

San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District

**PUBLIC NOTICE OF AVAILABILITY
NEGATIVE DECLARATION**

April 27, 2005

Project Title: Robbie Q. Harding (S-4287-1-0)

Project Location: 2134 East California Avenue

Project Location - City: Bakersfield

Project Location - County: Kern

Description of Project:

Robbie Q. Harding, of Kern River Family Mortuary proposes to install at a 1.75MBTU/Hr (primary burner and afterburner) Natural Gas-Fired Crematory Model A-200 HT by American Crematory Equipment Company. It is estimated that approximately 350 bodies per year will be cremated at the facility. A Health Risk Assessment has been performed for this project and indicates no significant risk. This facility is estimated to have emissions under the 2lbs per day (less than the BACT threshold) for each criteria pollutant; except NOx. However, BACT requirements for NOx will be satisfied by the use of Natural Gas fuel. Therefore, this facility would not trigger offset thresholds.

Lead Agency: San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District

Lead Agency Contact Person: Heather Ellison, Air Quality Planner
(661) 326-6980

Addresses where document may be obtained:

San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District

Headquarters Office
1990 E. Gettysburg Ave.
Fresno, CA 93726

Southern Regional Office
2700 'M' Street, Suite 275
Bakersfield, CA 93301

Public Review Period: Begins: April 27, 2005 Ends: May 27, 2005

Anyone interested in this matter is invited to comment on the document by written response on or before May 27, 2005.

Robbie Q. Harding

Negative Declaration prepared by:

Heather Ellison, Air Quality Planner
San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District

Information for the aforementioned document was provided by:

Robbie Q. Harding

Contacts:

Robbie Q. Harding
Provided technical project information

San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District

Contacts:

Spencer Hammond, Permit Services Engineer
Authority to Construct for Robbie Q. Harding

SJVAPCD Staff
Toxics and Hazardous pollutants assessment and analysis

Environmental Checklist Form

1. Project title: Robbie Q. Harding
2. Lead agency name and address:
San Joaquin Valley APCD
2700 M Street Suite 275
Bakersfield, Ca 93301
3. Contact person and phone number:
Heather Ellison
(661) 326-6980
4. Project location:
2134 East California Avenue
Bakersfield, California 93307
5. Project sponsor's name and address:
Robbie Q Harding & Lynn Reno
Kern River Family Mortuary
1900 North Chester Ave
Bakersfield, CA 93308
6. General Plan Designation / Zoning: M-2
7. Assessors Parcel Number:
8. Description of project:

The Robbie Q. Harding proposes to install at a 1.75MBTU/Hr (primary burner and afterburner) Natural Gas-Fired Crematory Model A-200 HT by American Crematory Equipment Company. It is estimated that approximately 350 bodies per year will be cremated at the facility. A Health Risk Assessment has been performed for this project and indicates no significant risk (Attachment B). This facility is estimated to have emissions under the 2lbs per day (less than the BACT threshold) for each criteria pollutant; except NOx. However, BACT requirements for NOx will be satisfied by the use of Natural Gas fuel. Therefore, this facility would not trigger offset thresholds.

9. Surrounding land uses and setting: Briefly describe the project's surroundings:

- South of the Project: gas station
- East of the Project: automobile repair shop and a fast food restaurant
- North of the Project: vacant lot
- West of the Project; veterinary hospital

10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement.)

The Crematorium has already obtained all the necessary approvals for this project as required by the County of Kern.

No other approval is needed.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

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

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

DETERMINATION:

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

Signature

Date

Printed Name: Heather Ellison

Title: Air Quality Planner

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

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

- 7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
- 8) This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
- 9) The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a) The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b) The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance

CHECKLIST

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. AESTHETICS -- Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES: In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment that, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

CHECKLIST

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>III. AIR QUALITY -- Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:</p>				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions, which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:</p>				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

CHECKLIST

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in '15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to '15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

CHECKLIST

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

CHECKLIST

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS B Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

CHECKLIST

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wild land fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY -				
- Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner, which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner, which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

CHECKLIST

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures, which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING - Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
X. MINERAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

CHECKLIST

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XI. NOISE B Would the project result in:				
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING -- Would the project:				
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

CHECKLIST

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES				
a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
XIV. RECREATION --				
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC -- Would the project:				
a) Cause an increase in traffic, which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

CHECKLIST

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS B				
Would the project:				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

CHECKLIST

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

Evaluation of Environmental Impacts

Aesthetics

This project will not have an adverse effect on any scenic resources, degrade existing visual character of the area or create a substantial glare that would effect day or nighttime views in the area. Additional buildings will comply with all requirements set forth by the City of Bakersfield. Outside lighting will not be in excess of City standards.

Agriculture Resources

This project will not convert prime farmland to non-agricultural uses or result in future conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses. The surrounding area is already developed and has not recently been utilized for agriculture purposes.

Air Quality

This project will not violate any air quality standard, result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in any criteria pollutant, expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutants or create any objectionable odors. A Health Risk Analysis has been performed which concluded that no significant risk will result from this project and is included in this document (Attachment B). The project emissions will be below the District threshold with Best Available Control Technology (BACT), as described in the project description, and is considered less than significant. The impacts on air quality are expected to be less than significant.

Biological Resources

This project will not have an adverse effect on the habitat of sensitive species, riparian areas, federally protected wetlands, or interfere with any migratory fish or wildlife species with established migratory corridors. This project will not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources or conflict with any Habitat Conservation plan. The Project Site is located within the City of Bakersfield Habitat Conservation Plan.

Cultural Resources

This site has already been disturbed. Therefore, there is no possibility that this project could have any adverse effect on cultural resources including;

historical resources, archaeological resources, paleontological resources, geologic features or the disturbance of any human remains.

Geology and Soils

Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, passed in 1972, intended to prevent buildings for human occupancy on the surface of active faults. The County requires that all development must complete a geologic investigation to demonstrate that the proposed project would not be across on any active faults. This project is not located in a known earthquake fault zone. It is not subject to landslides nor will it result in substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil. The structures for the project will meet all building code requirements.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

The project is not located on a hazardous materials site. A private airstrip or an airport land use plan is not within two miles of this project. The project site is not adjacent to wild lands.

Toxic emissions from the proposed project will not pose a significant health risk. This project will not interfere with an adopted emergency response/evacuation plan. This project will be subject to requirements set forth by the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) and California Occupational Safety and Health Administrations (CalOSHA).

Hydrology and Water Quality

This site uses the municipal water supply and does not have an onsite well, and therefore will not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge. Drainage patterns for the site will comply with City requirements and additional run-off will not exceed capacity of storm water drainage systems. This site is not located within a 100-year flood hazard area.

Land Use and Planning

Land use designations including; general plans, zoning and/or specific plans will not be in conflict with this project. All applicable permits have already been obtained or are in the process of being obtained.

Mineral Resources

No known mineral resources are located within the project site.

Noise

The potential exists for some short-term noise level increases that could result from construction activities. Noise impacts will cease following the construction period. This project will not significantly contribute or generate noise levels in excess of standards established or create excessive ground borne vibrations. No airport land use plan, airport or private airstrip exists within 2 miles of the site.

Population and Housing

This project will not displace any existing housing nor will it induce growth directly or indirectly within the area. It will not displace a substantial number of people requiring the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

Public services

The additional service required by the proposed project will be less than significant.

Recreation

The project is not located near nor will it include any recreational facilities and therefore, will have no impact on recreational resources.

Transportation/Traffic

This project will not cause a substantial increase in traffic or level of service standard required for congestion management. No airport/airstrip is located near the project site; the project will not result in any air traffic change. This project will not cause substantial increases in hazards due to a design feature or incompatible use. Adequate parking and emergency access already exists at the site. This project will not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation.

Utilities and Service Systems

This project will not exceed wastewater treatment requirements or require that new wastewater treatment facilities be built. Construction of new storm water drainage facilities will not be required. Sufficient water supplies are available to serve the proposed project with existing resources. Waste disposal needs can be met for this project by the local

landfill. The project will comply will all federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related with solid waste.

Mandatory Findings of Significance

This project does not have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory.

This project does not have the potential to achieve short-term, to the disadvantage of long-term, environmental goals. Neither does this project have impacts, which are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable. This project will have no potential environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.

Based upon consideration of the information provided in the comments to the Environmental Checklist and other analyses performed for this project, it does not have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment or to interfere with either short-term or long-term environmental goals. There will not be any significant cumulative impacts. The project will not cause any direct or indirect substantial adverse effects on human beings.

Attachment A

Mitigation for Emissions from Construction

Construction of the crematorium and the mortuary will cause some minor, temporary emission increases. However, fugitive dust emissions will be controlled by the following mitigations:

- Robbie Q. Harding shall employ all feasible dust mitigation practices during grading and construction as required by the San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District. The approved measures are as follows:
- All material excavated or graded should be sufficiently watered to comply with the requirements of the District's Regulation VIII and to prevent excessive amount of dust. Watering would occur at least twice a day with complete coverage, preferably in the late morning and after work is done for the day.
- All material transported off-site should be either sufficiently watered or securely covered to prevent excessive amounts of dust to comply with the requirements of the District's Regulation VIII.

Attachment B

San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District Risk Management Review

To: S.B. Hammond, AQE – Permit Services
From: Cheryl Lawler, AQT – Technical Services
Date: April 11, 2005
Facility Name: Robbie Q. Harding
Location: 2134 E. California Avenue, Bakersfield
Application #(s): S-4287-1-0
Project #: S-1041087

A. RMR SUMMARY

RMR Summary			
Categories	Natural Gas Crematory Incinerator (Unit 1-0)	Project Totals	Facility Totals
Prioritization Score	14.8	14.8	>1
Acute Hazard Index	0.09	0.09	0.09
Chronic Hazard Index	0.21	0.21	0.21
Maximum Individual Cancer Risk	1.62E-6	1.62E-6	1.62E-6
T-BACT Required?	<u>Yes</u>		
Special Permit Conditions?	<u>No</u>		

B. RMR REPORT

I. Project Description

Technical Services received a request on April 11, 2005, to re-run and update a Risk Management Review (RMR) for a 1.75 MMBtu/hr natural gas fired crematory incinerator. This update was necessary because new process rates were submitted by the processing engineer.

II. Analysis

Toxic emissions for this proposed project were calculated using emission factors taken from crematory source test results. In accordance with the

District's *Risk Management Policy for Permitting New and Modified Sources* (APR 1905-1, March 2, 2001), risks from the proposed project's toxic emissions were prioritized using procedures in the 1990 CAPCOA Facility Prioritization Guidelines and incorporated in the District's HEARTs database. The prioritization score for this proposed project was 14.8 which was greater than 1.0 (see RMR Summary Table). Therefore, a refined analysis was required and performed. ISCST3 was used, with the parameters outlined below and meteorological data for Bakersfield, to determine the maximum dispersion factor at the nearest residential and business receptors. These dispersion factors were input into the HARP model to calculate the chronic and acute hazard indices and the carcinogenic risk for the project.

The following parameters were used for the review:

Analysis Parameters Unit 1-0			
Source Type	Point	Location Type	Urban
Stack Diameter (m)	0.51	Closest Receptor (m)	30.48
Stack Height (m)	5.49	Receptor Type	Business
Stack Gas Temp. (K)	755	Stack Gas Velocity (m/sec)	2.97

III. Conclusion

The acute and chronic hazard indices were below 1.0; and the carcinogenic risk is 1.62E-6, which is over the 1 in a million threshold. **In accordance with the District's Risk Management Policy, the project is approved with Toxic Best Available Control Technology (T-BACT).**

These conclusions are based on the data provided by the applicant and the project engineer. Therefore, this analysis is valid only as long as the proposed data and parameters do not change.

SOURCES

1. San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District. Regulation VIII. Adopted April 11, 1991, Amended September 19, 1991, Amended December 17, 1992.
2. County of Kern. General Plan Environmental Impact Report and General Plan. Adopted June 2004.
3. San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District CEQA staff: Heather Ellison, Air Quality Planner, Spencer Hammond, Air Quality Engineer, and Hector R. Guerra, Senior Air Quality Planner.
4. San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District. Various District Rules. Adopted on various dates.