



**San Joaquin Valley Unified  
Air Pollution Control District**

**NEW CRYOGENIC NATURAL GAS  
PROCESSING PLANT**

**Project Number S-1103628**

**City of Elk Hills  
Kern County**

**Initial Study and Draft  
Negative Declaration**

**October 2010**

**SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY AIR POLLUTION CONTROL DISTRICT  
GOVERNING BOARD 2010**

CHAIR: TONY BARBA  
Supervisor, Kings County

VICE CHAIR: J. STEVEN WORTHLEY  
Supervisor, Tulare County

**MEMBERS:**

DAVID G. AYERS  
Councilmember, City of Hanford

MICHAEL G. NELSON  
Supervisor, Merced County

JUDITH G. CASE  
Supervisor, Fresno County

WILLIAM O'BRIEN  
Supervisor, Stanislaus County

RONN DOMINICI  
Supervisor, Madera County

LEROY ORNELLAS  
Supervisor, San Joaquin County

HENRY JAY FORMAN, PH.D.  
Appointed by Governor

JOHN G. TELLES, M.D.  
Appointed by Governor

ANN JOHNSTON  
Mayor, City of Stockton

CHRIS VIERRA  
Councilmember, City of Ceres

MIKE LANE  
Councilmember, City of Visalia

RAYMOND A WATSON  
Supervisor, Kern County

RANDY MILLER  
Councilmember, City of Taft

***AIR POLLUTION CONTROL OFFICER***

SEYED SADREDIN

INITIAL STUDY AND DRAFT  
NEGATIVE DECLARATION

**New Cryogenic Natural Gas Processing Plant for  
Occidental of Elk Hills, Inc.**

October 2010

Lead Agency: San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District  
1990 East Gettysburg Avenue  
Fresno CA 93726-0244

Agency CEQA Contact: Patia Siong, Senior Air Quality Specialist  
Phone: (559) 230-6000  
Fax: (559) 230-6061

Agency Permits Contact: Richard Edgehill, Air Quality Engineer  
Phone: (661) 392-5617  
Fax: (661) 392-5585

Project Sponsor  
and Location: Occidental of Elk Hills, Inc  
10800 Stockdale Highway  
Bakersfield, CA 93311

Project Contact(s): Dennis Champion, Occidental of Elk Hills, Inc.  
Phone: (661) 412-5214  
Fax: (661) 412-5270

Mike Kelly, Vector Environmental, Inc.  
Phone: (661) 323-1477 ext 205  
Fax: (661) 323-1459



## **A. INTRODUCTION**

The San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District (District) has received an Authority to Construct (ATC) application from Occidental of Elk Hills Inc. (Occidental). Occidental is proposing to construct and operate a new cryogenic natural gas processing plant to be located at the existing Occidental gas plant, (Stationary Source S-2234). The new plant will be designed to process approximately 200 MMscfd of natural gas from crude oil and natural gas production operations. Cryogenic processes involving compression and refrigeration are designed to separate ethane, propane, butane and natural gasoline from the produced gas stream. The remaining residue gas, containing primarily methane will be used as fuel or sold to offsite users.

The facility will be constructed on an existing industrial site, currently occupied by a warehouse and pipe storage yard and will encompass an estimated 16.71 acres. Construction is expected to occur for an approximately 14 months. The project site is currently designated in the Kern County 2004 General Plan as Limited Agriculture and is currently zoned as Limited Agriculture (A-1). Pursuant to Section 19.14.020(E) of the Zoning Ordinance of Kern County; gas exploration and production are a permitted use in Zone A-1. The core property in which the proposed gas plant will be located is zoned Limited Agriculture (A-1), which is consistent with the surrounding land use.

The District has conducted an Initial Study and determined that the proposed project would have a less than significant environmental effect. Consistent with CEQA Guidelines §15064(f)(2), the District has prepared a Draft Negative Declaration for public review and comment.

## **B. PURPOSE AND AUTHORITY**

The District has discretionary approval power over the project via its Permits Required Rule (Rule 2010) and New and Modified Stationary Source Review Rule (Rule 2201). No other Agency is known to have discretionary approval over the Project. As such, the District is the public agency having principal responsibility for approving the Project and serves as Lead Agency; California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines 15367.

CEQA requires each public agency to adopt objectives, criteria, and specific procedures consistent with CEQA Statutes and the CEQA Guidelines for administering its responsibilities under CEQA, including the orderly evaluation of projects and preparation of environmental documents. The District adopted its *Environmental Review Guidelines* (ERG) in 2001. The ERG was prepared to comply with this requirement and is an internal document used to comply with CEQA.



The basic purposes of CEQA are to:

- Inform governmental decision-makers and the public about the potential, significant environmental effects of proposed activities.
- Identify the ways that environmental damage can be avoided or significantly reduced.
- Prevent significant, avoidable damage to the environment by requiring changes in projects through use of alternatives or mitigation measures when the governmental agency finds the changes to be feasible.
- Disclose to the public the reasons why a governmental agency approved the project in the manner the agency chose if significant environmental effects are involved.

Under CEQA the Lead Agency is required to:

- Conduct preliminary reviews to determine if applications are subject to CEQA [CCR §15060].
- Conduct review to determine if projects are exempt from CEQA [CCR §15061].
- Prepare Initial Studies for projects that may have adverse environmental impacts [CCR §15063].
- Determine the significance of the environmental effects caused by the project [CCR §15064].
- Prepare Negative Declarations or Mitigated Negative Declarations for projects with no significant environmental impacts [CCR §15070].
- Prepare, or contract to prepare, EIRs for projects with significant environmental impacts [CCR §15081].
- Adopt reporting or monitoring programs for the changes made to projects or conditions of project approval, adopted in order to mitigate or avoid significant effects on the environment [PRC §21081.6 & CCR §15097].
- Comply with CEQA noticing and filing requirements.

## **C. PROJECT BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

### **Project Description**

Occidental is proposing to construct and operate a new cryogenic natural gas processing plant to be located at the existing Occidental gas plant, (Stationary Source S-2234). The new plant will be designed to process approximately 200 MMscfd of natural gas from crude oil and natural gas production operations. Cryogenic processes involving compression and refrigeration are designed to separate ethane, propane,



butane and natural gasoline from the produced gas stream. The remaining residue gas, containing primarily methane will be used as fuel or sold to offsite users. The facility will be constructed on an existing industrial site, currently occupied by a warehouse and pipe storage yard and will encompass an estimated 16.71 acres. Construction is expected to occur for an approximately 14 months.

### **Project Location**

The project is located in Kern County, California, which is the San Joaquin Valley Air Basin (SJVAB) (see Figure 1). The Cryogenic Gas Plant will be located in the existing gas plant source stationary source at the NW ¼ of Section 35, T30S/R23E. The plant will occupy approximately 16.71 acres.

The location of the gas plant and the boundaries of the “core property” included in the gas plant stationary source are shown below in Figure 1. The Elk Hills oil field comprises a contiguous area having a size of about 75 square miles. The location of the Plant within the NW ¼ of Section 35R is shown in Figure 2.

### **General Plan Designation and Zoning**

The project site is currently designated in the Kern County 2004 General Plan as Limited Agriculture and is currently zoned as Limited Agriculture (A-1). Pursuant to Section 19.14.020(E) of the Zoning Ordinance of Kern County; gas exploration and production are a permitted use in Zone A-1.

### **Surrounding Land Uses and Setting**

The 35R Cryogenic Gas Plant (or Cryo-Plant) will be located in the Occidental of Elk Hills Inc. gas plant source at the NW ¼ of Section 35, T30S/R23E. The core property in which the proposed gas plant will be located is zoned Limited Agriculture (A-1), which is consistent with the surrounding land use.

The District has verified that the project is not within 1,000 feet of the outer boundary of any schools. Therefore, the public notification requirement of California Health and Safety Code 42301.6 is not applicable to the project.

### **Other Public Agencies Whose Approval Is Required**

#### ***Kern County Planning Department***

Grading permits and other applicable building permits from the Kern County Planning and Building Department will be acquired prior commencement of site work.



***California Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB)***

This project will result in no waste or water discharge; hence no approvals from the California Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) will be required.

***California Department of Transportation (Caltrans)***

No encroachment permits are required from the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans).

***California Department of Fish and Game (DFG)***

No streambed or lake alterations will occur as a result of this project.

**D. DECISION TO PREPARE A NEGATIVE DECLARATION**


The District has considered the environmental effects of the project and has determined that the project will have a less than significant impact on the environment. Project design elements and conditions of project approval that reduce project related impacts on the environment would be enforced through District permit conditions and surrendering emission reduction credits.

Consistent with CEQA requirements, the District has prepared an Initial Study and determined that a Negative Declaration would be appropriate for the project.




**Figure 1**

**Regional Location within the SJVAB**



**Figure 2**

**Project Site and Vicinity Map (General location of the new plant)**








**Figure 3**

**Project Site Map**



**E. ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED**

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by the proposed Project, involving at least one impact that is a “Potentially Significant Impact” or “Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated”, 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/Soils          |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Hazards & Hazardous Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> | Hydrology/Water Quality            | <input type="checkbox"/> | Land Use/Planning      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Mineral Resources             | <input type="checkbox"/> | Noise                              | <input type="checkbox"/> | Population/Housing     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Public Services               | <input type="checkbox"/> | Recreation                         | <input type="checkbox"/> | Transportation/Traffic |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Utilities/Service Systems     | <input type="checkbox"/> | Mandatory Findings of Significance |                          |                        |

**F. DETERMINATION**

I certify that the project was independently reviewed and analyzed and that this document reflects the independent judgment of the District.

- 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 the mitigation measures described on an attached sheet have been added to the project. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION has been 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 significant effect(s) on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets, if the effect is a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated." An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

Signature: 

Date: 10/15/10

Printed name: David Warner, Director of Permit Services



**G. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT CHECKLIST**

| I. AESTHETICS<br><br><u>Would the Project</u>  | Potentially Significant Impact | Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|
| a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?  |                                |   |                              | <b>X</b>  |
| b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? |                                |   |                              | <b>X</b>  |
| c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surrounding?   |                                |   | <b>X</b>                     |           |
| d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area                                     |                                |   | <b>X</b>                     |           |

**a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?**

**No Impact.** The project will be located on property currently occupied by a warehouse and pipe storage area. This location is within the existing boundaries of the Occidental oil field as shown in Figure 1 and is consistent with the current and surrounding land use. Furthermore, the project site is already developed, is not within a scenic vista, and is not visible from a scenic highway. Thus, no impacts in this regard would occur.

**b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?**

**No Impact.** The project will be located on property currently occupied by a warehouse and pipe storage area. This location is within the existing boundaries of the Occidental oil field as shown in Figure 1 and is consistent with the current and surrounding land use. Furthermore, the project site is already developed for industrial use and thus contains no scenic resources such as rock outcroppings, trees, or historic buildings. Thus, no impacts in this regard would occur.

**c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surrounding?**

**Less than Significant Impact.** The project will be located on property currently occupied by a warehouse and pipe storage area. This location is within the existing boundaries of the Occidental oil field as shown in Figure 1 and is consistent with the



current and surrounding land use. Furthermore, the project site is already developed for industrial use. Thus, impacts are expected to be less than significant.

***d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?***

**Less than Significant Impact.** The project will be located on property currently occupied by a warehouse and pipe storage area. This location is within the existing boundaries of the Occidental oil field as shown in Figure 1 and is consistent with the current and surrounding land use. Furthermore, the project site is already developed for industrial use and there are light sources for the existing warehouse and the pipe storage area. The new gas plant would possibly involve some additional light from exterior sources (i.e., street lighting, building illumination, security lighting, and landscape lighting). However, the project will be located at an existing industrial site in the middle of the Elk Hills Oilfield. The nearest residential center is located in Dustin Acres, 6.38 miles southeast of this project. Thus, impacts from light and glare are expected to be less than significant.



| <b>II. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES</b><br><br>In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measures methodology provided in the Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board.<br><br><b>Would the Project</b> | <b>Potentially Significant Impact</b> | <b>Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated</b> | <b>Less Than Significant Impact</b> | <b>No Impact</b> |
|--|---------------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|------------------|
| a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?   |                                       |  |                                     | <b>X</b>         |
| b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?   |                                       |  |                                     | <b>X</b>         |
| c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?   |                                       |  |                                     | <b>X</b>         |
| d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?   |                                       |  |                                     | <b>X</b>         |
| e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?   |                                       |  |                                     | <b>X</b>         |

***a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?***

**No Impact.** The land is zoned limited agricultural and Kern County Zoning Ordinance allows for the exploration and production of gas. This project will occur



within the existing oil field boundaries of the Occidental of Elk Hills, Inc. and is an allowed use. Thus, this project will not result in farmland related impacts.

***b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?***

**No Impact.** This project is consistent with the current use of the land. The site is zoned A-1 Limited Agriculture and the zoning allows for the exploration and production of gas. Thus, this project will not result in farmland related impacts.

***c-e) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))? Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?***

**No Impact.** The project will be located on property currently occupied by a warehouse and pipe storage area. This location is within the existing boundaries of the Occidental oil field as shown in Figure 1 and is consistent with the current and surrounding land use. The site is zoned A-1 Limited Agriculture and the zoning allows for the exploration and production of gas. Thus, no impacts in these regards would occur.



| <b>III. AIR QUALITY</b><br><br>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.<br><br><b>Would the Project</b>                                   | <b>Potentially Significant Impact</b> | <b>Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated</b> | <b>Less Than Significant Impact</b> | <b>No Impact</b> |
|---|---------------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|------------------|
| a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?   |                                       |  | <b>X</b>                            |                  |
| b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or Projected air quality violation?  |                                       |  | <b>X</b>                            |                  |
| c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the Project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? |                                       |  | <b>X</b>                            |                  |
| d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?  |                                       |  | <b>X</b>                            |                  |
| e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?   |                                       |  |                                     | <b>X</b>         |

**Project Details**

Occidental is proposing to construct and operate a new cryogenic natural gas processing plant to be located at the existing Occidental gas plant, (Stationary Source S-2234). The new plant will be designed to process approximately 200 MMscfd of natural gas from crude oil and natural gas production operations. The facility will be constructed on an existing industrial site, currently occupied by a warehouse and pipe storage yard and will encompass an estimated 16.71 acres. Construction is expected to occur for an approximately 14 months. The District has conducted an engineering evaluation, and a project emissions analysis using URBEMIS 2007 version 9.2.4., both incorporated herein by reference. As presented below, the analysis demonstrates that construction and operational emissions will be below the District’s thresholds of significance for criteria pollutants. The District concludes that as a result of project design elements, District permit requirements and surrendering emission reduction credits, project related impacts on air quality will be reduced to less than significant.

**Construction Impacts:**

Construction related emissions occur during site preparation and construction of processing equipment necessary to implement and operate a cryogenic natural gas processing plant. The industrial facility is estimated to encompass 16.71 acre and construction is expected to occur for approximately 14 months. Only Fine grading would be necessary because the project will be located on a site previously occupied by



an existing warehouse and pipe storage site. Stored pipes would be moved to another storage area. The warehouse will temporarily serve as a construction headquarters and will be demolished in the third or fourth quarter of 2011.

It is estimated that construction would start in the fourth quarter of 2010 with operation starting in the first quarter of 2012. The types of equipment and operating hours were estimated for the construction and demolition activities. Both fugitive dust and construction exhaust impacts were considered. As presented in Table 1, construction impacts would be less than significant.

Operational Impacts:

Employees at the existing Occidental of Elk Hills, Inc. gas plant will be reassigned to man this project as needed. It is projected that the project would require six employees (two employees per shift per day for around the clock coverage). The finished products will be delivered via pipes to existing product pipelines for custody transfer. Therefore, operation of the project is not expected to increase in existing mobile source emissions.

The District has established Thresholds of Significance for determining whether project emissions would have a significant adverse impact on air quality. The District has established a 10-ton per year Threshold of Significance for ROG, which includes emissions of VOC, a 10-ton per year Threshold of Significance for NOx, and a 15-ton per year Threshold of Significance for PM10. The District's engineering evaluation, as summarized in Table 1, demonstrates that criteria pollutant emissions associated with the project fall below the District's Thresholds of Significance and thus, will not have a significant impact on air quality.

**Table 1. Estimated Project Emissions**

| Project Emissions          | ROG (tons/year) | NOx (tons/year) | PM <sub>10</sub> * (tons/year) |
|----------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|--------------------------------|
| Construction Year 2010     | 0.19            | 1.70            | 2.14                           |
| Construction Year 2011     | 1.01            | 8.45            | 1.64                           |
| Area and Operational       | 0.90            | 0.05            | 0.02                           |
| Stationary Sources         | 7.63            | 6.22            | 7.53                           |
| Significance Threshold     | 10.00           | 10.00           | 15.00                          |
| <i>Exceeds Threshold?</i>  | No              | No              | No                             |
| <i>Offset Requirements</i> | 10.33           | 9.32            | 9.79                           |

\* Total PM<sub>10</sub>





**a) *Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?***

**Less than Significant Impact.** The District's permitting program for stationary sources requires the installation of Best Available Control Technology (BACT) to minimize emissions at the project site. For this project, BACT will be implemented and the facility is required to provide emission offsets for emissions in excess of the threshold. Occidental (Stationary Source S-2234) is an existing Major Source, and as such is required to fully offset emissions in excess of the Major Source thresholds. A Major source is a stationary source with post-project emissions that are equal to or exceed the thresholds per Rule 2201 (New and Modified Stationary Source Review). As summarized in Table 1, project related emissions of criteria pollutants would be below the District thresholds of significance and stationary source emissions would be fully offset through surrendering emission reduction credits. Therefore, through a combination of project design elements, permit conditions, and surrendering emission reduction credits, impacts on air quality would be less than significant.

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

**Less than Significant Impact.** The project has the potential to contribute to the possible violation of an existing air quality standard or an existing or projected air quality violation. However, as discussed above, the project emissions are below District's thresholds of significance. The installation of this natural gas processing plant requires the issuance of an Authority to Construct (ATC) and Permit to Operate in compliance with Rule 2201. BACT will be used on the project's equipment and the facility is required to provide emission offsets for emissions in excess of the threshold. Therefore, through a combination of project design elements, permit conditions, and surrendering emission reduction credits, impacts on air quality would be less than significant.

**c) *Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?***

**Less than Significant Impact.** As discussed above, the project emissions are below District's thresholds of significance. The installation of this natural gas processing plant requires the issuance of an Authority to Construct (ATC) and Permit to Operate in compliance with Rule 2201. BACT will be used on the project's equipment and the facility is required to provide emission offsets for emissions in excess of the threshold. Therefore, through a combination of project design elements, permit conditions, and surrendering emission reduction credits, impacts on air quality would be less than significant.



The SJVAPCD thresholds are the same for the consideration of both project specific impacts and cumulatively considerable impacts. According to the Guide for Assessing and Mitigating Air Quality (GAMAQI), any project that would individually have a significant air impact would also be considered to have a significant cumulative air quality impact. The analyses demonstrate that project specific emissions are below the District thresholds of significance at a project specific level. Therefore, the project would have a less than cumulatively significant impact.

***d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?***

**Less than Significant Impact.** The District performed a Risk Management Review (RMR) analysis to determine possible health impacts from the project's permitted stationary source emissions on the nearest sensitive receptors. The closest residential receptor is located in Dustin Acres, 6.38 miles southeast of this project. Results of an RMR are given as prioritization scores. If a prioritization score is less than 1.0 a Health Risk Assessment (HRA) is not required for the project. As demonstrated in the engineering evaluation incorporated herein, the prioritization score for this project is less than 1.0. Therefore, an HRA was not required and health impacts are expected to be less than significant.

***e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?***

**No Impact.** The air contaminants which may be emitted at the project have no known objectionable odors associated with stationary source operations. Diesel exhaust from construction activities may generate odors. However, they would be temporary in nature and would unlikely affect a substantial number of people. The closest residential center is located in Dustin Acres, 6.38 miles southeast of this project. The District concludes that there is no substantial evidence of record to support a conclusion that the project would create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.



| IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES<br><br>Would the Project:   | Potentially Significant Impact | Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|
| a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? |                                |   |                              | <b>X</b>  |
| b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?  |                                |   |                              | <b>X</b>  |
| 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?   |                                |   |                              | <b>X</b>  |
| 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?   |                                |   |                              | <b>X</b>  |
| e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?  |                                |   |                              | <b>X</b>  |
| 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?   |                                |   |                              | <b>X</b>  |

***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?***

**No Impact.** The project will be located on property currently occupied by a warehouse and pipe storage area. The project site is in an area that has historically been used for oil production (within the Occidental of Elk oil field) and is already developed for industrial use. The District concludes that there is no substantial evidence of record to support a conclusion that construction and operation of the project would disturb any endangered species habitat.



- b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?***

**No Impact.** The project will be located on property currently occupied by a warehouse and pipe storage area. The project site is in an area that has historically been used for oil production (within the Occidental of Elk oil field) and is already developed for industrial use. The District concludes that there is no substantial evidence of record to support a conclusion that construction and operation of the project would impact riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities in the project area.

- 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?***

**No Impact.** The project will be located on property currently occupied by a warehouse and pipe storage area. The project site is in an area that has historically been used for oil production (within the Occidental of Elk oil field) and is already developed for industrial use. The District concludes that there is no substantial evidence of record to support a conclusion that construction and operation of the project would impact federally protected wetlands.

- 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?***

**No Impact.** The project will be located on property currently occupied by a warehouse and pipe storage area. The project site is in an area that has historically been used for oil production (within the Occidental of Elk oil field) and is already developed for industrial use. The District concludes that there is no substantial evidence of record to support a conclusion that construction and operation of the project would impact movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species, corridors, or nursery sites.

- e) Conflict with any local applicable policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?***

**No Impact.** The project will be located on property currently occupied by a warehouse and pipe storage area. The project site is in an area that has historically been used for oil production (within the Occidental of Elk oil field) and is already



developed for industrial use. The District concludes that there is no substantial evidence of record to support a conclusion that construction and operation of the project would conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources.

**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?**

**No Impact.** The project will be located on property currently occupied by a warehouse and pipe storage area. The project site is in an area that has historically been used for oil production (within the Occidental of Elk oil field) and is already developed for industrial use. The project site is not located within the boundaries of any Habitat Conservation Plans (HCP), Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plans (MSHCP) or National Community Conservation Plans (NCCPS). The site is not located within any United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) designated critical habitat. No impacts in this regard would occur.

| V. CULTURAL RESOURCES<br><br>Would the Project:   | Potentially Significant Impact | Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|
| a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in '15064.5?    |                                |   |                              | <b>X</b>  |
| b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to '15064.5? |                                |   |                              | <b>X</b>  |
| c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?       |                                |   |                              | <b>X</b>  |
| d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?                          |                                |   |                              | <b>X</b>  |

**a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?**

**No Impact.** The project will be located on property currently occupied by a warehouse and pipe storage area. The project site is in an area that has historically been used for oil production (within the Occidental of Elk oil field) and is already developed for industrial use. The District concludes that there is no substantial evidence of record to support a conclusion that construction and operation of the project would impact any historical resource.



***b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?***

**No Impact.** The project will be located on property currently occupied by a warehouse and pipe storage area. The project site is in an area that has historically been used for oil production (within the Occidental of Elk oil field) and is already developed for industrial use. The District concludes that there is no substantial evidence of record to support a conclusion that construction and operation of the project would impact any archaeological resources.

***c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?***

**No Impact.** The project will be located on property currently occupied by a warehouse and pipe storage area. The project site is in an area that has historically been used for oil production (within the Occidental of Elk oil field) and is already developed for industrial use. The District concludes that there is no substantial evidence of record to support a conclusion that construction and operation of the project would impact any paleontological or geologic resources.

***d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?***

**No Impact.** The project will be located on property currently occupied by a warehouse and pipe storage area. The project site is in an area that has historically been used for oil production (within the Occidental of Elk oil field) and is already developed for industrial use. The District concludes that there is no substantial evidence of record to support a conclusion that construction and operation of the project would impact any human remains.



| VI. GEOLOGY / SOILS<br><br>Would the Project   | Potentially Significant Impact | Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|
| 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. |                                |   | X                            |           |
| ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?   |                                |   | X                            |           |
| iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?   |                                |   |                              | X         |
| iv) Landslides?  |                                |   |                              | X         |
| b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?  |                                |   | X                            |           |
| 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?   |                                |   |                              | X         |
| 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?   |                                |   |                              | X         |
| 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?   |                                |   |                              | X         |

**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.*

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The potential for extensive surface rupture is considered minimal since no known earthquake faults are in the project area.



Active or potentially active faults are located within the southern San Joaquin Valley region. It is unlikely that ground rupture would occur at the project site because it is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone or within 500 feet of known active fault trace. No impacts in this regard would occur.

*ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?*

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Although this project is not located near active or potentially active faults, any impacts could potentially induce ground shaking but is unlikely to occur at the project site. However, compliance with California seismic design requirements would ensure that the project site would not expose persons or property to strong seismic ground shaking hazards. Thus, impacts are expected to less than significant.

*iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?*

**No impact.** The project is not located in a liquefaction hazard area. Compliance with California seismic design requirements would ensure the project site would not expose persons or property to liquefaction hazards. No impacts in this regard would occur.

*iv) Landslides?*

**No Impact.** This project will not result in landslides. The project will be located within the existing Occidental of Elk Hills Inc. gas plant where the site currently contains a warehouse and a pipe storage area. Due to the relatively flat nature of the project site and the lack of nearby steep slopes, the potential for rock falls or landslides to impact the site in the event of an earthquake is very minimal. No impacts in this regard would occur.

***b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?***

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Construction of the project would not involve ground-disturbing activities that could potentially create erosion, nor will it result in substantial loss of topsoil. The current site is already in use for a warehouse and a pipe storage area. No mass grading will be required. In addition, all grading and groundwork will be performed in accordance with Kern County Planning and Building Department requirements. No impacts in this regard would occur.





- 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?***

**No Impact.** The project will be located on property currently occupied by a warehouse and pipe storage area. The project is not located on an unstable geologic unit or soil. In addition, the project is designed in accordance with all building code requirements including those pertaining to excavations, grading, and foundations. Adherence to building code requirements would further reduce potential risks to life and property from unstable geologic units or soils. Impacts in this regard would be less than significant.

- 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?***

**No Impact.** The project is not located on expansive soil. It will be located on property currently occupied by a warehouse and pipe storage area. The project site is in an area that has historically been used for oil production (within the Occidental of Elk oil field). The project will adhere to the grading and foundation requirements of the California Buildings Standards Code (CBSC). These requirements set forth soil engineering standards that ensure building foundations are adequately supported. Adherence to CBSC standards would ensure that persons and structures are not exposed to hazards from shrinking and swelling of soils. No impacts in this regard would occur.

- 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?***

**No Impact.** This project involves natural gas processing and will not require septic tanks or wastewater disposal systems. This project will include several small drain tanks and a “produced water tank” that will receive liquids from several processing points within the plant. The produced water tank will be served by a tank vapor recovery system and the vapors recovered from the tank will be routed to the gas plant intake system or the field gas collection system. Thus, no impacts in this regard would occur.



| VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS<br><br>Would the Project:   | Potentially Significant Impact | Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|
| a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?       |                                |   | X                            |           |
| b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases? |                                |   | X                            |           |

**a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Assembly Bill (AB) 32 was adopted establishing a cap on statewide greenhouse gas emissions and sets forth the regulatory framework to achieve the corresponding reduction in statewide emissions levels. In executing its legislative mandate under AB32, the California Air Resources Board (CARB) developed a Scoping Plan. The Scoping Plan contains the main strategies California will use to reduce greenhouse gases (GHG) from Business-as-Usual (BAU) emissions projected from 2020 levels back down to 1990 levels. Business-as-Usual is the projected emissions in 2020 from the 2002-2004 baseline year, including increases in emissions caused by growth, without any greenhouse gas reduction measures. CARB determined that a 29% reduction from BAU is necessary to achieve the 1990 GHG emissions level.

On December 17, 2009, the District adopted the policy “*District Policy – Addressing GHG Emission Impacts for Stationary Source Projects Under CEQA When Serving as the Lead Agency*”. The policy was developed to assist Lead Agencies, project proponents, permit applicants, and interested parties in assessing and reducing the impacts of project specific GHG emissions on global climate change.

The approach in the policy relies on the use of Best Performance Standard (BPS) that would be applicable to projects that result in increased GHG emissions. Use of BPS is a method of streamlining the CEQA process of determining significance and is not a required emission reduction measure. Projects implementing BPS would be determined to have a less than cumulatively significant impact. Otherwise, demonstration of a 29 percent reduction in GHG emissions, from business-as-usual (BAU), is required to determine that a project would have a less than cumulatively significant impact consistent with GHG emission reduction targets established in the Air Resources Board’s AB 32 Scoping Plan.



For this project, a relatively small amount of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions will result from activities related to the project. Large gas processing plants typically emit large amounts of GHG from fuel combustion in equipment required for compression, and the flaring of waste gas recovered from gas treating systems. However, the project is designed to eliminate most of the GHG emissions from these processing activities. Compression required for processing natural gas will be provided using high efficiency electric compressors. Use of the electric compressors will significantly reduce GHG emissions. Furthermore, the project will be designed to eliminate the need for process flaring. Instead waste gas streams will be compressed and injected into the production strata to help maintain reservoir pressure. In summary, the project design involves the use of electric compressors, the injection of the waste gas and the injection of ethane which would result in large reductions in GHG emissions compared to a Business-as-Usual design facility.

The long-term reductions achieved by the design of the project relative to the BAU design facility are expected to result in a 73% reduction in GHG emissions or about 584,000 metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub> each year, throughout the life of the project. The long-term reductions in GHG emissions brought about by the design of the proposed project render the short-term effects of construction related GHG emissions to less than significant. Therefore, impacts are expected to less than significant.

***b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?***

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The County of Kern has not adopted a greenhouse gas Climate Action Plan yet but this project will not conflict with the goals and policies of the Kern County General Plan, and local ordinances. As discussed above, the project would also not interfere with the implementation of AB 32 because it would be consistent with the GHG emission reduction targets identified by CARB in their AB32 Scoping Plan. The project achieves BAU GHG emissions reduction greater than the 29% targeted reduction goal. This project will not conflict with District's policy for addressing GHG impacts nor with any other applicable plans, policies, or regulations. As such, impacts from GHG emissions are considered less than significant.



| VIII. HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS<br><br>Would the Project:  | Potentially Significant Impact | Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|
| a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?  |                                |   | <b>X</b>                     |           |
| 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?  |                                |   | <b>X</b>                     |           |
| c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?  |                                |   |                              | <b>X</b>  |
| 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?                                   |                                |   |                              | <b>X</b>  |
| 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? |                                |   |                              | <b>X</b>  |
| 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?  |                                |   |                              | <b>X</b>  |
| g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?  |                                |   |                              | <b>X</b>  |
| 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?   |                                |   |                              | <b>X</b>  |

***a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?***

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The project will be designed to process natural gas from crude oil and natural gas production operations by the Occidental of Elk Hills



Inc. Dry, sweet residue gas, propane, and natural gas liquids from the project will be delivered to existing pipelines for use as fuel or for custody transfer.

The U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT), Office of Pipeline Safety (OPS) regulates the safety of gas transmission pipelines. All gas pipeline projects delivering gas through a distribution system must be designed and constructed to meet or exceed the Federal safety standards established in 49 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 192. These regulations include specific standards for material selection and qualification, design requirements, protection from internal, external, and atmospheric corrosion, and worker training, safety, and qualifications specific to the location of the pipeline relative to population densities. Adhering to these guidelines and requirements will ensure that no significant hazard will be created to the public or the environment. Thus, impacts are expected to less than significant.

***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?***

**Less than Significant Impact.** Compliance with existing safety standards in the construction and long-term operation of the system is expected to minimize the hazard to the public and the environment. Construction in compliance with state building codes applicable to the installation of natural gas infrastructure reduces this impact. Occupational safety standards exist in Federal and State laws to minimize worker safety risks from both physical and chemical hazards in the workplace. The California Division of Occupational Safety and Health (Cal/OSHA) is responsible for developing and enforcing workplace safety standards and assuring worker safety in the handling and use of hazardous materials. Among other requirements, Cal/OSHA obligates many businesses to prepare Injury and Illness Prevention Plans and Chemical Hygiene Plans. The Hazard Communication Standard requires that workers be informed of the hazards associated with the materials they handle. Thus, impacts are expected to less than significant.

***c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?***

**No Impact.** This project will not be located within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. This project site will occupy approximately 16.71 acres and will be in an area that has historically been used for oil production (within the Occidental of Elk oil field). The Elk Hills oil field comprises a contiguous area having a size of about 75 square miles. Thus, there would be no impact.



- d) *Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials lists compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?***

**No Impact:** The project will be located on property currently occupied by a warehouse and pipe storage area. The project site is in an area that has historically been used for oil production (within the Occidental of Elk oil field). This project is not located on a site which meets this definition (Department of Toxic Substances Control website 2007). No impacts in this regard would occur.

- 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?***

**No Impact:** The project site is in an area that has historically been used for oil production (within the Occidental of Elk oil field). This project is not located within two miles or near a public airport or public use airport or within an airport land use plan. The nearest airport is the Airport Elk Hills-Buttonwillow and the nearest residential center is Dustin Acres, approximately 6.38 miles southeast of the project. No impacts in this regard would occur.

- f) *For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working the project area?***

**No Impact.** The project site is in an area that has historically been used for oil production (within the Occidental of Elk oil field). This project is not in the vicinity of a private airstrip. Thus, there would be no impact.

- g) *Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?***

**No Impact.** The project will be located on property currently occupied by a warehouse and pipe storage area. The project site is in an area that has historically been used for oil production (within the Occidental of Elk oil field). The project would not require any physical alterations to existing public or private roadways that would impair or interfere with emergency response or evacuation. This project is consistent with current and surrounding land use and will be incorporated in the field's current emergency response and emergency evacuation plans. No impacts in this regard would occur.



***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?***

**No Impact.** The project will be located on property currently occupied by a warehouse and pipe storage area. The project site is in an area that has historically been used for oil production (within the Occidental of Elk oil field) and is consistent with the current and surrounding land use. The Elk Hills oil field comprises a contiguous area having a size of about 75 square miles. No wildlands are within close proximity of the project.

| IX. HYDROLOGY / WATER QUALITY<br><br>Would the Project:   | Potentially Significant Impact | Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|
| a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?   |                                |   |                              | X         |
| 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)? |                                |   |                              | X         |
| c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner, which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?   |                                |   |                              | X         |
| d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?   |                                |   |                              | X         |
| e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?  |                                |   |                              | X         |
| f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?   |                                |   |                              | X         |
| 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?  |                                |   |                              | X         |



|    |   |  |  |  |          |
|----|---|--|--|--|----------|
| h) | Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?  |  |  |  | <b>X</b> |
| 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? |  |  |  | <b>X</b> |
| j) | Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow   |  |  |  | <b>X</b> |

**a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?**

**No Impact.** This project involves natural gas processing and will not require septic tanks or wastewater disposal systems. This project will include several small drain tanks and a “produced water tank” that will receive liquids from several processing points within the plant. The produced water tank will be served by a tank vapor recovery system and the vapors recovered from the tank will be routed to the gas plant intake system or the field gas collection system. This project involves natural gas processing and does not utilize groundwater or groundwater recharge.

**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)?**

**No Impact.** This project involves natural gas processing and does not utilize groundwater or groundwater recharge.

**c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?**

**No Impact.** The project will be located on property currently occupied by a warehouse and pipe storage area. The project site is in an area that has historically been used for oil production (within the Occidental of Elk oil field). This project does not alter the existing drainage pattern of the area and does not alter any streams, rivers, or any other waterways.





- d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?***

**No Impact.** The project will be located on property currently occupied by a warehouse and pipe storage area. The project site is in an area that has historically been used for oil production (within the Occidental of Elk oil field). This project does not alter the existing drainage pattern of the area and does not alter any streams, rivers, or any other waterways. It would not introduce any new flood hazard and would not necessitate any new flood control projects.

- 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?***

**No Impact.** The project will be located on property currently occupied by a warehouse and pipe storage area. The project site is in an area that has historically been used for oil production (within the Occidental of Elk oil field) and is already developed for industrial use. Precipitation at the project site is rarely sufficient to cause runoff and it is not likely that storm water will leave the property.

- f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?***

**No Impact:** The project will be located on property currently occupied by a warehouse and pipe storage area. The project site is in an area that has historically been used for oil production (within the Occidental of Elk oil field) and is already developed for industrial use. Precipitation at the project site is rarely sufficient to cause runoff and it is not likely that storm water will leave the property. This project does not utilize groundwater or groundwater recharge.

- 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?***

**No Impact.** The project will be located on property currently occupied by a warehouse and pipe storage area. The project site is in an area that has historically been used for oil production (within the Occidental of Elk oil field) and is already developed for industrial use. This project does not include housing, and it is located outside the 100-year flood zone.



**h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures, which would impede or redirect flood flows?**

**No Impact.** The project will be located on property currently occupied by a warehouse and pipe storage area. The project site is in an area that has historically been used for oil production (within the Occidental of Elk oil field) and is already developed for industrial use. The project is located outside the 100-year flood zone, so no redirection of flood flows will occur.

**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?**

**No Impact.** The project will be located on property currently occupied by a warehouse and pipe storage area. The project site is in an area that has historically been used for oil production (within the Occidental of Elk oil field) and is already developed for industrial use. The installation of this project will not expose people or structures to flooding. The project is located outside the 100-year flood zone.

**j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?**

**No Impact.** The project site is in Kern County which is not identified in the Tsunami Inundation maps by the California Geological Survey as a county with inundation risk. The project site is in an area that has historically been used for oil production (within the Occidental of Elk oil field) and is located outside the 100-year flood zone. It is unlikely that inundation would occur.

| <b>X. LAND USE / PLANNING</b><br><br><b>Would the Project:</b>  | <b>Potentially Significant Impact</b> | <b>Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated</b> | <b>Less Than Significant Impact</b> | <b>No Impact</b> |
|---|---------------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|------------------|
| a) Physically divide an established community?  |                                       |  |                                     | <b>X</b>         |
| 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? |                                       |  |                                     | <b>X</b>         |
| c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?   |                                       |  |                                     | <b>X</b>         |



**a) Physically divide an established community?**

**No Impact.** The project will be located on property currently occupied by a warehouse and pipe storage area. The project site is in an area that has historically been used for oil production (within the Occidental of Elk oil field) and is already developed for industrial use. This project is consistent with the current and surrounding land use and will not 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?**

**No Impact.** The project site is zoned A-1 – Limited Agriculture. This project is consistent with current and surrounding land use and will therefore not conflict with any land use plans, policies, or regulations.

**c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?**

**No Impact.** The project will be located on property currently occupied by a warehouse and pipe storage area. The project site is in an area that has historically been used for oil production (within the Occidental of Elk oil field). It is not subject to the provisions of any Habitat Conservation Plans or Natural Community Conservation Plans.

| <b>XI. MINERAL RESOURCES</b><br><br><b>Would the Project:</b>   | <b>Potentially Significant Impact</b> | <b>Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated</b> | <b>Less Than Significant Impact</b> | <b>No Impact</b> |
|---|---------------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|------------------|
| a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?                                |                                       |  |                                     | <b>X</b>         |
| 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? |                                       |  |                                     | <b>X</b>         |

**a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?**

**No Impact.** The project will be located on property currently occupied by a warehouse and pipe storage area. The project site is in an area that has historically been used for oil production (within the Occidental of Elk oil field) and is already developed for industrial use.



**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?**

**No Impact.** The project will be located on property currently occupied by a warehouse and pipe storage area. The project site is in an area that has historically been used for oil production (within the Occidental of Elk oil field) and is already developed for industrial use.

| XII. NOISE<br><br>Would the Project result in:  | Potentially Significant Impact | Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated | 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?   |                                |   |                              | <b>X</b>  |
| b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels?   |                                |   | <b>X</b>                     |           |
| c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the Project vicinity above levels existing without the Project?  |                                |   |                              | <b>X</b>  |
| d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the Project vicinity above levels existing without the Project?  |                                |   | <b>X</b>                     |           |
| 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? |                                |   |                              | <b>X</b>  |
| 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?  |                                |   |                              | <b>X</b>  |

**a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in any local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?**

**No Impact.** The project will be located on property currently occupied by a warehouse and pipe storage area. The project site is in an area that has historically been used for oil production (within the Occidental of Elk oil field) and is already developed for industrial use. The nearest residential center is Dustin Acres, located approximately 6.38 miles southeast. Existing sources of ambient noise in the project



area include traffic and equipments for the daily operation of the existing facilities. There is no expected increase in trips for the operation of this project, and no increase in noise due to an increase in employees or resources transport.

***b) Exposure of persons to, or generation of, excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels?***

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The project will be located on property currently occupied by a warehouse and pipe storage area. The project site is in an area that has historically been used for oil production (within the Occidental of Elk oil field) and is already developed for industrial use. The nearest residential center is Dustin Acres, located approximately 6.38 miles southeast. Operation of the project will include a variety of equipment required for compressing, treating, and dehydrating rich wet field gas, equipment required for processing and extracting natural gas liquids, and recovering liquefied petroleum gas products and utility systems required for supporting the various process units that comprise the project. This may cause perceptible on-site ground borne noise or vibration, but since the construction site is far from the nearest neighbor, it is highly unlikely that any vibration or noise will be noticed off-site. Activities associated with construction equipment would occur on a temporary basis.

***c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?***

**No Impact.** The project will be located on property currently occupied by a warehouse and pipe storage area. The project site is in an area that has historically been used for oil production (within the Occidental of Elk oil field) and is already developed for industrial use. The nearest residential center is Dustin Acres, located approximately 6.38 miles southeast. Future noise types and volumes are expected to be similar to the existing conditions of the land use and are expected to remain well below the applicable Kern County noise standards.

***d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?***

**Less than Significant Impact.** Noise levels associated with construction activities would be higher than the ambient noise levels in the existing project site; however construction noise levels would be temporary. The nearest residential center is Dustin Acres, located approximately 6.38 miles southeast and are not expected to be impacted by temporary increases in noise.



- 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?***

**No Impact.** This project is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public use airport. The closest airport is located approximately 5.6 miles north of the proposed project. This distance precludes the possibility of the project site being adversely exposed to aviation noise.

- 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?***

**No Impact.** This project is not within the vicinity of a private airstrip.



| XIII. POPULATION / HOUSING<br><br>Would the Project:  | Potentially Significant Impact | Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|
| 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)? |                                |   |                              | <b>X</b>  |
| b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?   |                                |   |                              | <b>X</b>  |
| c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?   |                                |   |                              | <b>X</b>  |

***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)?***

**No Impact.** The project will be located on property currently occupied by a warehouse and pipe storage area. The project site is in an area that has historically been used for oil production (within the Occidental of Elk oil field) and is already developed for industrial use. The project will be manned using existing personnel and will not involve an increase in employees and/or their families.

***b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?***

**No Impact.** The project will be located on property currently occupied by a warehouse and pipe storage area. The project site is in an area that has historically been used for oil production (within the Occidental of Elk oil field) and is already developed for industrial use.

***c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?***

**No Impact.** The project will be located on property currently occupied by a warehouse and pipe storage area. The project site is in an area that has historically been used for oil production (within the Occidental of Elk oil field) and is already developed for industrial use.



| <b>XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES</b><br><br><b>Would the Project:</b>  | <b>Potentially Significant Impact</b> | <b>Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated</b> | <b>Less Than Significant Impact</b> | <b>No Impact</b> |
|---|---------------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|------------------|
| a) Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services: | -                                     | -  | -                                   | -                |
| i) Fire protection?   |                                       |  | <b>X</b>                            |                  |
| ii) Police protection?  |                                       |  |                                     | <b>X</b>         |
| iii) Schools?   |                                       |  |                                     | <b>X</b>         |
| iv) Parks?  |                                       |  |                                     | <b>X</b>         |
| v) Other public facilities?   |                                       |  |                                     | <b>X</b>         |

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

*i) Fire Protection?*

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The project will be located on property currently occupied by a warehouse and pipe storage area. The project site is in an area that has historically been used for oil production (within the Occidental of Elk oil field) and is already developed for industrial use. The project will include a 175 brake horsepower, EPA certified Tier-3 diesel engine, to be used to power water pump for fire fighting, should the need arise. The project would not require construction of a new fire station or a substantially increase in the level of service.

*ii) Police Protection?*

**No Impact.** The project will be located on property currently occupied by a warehouse and pipe storage area. The project site is in an area that has





historically been used for oil production (within the Occidental of Elk oil field) and is already developed for industrial use.

iii) *Schools?*

**No Impact.** The project will be manned using existing personnel and will not involve an increase in employees and/or their families.

iv) *Parks?*

**No Impact.** The project will be manned using existing personnel and will not involve an increase in employees and/or their families.

v) *Other Public Facilities?*

**No Impact.** The project will be manned using existing personnel and will not involve an increase in employees and/or their families.

| <b>XV. RECREATION</b><br><br><b>Would the Project:</b>   | <b>Potentially Significant Impact</b> | <b>Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated</b> | <b>Less Than Significant Impact</b> | <b>No Impact</b> |
|--|---------------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|------------------|
| a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? |                                       |  |                                     | <b>X</b>         |
| b) Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?                       |                                       |  |                                     | <b>X</b>         |

***a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?***

**No Impact.** The project will be manned using existing personnel and will not involve an increase in employees and/or their families.



**b) Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?**

**No Impact.** The project will be manned using existing personnel and will not involve an increase in employees and/or their families.

| <b>XVI. TRANSPORTATION / TRAFFIC</b><br><br><b>Would the Project:</b>  | <b>Potentially Significant Impact</b> | <b>Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated</b> | <b>Less Than Significant Impact</b> | <b>No Impact</b> |
|--|---------------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|------------------|
| a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and on motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit? |                                       |  |                                     | <b>X</b>         |
| b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads of highways?  |                                       |  |                                     | <b>X</b>         |
| 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?  |                                       |  |                                     | <b>X</b>         |
| d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?   |                                       |  |                                     | <b>X</b>         |
| e) Result in inadequate emergency access?  |                                       |  |                                     | <b>X</b>         |
| f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?   |                                       |  |                                     | <b>X</b>         |



- a) ***Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and on motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?***

**No Impact.** The facility will be manned using existing personnel, and residue gas and NGL products will be delivered using product pipeline systems. Temporary increases in traffic will occur during construction from workers but would be minimized by commuting by buses. The project will not increase the oilfield traffic and employee commute that currently occurs in the area nor would it require any changes to the existing and planned circulation system.

- b) ***Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads of highways?***

**No Impact.** The project related facility will be manned using existing personnel, and residue gas and natural gas liquids products will be delivered using existing pipeline systems. Temporary increases in traffic will occur during construction from workers but would be minimized by commuting by buses.

- c) ***Result in change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in air traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?***

**No Impact.** The project will be located on property currently occupied by a warehouse and pipe storage area. The project site is in an area that has historically been used for oil production (within the Occidental of Elk oil field) and is already developed for industrial use. Construction and operational activities will not affect air traffic patterns.

- d) ***Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g. sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g. farm equipment)?***

**No Impact.** There will be no alterations to existing roads or intersections. The project related facility will be manned using existing personnel, and residue gas and natural gas liquids products will be delivered using existing pipeline systems.

- e) ***Result in inadequate emergency access?***

**No Impact.** There will be no change affecting emergency access. This project does not result in changes to the existing pathways. The project will be located on



property currently occupied by a warehouse and pipe storage area. The project site is in an area that has historically been used for oil production (within the Occidental of Elk oil field).

**f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or program regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?**

**No Impact.** The project will be located on property currently occupied by a warehouse and pipe storage area. The project site is in an area that has historically been used for oil production (within the Occidental of Elk oil field) and is already developed for industrial use. The project will be manned using existing personnel and will not involve an increase in employees and/or their families. Residue gas and natural gas liquids products will be delivered using existing pipeline systems.

| <b>XVII. UTILITIES / SERVICE SYSTEMS</b><br><br><b>Would the Project:</b>  | <b>Potentially Significant Impact</b> | <b>Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated</b> | <b>Less Than Significant Impact</b> | <b>No Impact</b> |
|--|---------------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|------------------|
| a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?  |                                       |  |                                     | <b>X</b>         |
| 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?                           |                                       |  |                                     | <b>X</b>         |
| c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?                                    |                                       |  |                                     | <b>X</b>         |
| d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the Project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?   |                                       |  |                                     | <b>X</b>         |
| e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the Project that it has adequate capacity to serve the Project's Projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments? |                                       |  |                                     | <b>X</b>         |
| f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the Project's solid waste disposal  |                                       |  |                                     | <b>X</b>         |



|   |  |  |  |   |
|---|--|--|--|---|
| needs?  |  |  |  |   |
| g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste? |  |  |  | X |

**a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?**

**No Impact.** The project involves natural gas processing and does not involve wastewater. The project will include several small drain tanks and a “produced water tank” that will receive liquids from several processing points within the plant. The produced water tank will be served by a tank vapor recovery system and the vapors recovered from the tank will be routed to the gas plant intake system or the field gas collection system.

**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 Impact.** The project involves natural gas processing and does not require or result in the construction or expansion of new water or wastewater treatment facilities.

**c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts?**

**No Impact.** The project will be located on property currently occupied by a warehouse and pipe storage area. The project site is in an area that has historically been used for oil production (within the Occidental of Elk oil field) and is already developed for industrial use. The construction of this proposed project will not create a demand for new or expanding storm water drainage facilities.

**d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?**

**No Impact.** The project does not use steam for heating and will only require a small amount of water for utilities purposes; hence, it will have sufficient water supply.



**e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the Project's Projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments??**

**No Impact.** The project involves natural gas processing and does not require or result in the construction or expansion of new water or wastewater treatment facilities. The project will not impact any wastewater treatment providers.

**f-g) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs? Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?**

**No Impact.** The project will be located on property currently occupied by a warehouse and pipe storage area. The project site is in an area that has historically been used for oil production (within the Occidental of Elk oil field) and is already developed for industrial use. The project involves natural gas processing and is not expected to generate landfill waste.

| <b>XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE</b>   | <b>Potentially Significant Impact</b> | <b>Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated</b> | <b>Less Than Significant Impact</b> | <b>No Impact</b> |
|--|---------------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|------------------|
| a) Does the Project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory? |                                       |  | <b>X</b>                            |                  |
| 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)?   |                                       |  | <b>X</b>                            |                  |



|  |  |  |          |  |
|--|--|--|----------|--|
| c) Does the Project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? |  |  | <b>X</b> |  |
|--|--|--|----------|--|

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

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The project will be located on property currently occupied by a warehouse and pipe storage area. The project site is in an area that has historically been used for oil production (within the Occidental of Elk oil field) and is already developed for industrial use. Project design elements and conditions of project approval that reduce project related impacts on the environment would be enforced through District permit conditions and surrendering emission reduction credits.

**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)?**

**Less than Significant Impact.** The San Joaquin Valley Air Basin is in nonattainment for ozone and PM2.5 standards and in nonattainment for State PM10 standards because of cumulative emissions from numerous sources throughout the Valley as well as transport of pollutants from other regions outside of the Valley. The annual emissions threshold of 10 tons for both ROG and NOx, and 15 tons for PM10 are to limit the cumulative impact from contribution of individual projects, thereby reducing the cumulative impacts of many smaller-scale projects. The project would not result in emissions exceeding those thresholds. Additionally, compliance with District Regulation VIII requirements would ensure that cumulative PM10 and PM2.5 impacts would be less than significant. The project would also use existing personnel to manage the facility. Therefore, the project is not expected to pose a significant cumulative CO impact from mobile sources or have hazardous air pollutants (HAPs) impact based on results of the Health Risk Assessment. There are no significant cumulative noise, and traffic impacts caused by the project. The project is not part of any larger, planned development. Therefore, the project’s cumulative impacts are expected to be less than significant.



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

**Less than Significant Impact.** The project will be located on property currently occupied by a warehouse and pipe storage area. The project site is in an area that has historically been used for oil production (within the Occidental of Elk oil field) and is already developed for industrial use. Project design elements and conditions of project approval that reduce project related impacts on the environment would be enforced through District permit conditions and surrendering emission reduction credits.

The applicant for this project is required to comply with applicable rules and regulation. This project will not conflict with District's policy for addressing GHG impacts nor with any other applicable plans, policies, or regulations. Furthermore, the project reduces BAU GHG emission by greater than 29%. Therefore, the project would not interfere with the implementation of AB 32 because it would be consistent with the GHG emission reduction targets identified by California Air Resources Board's Climate Scoping Plan.





## H. BIBLIOGRAPHY:

*California State Water Resources Control Board. Website:*

[http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water\\_issues/programs/stormwater/oilgasfaq.shtml](http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/stormwater/oilgasfaq.shtml).

*California Department of Fish and Game. Natural Community Conservation Planning.*

Website: <http://www.dfg.ca.gov/habcon/nccp/>.

*California Department of Conservation. Geologic Hazards and California Geological Survey. Website:* <http://www.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/hazards/Pages/index.aspx>.

*County of Kern. Title 19 - Zoning. Website:*

<http://www.co.kern.ca.us/planning/pdfs/KCZOMar09.pdf>.

*County of Kern. Kern County Online GIS Mapping. Website:*

[http://www.co.kern.ca.us/gis/mapping\\_disclaimer.asp](http://www.co.kern.ca.us/gis/mapping_disclaimer.asp).

*County of Kern, Planning and Community Development Department. General Plans and Elements. Website:* <http://www.co.kern.ca.us/planning/gpe.asp>.

*Federal Emergency Management Agency. Website:*

<http://msc.fema.gov/webapp/wcs/stores/servlet/FemaWelcomeView?storeId=10001&catalogId=10001&langId=-1>.

*Guide for Assessing and Mitigating Air Quality Impacts (GAMAQI), January 2002.*

Website:

<http://www.valleyair.org/transportation/CEQA%20Rules/GAMAQI%20Jan%202002%20Rev.pdf>

*Kelly, Mike. President/Chief Executive Officer, Vector Environmental, Inc. Electronic and telephone communication.*

*Occidental of Elk Hills, Inc. July 6, 2001. Volume-1. Application for Authority to Construct Permits for a New Cryogenic Natural Gas Processing Plant. Construction of a New Natural Gas Processing Plant at the Occidental of Elk Hills, Inc. Gas Plant Source (S-2234). Available at: San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District. 1990 East Gettysburg Avenue, Fresno, CA 93611.*

*Professional Guide for the Preservation and Protection of Native American Remains and Associated Grave Goods. Website:* <http://www.nahc.ca.gov/profguide.html>.

*San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District. October, 2010. Authority to Construct: Application Review Applicant No. S-2234, Project No. S-1103628. Available*



at San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District. 1990 East Gettysburg Avenue, Fresno, CA 93611.

*San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District. September, 2010. Air Quality Calculations. URBEMIS 2007 9.2.4 version. CEQA Project #20100618 S-2234, S-1103628. Available at: San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District. 1990 East Gettysburg Avenue, Fresno, CA 93611.*

*U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service. Conservation Plans and Agreements Database. Website: [http://ecos.fws.gov/conserv\\_plans/public.jsp](http://ecos.fws.gov/conserv_plans/public.jsp).*

*U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service. FWS Critical Habitat for Threatened & Endangered Species Database. Website: <http://crithab.fws.gov/>.*