complete if applicable):

Consulting Firm: _____

Address: _____

City/State/Zip: _____

Contact: _____

Phone: (____) _____

For SCH Use Only:

Date Received at SCH _____

Date Review Starts _____

Date to Agencies _____

Date to SCH _____

Clearance Date _____

Notes:

Applicant: _____

Address: _____

City/State/Zip: _____

Phone: (____) _____

CITIES

- 1 ___ Arvin
 2 Bakersfield
 3 ___ California City
 4 ___ Delano
 5 ___ Maricopa
 6 ___ McFarland
 7 ___ Ridgecrest
 8 ___ Shafter
 9 ___ Taft
 10 ___ Tehachapi
 11 ___ Wasco

COUNTIES

- 12 ___ Inyo
 13 ___ Kings
 14 ___ Los Angeles
 15 ___ San Bernardino
 16 ___ San Luis Obispo
 17 ___ Santa Barbara
 18 ___ Tulare
 19 ___ Ventura

FEDERAL AGENCIES

- 20 ___ BLM - Ridgecrest/Bakersfield
 21 ___ China Lake Naval Air Weapons Station
 22 ___ Edwards AFB
 23 U.S. EPA
 24 Fish & Wildlife Sacramento (HCP Area)
 25 ___ Forest Service - Sequoia/Los Padres
 26 Soil Conservation Service (Bak Office Only)
 27 ___ U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
 28 ___ RCD _____
 29 Other USDA _____

COUNTY OF KERN

- 30 Agriculture
 31 ___ Airports
 32 Air Pollution Control
 33 Community Development
 34 ___ County Clerk
 35 ___ C.A.O.
 36 Engineering Services - FloodPlain
 37 Engineering Services - Survey
 38 Environmental Health
 39 Fire
 40 ___ Library - _____
 41 ___ Museum
 42 ___ Parks and Recreation
 43 ___ RMA-Special Projects/Fiscal Analysis
 44 ___ Sheriff
 45 Roads (___1___ copies)
 46 Waste Management
 47 ___ Other _____

LOCAL AGENCIES

- 48 ___ Rosedale Union School District
 49 ___ Kern High School District
 50 ___ Superintendent of Schools
 51 ___ Kern COG
 52 ___ LAFCO
 53 ___ CSD_North of the River San Dst
 54 ___ Water District Rosedale Rio Bravo
 55 Kern County Water Agency
 56 ___ Parks & Rec_North Bakersfield _____
 57 San Joaquin APCD
 58 ___ Golden Empire Transit
 59 ___ Kern Mosquito Abatement
 60 ___ Other

OTHER

- 61 ___ Audubon Society - Sacramento
 62 ___ Construction Material Assoc.of California
 63 ___ GTE (Contel) - Victorville (Bak)/Taft
 64 ___ Desert Tortoise Preserve Committee
 65 ___ Native Amer Heritage Council of KC
 66 Pacific Bell (Fresno Office Only)
 67 PG&E - Bakersfield
 68 ___ PG&E - Fresno
 69 ___ Sierra Club
 70 So. Cal Edison - Bak/Ridg/A-V/Woff/SF
 71 So. Cal Gas (NOTE: must have 2 copies)
 72 ___ Smart Growth Coalition
 73 ___ Mountain Communities Town Council (2)
 74 ___ Farm Bureau Federation
 75 ___ Other_Oxy Resources, Attn Michael Gooding

STATE AGENCIES

- 76 ___ Air Resources Board
 77 So. San Joaquin Arch Info. Center
 78 ___ CalTrans /Distr 6
 79 Clearinghouse (___15___ copies)*
 80 ___ Conservation - Office Mine & Rec*
 81 ___ CSU Bakersfield - Library
 82 Division of Oil & Gas - Bakersfield
 83 ___ Energy Commission
 84 Fish and Game - Fresno
 85 ___ Food and Agriculture - Sacramento
 86 Health Services - Fresno/Sacramento
 87 ___ Highway Patrol_Sacramento
 88 Historical Preservation
 89 ___ Integrated Waste Management
 90 ___ Parks and Recreation
 91 ___ Public Utilities Commission
 92 Reg Water Quality - Central
 93 ___ States Lands Commission
 94 Water Resources - Fresno (Dont send to Sacramento)
 95 ___ Other

PLANNING DEPARTMENT

TED JAMES, AICP, Director

2700 "M" STREET, SUITE 100
BAKERSFIELD, CA 93301-2323

Phone: (661) 862-8600

FAX: (661) 862-8601 TTY Relay 1-800-735-2929

E-Mail: planning@co.kern.ca.us

Web Address: www.co.kern.ca.us/planning



RESOURCE MANAGEMENT AGENCY

DAVID PRICE III, RMA DIRECTOR

Community & Economic Development Department

Engineering & Survey Services Department

Environmental Health Services Department

Planning Department

Roads Department

August 25, 2004

FILE: Rexland Acres Wastewater System

ADDRESSEES (see Distribution List)

In Response Please Reference: Consultation Process on Proposed Negative Declaration for EA MWH 1-01; Rexland Acres Wastewater System (Kern County Engineering and Survey Services Department (PP02218))


Ladies and Gentlemen:

This Department, as Lead Agency, has determined that preparation of a Negative Declaration would be appropriate for the referenced project. As required by Section 15073 of the State CEQA Guidelines, we are submitting the proposed Negative Declaration to all responsible agencies for consultation. This consultation is requested to ensure that the environmental decision by our Department will reflect the concerns of responsible agencies involved with the project.

If a response is not received from your agency by **September 24, 2004**, this Department will assume that your agency has no comment. **Should you have any questions, please contact Lorelei H. Oviatt, AICP, Supervising Planner ((661) 862-8866) of this Department.**

Very truly yours,

TED JAMES, AICP, Director
Planning Department


By Lorelei H. Oviatt, AICP
Supervising Planner

paw

Enclosure



California Regional Water Quality Control Board

Central Valley Region

Robert Schneider, Chair



Terry Tamminen
Secretary for
Environmental
Protection

Fresno Branch Office
www.swrcb.ca.gov/~rwqcb5
1685 E Street, Fresno, California 93706
(559) 445-5116 • FAX (559) 445-5910

Arnold Schwarzenegger
Governor

9 September 2004

Ms. Lorelei H. Oviatt, Supervising Planner
Kern County Planning Department
2700 M Street
Suite 100
Bakersfield, CA 93301

PROPOSED NEGATIVE DECLARATION, REXLAND ACRES WASTEWATER COLLECTION SYSTEM, KERN COUNTY, SCH NO. 2001102078

Regional Board staff has reviewed the draft negative declaration in support of sanitary sewer lines within the rural community of Rexland Acres and connecting to the Kern Sanitary Authority wastewater treatment plant. Rexland Acres is in a portion of Section 20, T30S, R28E, MDB&M; generally bound by South Union Avenue, East Panama Lane, Kern Island Canal, and Rexland Avenue, southeast of Bakersfield.

The proposed project is for 26,200 linear feet of eight-inch diameter force main and two lift stations to provide wastewater services for 746 dwelling units in Rexland Acres. The project is to remedy the high failure rate of individual disposal systems that are currently used by the dwellings. At full capacity, the project would contribute an average of 0.26 million gallons per day (mgd) of additional wastewater to the treatment plant. Peak flows would contribute up to 0.51 mgd of additional wastewater.

The proposed project, once completed, will result in a net improvement in groundwater quality in the Rexland Acres area. Therefore, the Regional Board supports the project.

Since construction associated with the project will disturb one acre or more, compliance with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Permit No. CAS000002 for Discharges of Storm Water Associated With Construction Activity is required. Before construction begins, the proponent must submit a Notice of Intent to comply with the permit, a site map, and an appropriate fee to the State Water Resources Control Board and a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) must be prepared.

If the project will result in the discharge of dredged or fill material into navigable waters or wetlands (jurisdictional waters), the proponent must obtain a permit pursuant to Section 404 of the Clean Water Act from the US Army Corps of Engineers and a Section 401 Water Quality Certification from this office. The Regional Board will review the Section 401 certification application to ensure that discharges will not violate water quality standards. If the project will result in the discharge of dredged or fill material into wetlands that are determined by the Corps to be non-jurisdictional, the proponent will not be required to obtain a Section 401 Water Quality Certification, but may be required to submit a report of waste

California Environmental Protection Agency

discharge (RWD) if the wetlands are waters of the State. For more information regarding Section 404 permitting, contact the Sacramento District of the Corps of Engineers at (916) 557-5250.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this negative declaration. If you have any questions regarding our comments, please call Jarrod Ramsey-Lewis at (559) 445-5569.



DOUGLAS K. PATTESON

Senior Engineer

RCE No. 55985

cc: State Clearinghouse, Sacramento



Arnold
Schwarzenegger
Governor

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
Governor's Office of Planning and Research
State Clearinghouse and Planning Unit



Jan Boel
Acting Director

September 27, 2004

Lorelei H. Oviatt
Kern County Planning Department
2700 M Street, Suite 100
Bakersfield, CA 93301

Subject: EA MWH 1-01 Rexland Acres Wastewater System (Kern County Engineering and Survey Services Dept.)
SCH#: 2001102078

Dear Lorelei H. Oviatt:

The State Clearinghouse submitted the above named Negative Declaration to selected state agencies for review. On the enclosed Document Details Report please note that the Clearinghouse has listed the state agencies that reviewed your document. The review period closed on September 24, 2004, and the comments from the responding agency (ies) is (are) enclosed. If this comment package is not in order, please notify the State Clearinghouse immediately. Please refer to the project's ten-digit State Clearinghouse number in future correspondence so that we may respond promptly.

Please note that Section 21104(c) of the California Public Resources Code states that:

"A responsible or other public agency shall only make substantive comments regarding those activities involved in a project which are within an area of expertise of the agency or which are required to be carried out or approved by the agency. Those comments shall be supported by specific documentation."

These comments are forwarded for use in preparing your final environmental document. Should you need more information or clarification of the enclosed comments, we recommend that you contact the commenting agency directly.

This letter acknowledges that you have complied with the State Clearinghouse review requirements for draft environmental documents, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act. Please contact the State Clearinghouse at (916) 445-0613 if you have any questions regarding the environmental review process.

Sincerely,

Terry Roberts
Director, State Clearinghouse

Enclosures
cc: Resources Agency

**Document Details Report
State Clearinghouse Data Base**

SCH# 2001102078
Project Title EA MWH 1-01 Rexland Acres Wastewater System (Kern County Engineering and Survey Services
Lead Agency Dept.)
Kern County Planning Department

Type Neg Negative Declaration
Description Construction of sewer lines in the rural community of Rexland Acres, connecting to the Kern Sanitation Authority Wastewater Treatment Plant. Approximately 26,200 feet of the eight-inch force-main line to connect community to the wastewater treatment plant proposed to remedy a high rate of septic system failures to prevent potential degradation of groundwater in the Rexland Acres community.

Lead Agency Contact

Name Lorelei H. Oviatt
Agency Kern County Planning Department
Phone (661) 862-8866 **Fax**
email
Address 2700 M Street, Suite 100
City Bakersfield **State** CA **Zip** 93301

Project Location

County Kern
City Bakersfield
Region
Cross Streets South Union Avenue / East Pacheco Road
Parcel No.
Township **Range** **Section** **Base**

Proximity to:

Highways 58
Airports
Railways
Waterways
Schools
Land Use Existing Road Right-of-Way / Agricultural Land

Project Issues Agricultural Land; Air Quality; Archaeologic-Historic; Landuse; Noise; Public Services; Recreation/Parks; Septic System; Sewer Capacity; Traffic/Circulation; Water Quality

Reviewing Agencies Resources Agency; Regional Water Quality Control Bd., Region 5 (Fresno); Department of Parks and Recreation; Native American Heritage Commission; Department of Health Services; Office of Historic Preservation; Department of Fish and Game, Region 4; Department of Water Resources; California Highway Patrol; Caltrans, District 6; State Water Resources Control Board, Clean Water Program; State Water Resources Control Board, Division of Water Quality

Date Received 08/26/2004 **Start of Review** 08/26/2004 **End of Review** 09/24/2004



California Regional Water Quality Control Board

Central Valley Region

Robert Schneider, Chair




Terry Tamminen
Secretary for
Environmental
Protection

Fresno Branch Office
www.swrcb.ca.gov/~rwqcb5
1685 E Street, Fresno, California 93706
(559) 445-5116 • FAX (559) 445-5910

Arnold Schwarzenegger
Governor

9 September 2004

Ms. Lorelei H. Oviatt, Supervising Planner
Kern County Planning Department
2700 M Street
Suite 100
Bakersfield, CA 93301



PROPOSED NEGATIVE DECLARATION, REXLAND ACRES WASTEWATER COLLECTION SYSTEM, KERN COUNTY, SCH NO. 2001102078

Regional Board staff has reviewed the draft negative declaration in support of sanitary sewer lines within the rural community of Rexland Acres and connecting to the Kern Sanitary Authority wastewater treatment plant. Rexland Acres is in a portion of Section 20, T30S, R28E, MDB&M; generally bound by South Union Avenue, East Panama Lane, Kern Island Canal, and Rexland Avenue, southeast of Bakersfield.

The proposed project is for 26,200 linear feet of eight-inch diameter force main and two lift stations to provide wastewater services for 746 dwelling units in Rexland Acres. The project is to remedy the high failure rate of individual disposal systems that are currently used by the dwellings. At full capacity, the project would contribute an average of 0.26 million gallons per day (mgd) of additional wastewater to the treatment plant. Peak flows would contribute up to 0.51 mgd of additional wastewater.

The proposed project, once completed, will result in a net improvement in groundwater quality in the Rexland Acres area. Therefore, the Regional Board supports the project.

Since construction associated with the project will disturb one acre or more, compliance with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Permit No. CAS000002 for Discharges of Storm Water Associated With Construction Activity is required. Before construction begins, the proponent must submit a Notice of Intent to comply with the permit, a site map, and an appropriate fee to the State Water Resources Control Board and a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) must be prepared.

If the project will result in the discharge of dredged or fill material into navigable waters or wetlands (jurisdictional waters), the proponent must obtain a permit pursuant to Section 404 of the Clean Water Act from the US Army Corps of Engineers and a Section 401 Water Quality Certification from this office. The Regional Board will review the Section 401 certification application to ensure that discharges will not violate water quality standards. If the project will result in the discharge of dredged or fill material into wetlands that are determined by the Corps to be non-jurisdictional, the proponent will not be required to obtain a Section 401 Water Quality Certification, but may be required to submit a report of waste

Waste Management

To: Jim Ellis, Planning Department
From: DAPHNE H. WASHINGTON, DIRECTOR
By: Tom McCutcheon, Special Projects Manager *MM*
Subject: Proposed Negative Declaration for Rexland Acres Wastewater System
Date: September 17, 2004

Kern Sanitation Authority's staff has completed a review of the Negative Declaration for the Rexland Acres Wastewater System. The document indicates that the Rexland Acres Wastewater System's flow will go to the Kern Sanitation Authority (KSA) Wastewater Treatment Plant, which is also illustrated on the document's attached maps.


The amount of future wastewater flow to the KSA Wastewater Treatment Plant is contingent on the available facility treatment capacity at the time sewer service is requested. KSA is willing to reserve capacity for the flow from Rexland Acres Wastewater System for five years.

We request the following text be incorporated into the proposed Negative Declaration:

"The applicant recognizes that the proposed Kern Sanitation Authority (KSA) accommodation of future wastewater flow from the Rexland Acres project is contingent upon the existence of available process treatment capacity at the time service is needed. Residential development currently underway around the KSA Plant may utilize a substantial amount of available treatment capacity before the Rexland Acres Wastewater System is ready to come online. However, KSA will reserve treatment capacity until January 1, 2010, for the sewer flow from the Rexland Acres Wastewater System. If the Rexland Acres Wastewater System has not connected to KSA by January 1, 2010, a new 'Will Serve' letter would need to be obtained from KSA to connect after that date."

In addition, the section entitled, "Identification of Environmental Effects (Additional Remarks to Matrix), XVL, Utilities and Service Systems", should incorporate similar text as that provided above.

Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me. Thank you.



San Joaquin Valley
Air Pollution Control District

Reference: S20040286

September 22, 2004

Attn: Ms. Lorelei Oviatt
Kern County Planning Department
2700 "M" Street Suite 100
Bakersfield, California 93301

RE: Rexland Acres Wastewater System

Dear Ms. Oviatt:

The San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District (District) has reviewed the documents provided and has the following comments:

The entire San Joaquin Valley is non-attainment for ozone and fine particulate matter (PM-10). The Federal Clean Air Act (CAA) and the California Clean Air Act require areas that are designated non-attainment to reduce emissions until standards are met. Based upon review of the information provided, it does not appear that this project would result in any significant adverse air quality impacts.

A current list of District rules can be found at www.valleyair.org/rules/1ruleslist.htm. The following rule that has been adopted by the District to reduce emissions throughout the San Joaquin Valley, and is required:

District Regulation VIII - Fugitive Dust Rules is a series of rules designed to reduce PM-10 emissions generated by human activity, including construction, road building, bulk materials storage, landfill operations, etc. Please be advised that on August 19, 2004, the District's Governing Board adopted amendments to Regulation VIII (specifically, Rules 8011 through 8061), which become effective on October 1, 2004. If construction were to commence after October 1, 2004, the applicant should contact the District to determine where requirements have changed and how rule changes may affect the project. Applicants can find the most current version on the District's web page at www.valleyair.org. A synopsis highlighting many of the current requirements of this regulation has been enclosed. The Compliance Assistance Bulletin is not meant to be all-inclusive, but it can be a useful compliance aid in the field and office alike.

David L. Crow
Executive Director/Air Pollution Control Officer

The District encourages innovation in measures to reduce air quality impacts. There are a number of measures that could be incorporated into this project to provide additional reductions of the overall level of emissions. (Note: Some of these measures may already exist as City development standards. Any measures selected should be implemented to the extent possible.) The measures listed below should not be considered all-inclusive and remain options that the project proponent should consider.

From Table 6-3 of the District's Guide to *Assessing and Mitigating Air Quality Impacts* 2002 revision (GAMAQI)

- Install Sandbags or other erosion control measures to prevent silt runoff to public roadways from sites with a slope greater than one percent
- Install wheel washers for all exiting trucks, or wash off all trucks and equipment leaving the site
- Install wind breaks at windward side(s) of construction areas
- Limit area subject to excavation, grading, and other construction activity at any one time

From Table 6-4 of the GAMAQI:

- Use of Alternative fueled or catalyst equipped diesel construction equipment.
- The project applicant should identify the construction equipment that can feasibly be switched from conventional to alternative-fueled or catalyst-equipped diesel equipment. The project applicant should identify a minimum of alternative fueled or catalyst-equipped diesel construction equipment that will be used for this project. As an example of alternative fuels, not all biodiesels or biodiesel blends will result in reduced NOx emissions. According to the EPA's website, biodiesel use generally results in an increase in NOx emissions. The California Air Resources Board (CARB) has certified specific biodiesels for NOx reduction. Only biodiesels that have been certified by CARB should be used. For more information on biodiesel or other types of alternative fuels, please call Mr. Chris Acree, Air Quality Specialist, at (559) 230-5829. The applicant should calculate the associated emission reductions from implementing this mitigation measure.
- Limit the hours of operation of heavy-duty equipment and/or the amount of equipment in use
- The project applicant should specify the conditions of reduced hours or reduced amount of equipment. Implement activity management (e.g. rescheduling activities to reduce short-term impacts)
 - The applicant should specify what measures will be implemented.
- Curtail construction during periods of high ambient pollutant concentrations; this may include ceasing of construction activity during the peak-hour of vehicular traffic on adjacent roadways
 - The project applicant should state the criteria for curtailing construction activities, and the steps that will be taken to reduce emissions. For curtailment during periods of high ambient pollutant concentrations, the criteria should be set in terms of the Air Quality Index. See the table below for more information on the Air Quality Index.

<http://www.epa.gov/airnow/aqi.html#good>

Air Quality Index Levels of Health Concern	Numerical Value	Meaning
Good	0-50	Air quality is considered satisfactory, and air pollution poses little or no risk.
Moderate	51-100	Air quality is acceptable; however, for some pollutants there may be a moderate health concern for a very small number of people who are unusually sensitive to air pollution.
Unhealthy for Sensitive Groups	101-150	Members of sensitive groups may experience health effects. The general public is not likely to be affected.
Unhealthy	151-200	Everyone may begin to experience health effects; members of sensitive groups may experience more serious health effects.
Very Unhealthy	201-300	Health alert: everyone may experience more serious health effects.
Hazardous	> 300	Health warnings of emergency conditions. The entire population is more likely to be affected.

Additional Mitigation Measures:

- When feasible, construction activity should occur during early morning, late evening, and night time hours. Ozone formation is directly related to temperature and sunlight. If the project emits short-lived ozone precursors during cooler hours, the project's local impact will be reduced.
- Pave haul roads in the project area.
- Construction equipment should have engines that are at least Tier I (as certified by the Air Resources Board). Tier I and Tier II engines have a significantly less PM and NOx emissions compared to uncontrolled engines. To find engines certified by the Air Resources Board, see <http://www.arb.ca.gov/msprog/offroad/cert/cert.php>. This site lists engines by type, then manufacturer. The "Executive Order" shows what Tier the engine is certified as.
- Participate in the District's Heavy Duty Engine Program. The District has a Heavy-Duty Engine program to help engine owners reduce emissions. The Heavy Duty program provides incentives for the replacement of older diesel engines with new, cleaner, fuel-efficient diesel engines. The program also provides incentives for the re-power of older, heavy-duty trucks with cleaner

diesel engines or alternative fuel engines. New alternative fuel heavy-duty trucks also qualify. For more information regarding this program, contact the District at (559) 230-5858 or visit our website at <http://www.valleyair.org/transportation/heavydutyidx.htm>.

Additional Construction Mitigation:

- See the Air Resources Board's website for more information on reducing emissions from diesel engines. California's Diesel Risk Reduction Plan <http://www.arb.ca.gov/diesel/documents/rrpapp.htm>. Specifically- Appendix 3 *Mobile Diesel-Fueled Engines* and Appendix 9 *Diesel PM Control Technologies*. Another website for reducing construction emissions is the UC Davis-Caltrans *Air Quality Project* at <http://aqp.engr.ucdavis.edu/>.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment. If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact me at (661) 326-6980.

Sincerely,



Heather Ellison
Air Quality Planner

Enclosures

C: File



San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District

COMPLIANCE ASSISTANCE BULLETIN

September 2002

(Update from June 2002)

Fugitive Dust Control at Construction Sites

Regulation VIII, Fugitive PM10 Prohibitions, of the District's Rules and Regulations regulates activities that generate fugitive dust. Fugitive dust is emitted to the air from open ground or caused by activities such as excavation, transporting bulk materials, or travel on unpaved surfaces. "PM10" is a term applied to small sized particulate matter - microscopic dust particles - in the air. The San Joaquin Valley currently exceeds the air quality standards for particulate matter. It is for this reason that the District adopted Regulation VIII in 1993. Significant amendments to Regulation VIII were adopted in 2001 and became effective May 15, 2002. The following dust control and administrative requirements are applicable at construction sites:

Visible Dust Emissions (VDE). Visible dust emissions may not exceed 20% opacity during periods when soil is being disturbed by equipment or wind at any time. Dust control may be achieved by means of applying water before and during earth work and on traffic areas, phasing work to limit dust, and setting up wind fences to limit wind blown dust. VDE opacity of 20% means the amount of dust that would obstruct the view of an object by 20%.

Soil stabilization. Soil stabilization is required at any construction site after normal working hours and on weekends and holidays. This requirement also applies to inactive construction areas such as phased projects where disturbed land is left unattended. Applying water to form a visible crust on the soil is an effective method for stabilizing a disturbed surface area. Long-term methods include applying dust suppressants or establishing vegetative cover. Restricting vehicle access from the area will help to maintain a stabilized surface. Information regarding stabilization standards and test methods are in Rule 8011 – *General Requirements*.

Carryout and Trackout. These requirements are found in Rule 8041 – *Carryout and Trackout*. Carryout and trackout are materials adhered to vehicle tires and transport vehicles carried from a construction site and deposited onto a paved public road. Should carryout and trackout occur, it must be cleaned up at least daily, and immediately if it extends more than 50 feet from the exit point onto a paved road. The recommended clean-up methods include manually sweeping, sufficiently wetting the area prior to mechanical sweeping to limit VDE or using a PM10-efficient street sweeper. A blower device, or dry sweeping with any mechanical device other than a PM10-efficient street sweeper is prohibited.

Access and Haul Roads. Dust control is required on all unpaved access and haul roads, and unpaved vehicle and equipment traffic areas at construction sites, per Rule 8021 – *Construction, Demolition, Excavation, Extraction, and Other Earthmoving Activities*.

Storage Piles and Bulk Materials. The handling, storage, and transportation requirements for bulk materials are found in Rule 8031 – *Bulk Materials*. These requirements include: applying water as materials are handled, stabilizing or covering stored materials, and installing wind barriers to limit VDE. Limiting vehicle speed, loading haul trucks with a freeboard six inches or greater, covering haul trucks, or applying water to the top of the load are options for reducing VDE from vehicle transportation of bulk materials.

Demolition. Wetting of the exterior of a building to be demolished is required. Demolition debris and the area around the demolition must also be controlled to limit VDE. Cleaning up carryout and trackout must be completed according to Rule 8041. Demolition activities are also subject to the District's asbestos rule, Rule 4002 – *National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants*.

Dust Control Plans. For large construction projects, Rule 8021 requires the owner or contractor to submit a Dust Control Plan to the District for approval at least 30 days prior to commencing construction activities. This requirement applies to projects that include 40 or more acres of disturbed surface area or will involve moving more than 2,500 cubic yards per day of material on at least three days during the project.

Record keeping. All sites subject to the regulation that employ dust control measures must keep records for each day any dust controls are used. The District has developed record keeping forms for water application, street sweeping, and for "permanent" controls such as applying long term dust palliatives, vegetation, ground cover materials, paving, or other durable materials. Pursuant to Rule 8011, records must be kept for one year after the end of dust generating activities.

Exemptions. Activities in areas above 3,000 feet elevation are exempt from all Regulation VIII requirements. The following exemptions in Rule 8021 apply to construction activities:

- Blasting activities
- Maintenance and remodeling of existing buildings if the addition is less than 50% of the size of the existing building or 10,000 square feet. These activities, however, are subject to the District's asbestos rule, Rule 4002.
- Additions to single family dwellings
- Mowing, disking or other weed control on sites less than ½ acre.

Nuisance. Whether or not the construction activity is exempt from the Regulation VIII requirements, any activity that creates fugitive dust must not cause a nuisance, per Rule 4102 - *Nuisance*. Therefore, it is important to monitor the dust generating activities and, if necessary, plan for and implement the appropriate dust control measures to limit the public's exposure to fugitive dust.

This is a basic summary of Regulation VIII as it applies to the construction industry. For more information contact the Compliance Division of the District office nearest to you.