

# CALGEM AS LEAD AGENCY PRELIMINARY REVIEW FORM

Form Revised June 3, 2024

This form shall be completed when CalGEM acts as the CEQA Lead Agency (LA). Refer to the CEQA Program Lead Agency Preliminary Review Standard Operating Procedure, July 5, 2023 (revised May 30, 2024), for a description of requirements and procedures. Plug and abandonment and reworks on oil, gas, injection, and geothermal wells are sometimes found to be exempt from CEQA per CalGEM's regulations. (14 CCR §§ 1684.1 and 1684.2.)

Instruction is in blue text. Example language is in green text.

**\*\*Remove "DRAFT" watermark and delete all instructional and example language, and this sentence prior to submitting for first review. Retain only the text that applies to the project.\*\***

| I. PROJECT INFORMATION.            |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| <b>Permit Applicant</b>            | Operator's name, operator contact person name and email address  |  |  |  |  |  |
| <b>CalGEM Project Name</b>         |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| <b>Project Location</b>            | Field, if any  | Name of Oil, Gas or Geothermal   |  |  |  |  |
|                                    | County   |  | City   |  |  |  |
|                                    | CalGEM District  |  |  |  |  |  |
| <b>Project Information Summary</b> | Ownership  | <input type="checkbox"/> PRIVATE<br><input type="checkbox"/> Surface<br><input type="checkbox"/> Mineral   | <input type="checkbox"/> STATE<br><input type="checkbox"/> Surface<br><input type="checkbox"/> Mineral | <input type="checkbox"/> FEDERAL<br><input type="checkbox"/> Surface<br><input type="checkbox"/> Mineral | <input type="checkbox"/> TRIBAL<br><input type="checkbox"/> Surface<br><input type="checkbox"/> Mineral  |  |
|                                    | Project Type   | <input type="checkbox"/> O&G<br><input type="checkbox"/> New Drill<br><input type="checkbox"/> Rework or Redrill<br><input type="checkbox"/> P&A | <input type="checkbox"/> UIC   | <input type="checkbox"/> UGS <input type="checkbox"/> WST  | <input type="checkbox"/> GEO<br><input type="checkbox"/> Exploratory<br><input type="checkbox"/> Field Development<br><input type="checkbox"/> Single well |  |
|                                    |  | <input type="checkbox"/> State P&A   |  | <input type="checkbox"/> Rulemaking  |  |  |
| Quantity of Wells                  |  | <input type="checkbox"/> Production #  |  | <input type="checkbox"/> Injection #   | <input type="checkbox"/> Disposal #  |  |
|                                    |  | <input type="checkbox"/> Observation #   |  | <input type="checkbox"/> Storage #   |  |  |
|                                    | UIC Project Code   |  |  | UGS Project Code   |  |  |
| <b>Application and/or NOI Type</b> | Application for Injection Approval for a New UIC Project, Modify Project (Expansion, PxP review), Merge Projects, Transfer Projects; Notice of Intention to Rework a Well, Notice of Intention to Drill a New Well<br>Notice of Intention to rework a well   |  |  |  |  |  |
| <b>Project Activity Type</b>       | Brief description of the proposed activity type and the program it belongs to.<br>Ex 1: Rework of O&G well including perforation of scab liner, plug back, add perforations, and run and gravel pack inner liner.<br>Ex 2: Rework of Gas Storage well. Assess mechanical integrity of casing and install new cemented inner string or production liner as necessary. Install CalGEM compliant tubing |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |
|--|--|
|  | and packer. Compliance with revised regulations (14 CCR § 1726 et seq.) to enhance the safety of UGS projects. |
|--|--|

Enter individual well details below. Add more lines if needed.

| WellSTAR Form ID # | Well Name | API Number (if applicable) | Proposed Well Activity |
|--------------------|-----------|----------------------------|------------------------|
| 123456             | Well A    | 12345678                   | Rework                 |
| 789000             | Well B    | N/A                        | New Drill              |
|                    |           |                            |                        |
|                    |           |                            |                        |
|                    |           |                            |                        |

## II. FEDERAL AGENCY DOCUMENTS (NEPA) 14 CCR § 15063(a)(2)

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
| <b>Federal Nexus?</b>                  | Does the project have a federal component (e.g., involve(s) federal mineral rights and/or federal surface rights)? If no, skip this section because it does not apply.   | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| <b>Documents Submitted</b>             | <input type="checkbox"/> Sundry Notice <input type="checkbox"/> Categorical Exclusion <input type="checkbox"/> EA <input type="checkbox"/> FONSI<br><input type="checkbox"/> Determination of NEPA Adequacy <input type="checkbox"/> EIS   |  |
| <b>NEPA Lead Agency Document</b>       | Did the operator submit a NEPA Document (FONSI, EA, or EIS) prepared by the federal government that should be evaluated for use in lieu of preparing a CEQA document?<br>If yes, compare the NEPA document with CEQA Appendix G in Attachment 1, NEPA   CEQA IMPACT ANALYSIS COMPARISON at the end of this form. If no, remove attachment 1. |  |
| <b>NEPA Number</b>                     |  | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| <b>NEPA Lead Agency</b>                |  |  |
| <b>Record of Decision</b>              | Was a Record of Decision/Decision Record submitted and approved?<br><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <a href="#">Explain</a>   |  |
| <b>Application for Permit to Drill</b> | List the Application for Permit to Drill (APD) number for each well and the approval date.   |  |
|  |  |  |

## III. LOCAL AGENCY REQUIREMENTS (CEQA) (14 CCR §§ 15050, 15096(a), (f))

|                                       |   |  |
|---------------------------------------|---|--|
| <b>CEQA Lead Agency CEQA Document</b> | Did the applicant submit a Local Agency's document that CalGEM may rely upon? If CalGEM completed an RA review of the environmental document, that RA Review Form is part of the administrative record for this project and may be referenced here. | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
|---------------------------------------|---|--|

## IV. POTENTIAL IMPACTS IDENTIFIED (E.g., 14 CCR §§ 15060)

|                           |   |  |
|---------------------------|---|--|
| <b>Biological Impacts</b> | Is there currently evidence in this document and the administrative record that supports that the proposed project may result in significant impacts to biological resources and/or their habitat?<br><a href="#">Explain here</a>                                    | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| <b>Source</b>             | Name of document and or database identifying the T&E or rare species and habitat  |  |
| <b>CEQA</b>               | List State Species Potentially Impacted<br>List of State-threatened, endangered and rare species by Common Name ( <i>scientific name</i> ). If a project is on federal land, note any State species listed here that is not also listed in submitted NEPA document(s) |  |

| NEPA   | List Federal Species Potentially Impacted   | List of Federal threatened, endangered and rare species Common Name ( <i>scientific name</i> ) |
|--|---|--|
| <b>Change in Existing Use</b>                | Does the proposed project include modifications or changes to an existing or former use that are more than negligible?<br><a href="#">Explain here</a>  | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No                                       |
| <b>Change in Existing Facilities</b>         | Does the proposed project include more than negligible modifications or changes to an existing facility, or the construction of a new facility?<br><a href="#">Explain here</a>                                 | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No                                       |
| <b>Cumulative Impacts</b>                    | Are any impacts of the proposed project potentially significant when added to the cumulative impacts of other closely related past, present, and probable future projects?<br><a href="#">Explain here</a>      | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No                                       |
| <b>Other Potential Environmental Impacts</b> | Were additional environmental issues (outside of species information) identified that might require preparation of an initial study or additional explanation by the applicant?<br><a href="#">Explain here</a> | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No                                       |
|  |   |  |

| V. REVIEW OF POTENTIAL CEQA EXEMPTIONS             |   |  |
|--|---|--|
| Code / Regulation                                  | Exemption Type  | Does this Exemption Apply to the Project?                |
| <b>Statutory Exemption</b>                         |   |  |
| PRC § 21169;<br>14 CCR §15261(b)                   | Ongoing Project (pre-CEQA. Approval prior to April 5, 1973)     | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| PRC § 21080 (b)(3);<br>14 CCR § 15269(a)           | Declared Emergency  | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| PRC § 21080(b)(4);<br>14 CCR § 15269(b), (c)       | Emergency Projects  | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| PRC § 21080.23;<br>14 CCR § 15284                  | Pipelines   | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| <b>Categorical Exemption PRC 21084<sup>1</sup></b> |   |  |
| 14 CCR §§ 15301, 1684.1                            | <b>Class 1:</b> Existing Facilities                             | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| 14 CCR § 15302                                     | <b>Class 2:</b> Replacement or Reconstruction                   | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| 14 CCR § 15303                                     | <b>Class 3:</b> New Construction/Conversion of Small Structures | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| 14 CCR §§ 15304, 1684.2                            | <b>Class 4:</b> Minor Alterations to Land                       | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| 14 CCR § 15306                                     | <b>Class 6:</b> Information Collection                          | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| 14 CCR § 15307                                     | <b>Class 7:</b> Protection of Natural Resources                 | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| 14 CCR § 15308                                     | <b>Class 8:</b> Protection of the Environment                   | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |

<sup>1</sup> Evaluate and consider CEQA Guidelines section 15300.2 exceptions prior to selecting one or more “Yes” for Categorical Exemptions.

|                             |   |  |
|-----------------------------|---|--|
| <b>14 CCR § 15311</b>       | <b>Class 11: Accessory Structures</b>   | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| <b>14 CCR § 15330</b>       | <b>Class 30: Minor Actions to Prevent, Minimize, Stabilize, Mitigate, or Eliminate a Release (Actual or Threat) of Hazardous Substances (Waste or Material)</b> | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| <b>14 CCR § 15333</b>       | <b>Class 33: Small Habitat Restoration Projects</b>   | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| <b>General Exemption</b>    |   |  |
| <b>14 CCR § 15061(b)(3)</b> | <b>Common Sense Exemption</b>   | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |

## **RATIONALE THAT SUPPORTS SELECTION OF EACH APPLICABLE EXEMPTION:**

List the exemptions that apply to the proposed project and provide the rationale. Refer to SOP for more information.

Exemption Example: Class 1, Existing Facilities (14 CCR §§ 15301, 1684.1): Class 1 applies to the “operation, repair, maintenance, or minor alteration” of existing facilities involving “negligible or no expansion of use beyond that existing previously” (§ 1684.1). The project involves the maintenance of an oil production well and does not include modifications or changes to an existing use. The well is and will remain an oil production well and will generally have the same production capacity. The proposed project involves replacing a liner in an existing well on an existing offshore wellpad. The operator indicates that no permanent facilities would be constructed and the project would not involve any new ground surface disturbance, including no new roads or other corridors. CalGEM engineer has confirmed that the proposed work is within the scope of the UIC projects 849-48-001, 849-45-001, and 849-42-001. Therefore, there is no expansion of use beyond that previously existing.

## **VI. STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

|   |   |
|---|---|
| Based on potential impacts identified in this review and lack of support for potential exemptions, CEQA Program staff recommends that the proposed project is not exempt and that additional environmental review, an initial study or addendum, be prepared.   | <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Initial Study (can include Addendum)</b>  |
| Based on information contained in this document CEQA Program staff recommend that the proposed project is exempt from further CEQA review.  | <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Exemption(s)</b>  |
| <b>Federal Projects Only</b><br>Based on information contained in this document CEQA Program staff recommend accepting the NEPA Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) in lieu of a Negative Declaration.   | <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Accept the FONSI in lieu of a Negative Declaration.</b>   |
| <b>Federal Projects Only</b><br>Based on information contained in this document CEQA Program staff recommend accepting the NEPA Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) in lieu of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR).   | <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Accept the EIS in lieu of an EIR.</b>   |
| <b>Federal Projects Only</b><br>Based on information contained in this review the submitted NEPA documents do not meet the requirements of CEQA. CEQA Program staff do not recommend accepting NEPA document in lieu of CEQA; additional CEQA review including initial study, addendum, and/or supplemental documentation is recommended. | <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Do not accept considered NEPA document in lieu of CEQA without additional documentation or review</b> |

## VII. SIGNATURES AND DATES COMPLETED

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Prepared by:</b>   | <a href="#">DocuSign Signature</a> <b>Date:</b> <a href="#">Date completed</a> |
|   | <a href="#">Title</a><br>California Geologic Energy Management Division        |
| <b>Quality Assurance<br/>and Quality<br/>Control Officer:</b> | <a href="#">DocuSign Signature</a> <b>Date:</b> <a href="#">Date reviewed</a>  |
|   | <a href="#">Title</a><br>California Geologic Energy Management Division        |

**Attachment 1. NEPA, CEQA Impact Analysis Comparison Form**  
 (If not applicable, remove Attachment 1 prior to submitting the PR for first review)

| NEPA   CEQA IMPACT ANALYSIS COMPARISON (Review of NEPA Document)   |
|--|
| Comparison of NEPA Document to CEQA Environmental Checklist (Appendix G)<br>(E.g., 14 CCR§ 15221)  |
| <p><b>AESTHETICS:</b> Are there impacts to Aesthetic Resources in the proposed project that are not discussed in the NEPA document?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <a href="#">Explain here</a></p> <p>Points of Analysis: No Impact. The project occurs within an active portion of an oilfield on a federal oil lease and no impacts to aesthetic resources were identified in the EA.</p>  |
| <p><b>AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES:</b> Are there impacts to Agricultural and Forestry Resources in the proposed project that are not discussed in the NEPA document?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <a href="#">Explain here</a></p> <p>Points of Analysis: No Impact. The project is located on a federal oil lease and compliant with BLM RMP.</p>   |
| <p><b>AIR QUALITY:</b> Are there impacts to Aesthetic Air Quality Resources that are not discussed in the NEPA document?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <a href="#">Explain here</a></p> <p>Points of Analysis: Less than Significant. Reviewed and found consistent with CEQA. Further, compliance with Air Quality standards will be enforced by CARB and the SJVAPCD under existing law.</p>   |
| <p><b>BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES:</b> Are there impacts to Biological Resources that are not discussed in the NEPA document?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <a href="#">Explain here</a></p> <p>Points of Analysis: Less than Significant. The Special Status Species information provided by CDFW indicates that there is potentially suitable habitat within the Project site that can serve as refugia, breeding, denning, foraging and dispersal habitat for protected species. Based on the field surveys and Sensitive Species Review Forms conducted by a consulting biologist for the project, federally and state listed species were absent from the project area and the 250ft buffer during the surveys. The NEPA EA examined the species identified by CDFW as threatened or endangered. The project occurs within the Conserved Lands described in the Bakersfield RMP, which directs public lands within reserve areas (red zones) and habitat corridors (green zones) to be managed with disturbance limitations. Because the project occurs within a green zone habitat corridor, the EA discusses the compensation acres required by the RMP for the project. Additionally, the EA discusses the 2017 Oil and Gas Programmatic Biological Opinion 08ESMF00-2016-F-0683 which includes a conservation program that includes detailed monitoring, reporting, and survey requirements as well as additional measures to avoid and minimize impacts to listed species. The 2017 BO applies to the project and therefore the project is subject to the mitigation measures discussed in the EA. The implementation of these measures would reduce the potential for impacts.</p> |
| <p><b>CULTURAL RESOURCES:</b> Are there impacts to Cultural Resources that are not discussed in the NEPA document?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <a href="#">Explain here</a></p> <p>Points of Analysis: No Impact. The NEPA EA discusses a Paleontological Mitigation Plan that, if implemented, would mitigate all potential impacts to paleontological resources as a result of project activities.</p>   |
| <p><b>ENERGY:</b> Are there impacts to Energy that are not discussed in the NEPA document?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <a href="#">Explain here</a></p> <p>Points of Analysis: Less than Significant. No additional impacts to Energy Resources were identified.</p>   |
| <p><b>GEOLOGY AND SOILS:</b> Are there impacts to Geology and Soils that are not discussed in the NEPA document?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <a href="#">Explain here</a></p> <p>Points of Analysis: No Impact. The proposed project is within a previously disturbed oilfield with numerous access roads, wells, pipelines, powerlines, and other associated oilfield infrastructure. Therefore, the soils</p>  |

|   |
|---|
| <p>found within the proposed project site are highly disturbed and particularly prone to erosion from water and wind.</p>   |
| <p><b>GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS:</b> Are there impacts to Greenhouse Gas Emissions that are not discussed in the NEPA document?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <a href="#">Explain here</a></p> <p>Points of Analysis: Less than Significant. Reviewed and found consistent with CEQA. Further, compliance with GHG emission standards will be enforced by CARB and the SJVAPCD under existing law.</p>   |
| <p><b>HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS:</b> Are there impacts to Hazards and Hazardous Materials that are not discussed in the NEPA document?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <a href="#">Explain here</a></p> <p>Points of Analysis: Less than Significant. No impacts to Hazards or Hazardous Materials Resources were identified that were not discussed in the EA.</p>   |
| <p><b>HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY:</b> Are there impacts to Hydrology and Water Quality that are not discussed in the NEPA document?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <a href="#">Explain here</a></p> <p>Are impacts to bodies of water (streams, waterways, and waterbodies) and their distance from proposed projects discussed in the NEPA document?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <a href="#">Explain here</a></p> <p>Points of Analysis: Less than Significant. The NEPA EA states that the proposed project would not result in direct or indirect impacts to underground sources of drinking water or surface waters. Surface waters are not expected to be directly or indirectly impacted because the operator would implement all applicable Design Features/COAs for Surface, which would avoid erosion, sediment carry, and other potential impacts to the closest intermittent drainage in the Project area.</p> |
| <p><b>LAND USE AND PLANNING:</b> Are there impacts to Land Use and Planning that are not discussed in the NEPA document?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <a href="#">Explain here</a></p> <p>Points of Analysis: No Impact. The project is located on a federal oil lease and compliant with BLM RMP.</p>   |
| <p><b>MINERAL RESOURCES:</b> Are there impacts to Mineral Resources that are not discussed in the NEPA document?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <a href="#">Explain here</a></p> <p>Points of Analysis: No Impact. The project is located on a federal oil lease and compliant with BLM RMP.</p>   |
| <p><b>NOISE:</b> Are there impacts to Noise Resources that are not discussed in the NEPA document?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <a href="#">Explain here</a></p> <p>Points of Analysis: No Impact. The project is not located in the vicinity of sensitive receptors or subject to a noise ordinance or local standard.</p>  |
| <p><b>POPULATION AND HOUSING:</b> Are there impacts to Population and Housing that are not discussed in the NEPA document?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <a href="#">Explain here</a></p> <p>Points of Analysis: No Impact. The project is located on a federal oil lease and compliant with BLM RMP.</p>   |
| <p><b>PUBLIC SERVICES:</b> Are there impacts to Public Services that are not discussed in the NEPA document?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <a href="#">Explain here</a></p> <p>Points of Analysis: No Impact. The project is located on a federal oil lease and compliant with BLM RMP.</p>   |
| <p><b>RECREATION:</b> Are there impacts to Recreation that are not discussed in the NEPA document?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <a href="#">Explain here</a></p> <p>Points of Analysis: No Impact. The project is located on a federal oil lease within an active oil field and compliant with BLM RMP.</p>  |
| <p><b>TRANSPORTATION:</b> Are there impacts to Transportation that are not discussed in the NEPA document?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <a href="#">Explain here</a></p> <p>Points of Analysis: No Impact. The project is located on a federal oil lease and compliant with BLM RMP.</p>   |



**TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES:** Are there impacts to Tribal Cultural Resources that are not discussed in the NEPA document? Or are their California recognized tribes that were not consulted in the NEPA process and that want to be consulted?

☐ No ☐ Yes [Explain here](#)

Points of Analysis: No Impact expected. Reviewed and found consistent with CEQA. However, a Tribal Notification will be sent to identified Native American groups in accordance with PRC 21080.3.1 before a Negative Declaration will be adopted.

**UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS:** Are there impacts to Utilities and Service Systems that are not discussed in the NEPA document?

☐ No ☐ Yes [Explain here](#)

Points of Analysis: No Impact. The project is located on a federal oil lease and compliant with BLM RMP.

**WILDFIRE:** Are there impacts to Wildfire that are not discussed in the NEPA document?

☐ No ☐ Yes [Explain here](#)

Points of Analysis: No Impact. The project is not located in a Very High Fire Hazard Severity zone and due to the nature of the work, there is no potential that the proposed work will substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan, exacerbate wildfire risks, require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure that may exacerbate fire risk, or expose people or structures to significant risk as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes.

#### **MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE:**

1. Does the EIS address whether the project has the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment; substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species; cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels; threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community; substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of an endangered, rare or threatened species; or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory.? (14 CCR § 15065(a)(1))

☐ No ☐ Yes ☐ N/A [Explain here](#) The EIS, in its entirety, addresses and discloses all potential environmental effects associated with the construction and operation of the proposed well, including direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts in the resource areas outlined in Appendix G of the CEQA guidelines. Potential impacts related to habitat to wildlife species were discussed in the Biological Resources Section 4.4 of the EIS and were all found to be less than significant with mitigation. Additionally, potential impacts to cultural, archaeological, and paleontological resources related to major periods of California and the Buena Vista oil field history, or prehistory, were discussed in the Cultural Resources Section 4.5, and were also found to be less than significant with mitigation.

2. Does the EIS address whether the project has impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of an individual 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.) (14 CCR § 15065(a)(3))

☐ No ☐ Yes ☐ N/A [Explain here](#) Cumulative impacts are the change in the environment, which results from the incremental impact of the project when added to other closely related past, present and reasonably foreseeable projects. When considered together with the past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future development of oil and gas production within the Coalinga gas field and unincorporated Kern County, the incremental impact of the development of a new exploratory production well in this project is potentially significant. There is reasonable possibility that the cumulative impact to land, air, water, and biological resources resulting from successive projects of the same type in area may be significant.

3. Does the EIS address whether the project has environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? (14 CCR § 15065(a)(4))

☐ No ☐ Yes ☐ N/A [Explain here](#)

While changes to the environment that could indirectly affect human beings would be represented by all of the designated CEQA issue areas, those that could directly affect human beings include air quality, geology and soils, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, noise, population and housing, public services, recreation, transportation/traffic, utilities, and climate change, which are addressed in Section 4.2 of the EIS (Air Quality), Section 4.5 (Geology/Soils and Mineral Resources), Section 4.6 (Greenhouse Gas Emissions), Section 4.7 (Safety/Risk of Upset), Section 4.8 (Hydrology/Water Quality), Section 4.10 (Noise),



Section 4.12 (Public Services and Recreation), Section 4.13 (Transportation/Traffic), and Section 4.14 (Utilities/Service Systems) of the submitted EIS.

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Additional<br/>Impacts<br/>to the<br/>Environment</b> | <p>Based on a comparison of the operator's project description, along with the submitted NEPA documents, are there additional environmental impacts disclosed in the NEPA/CEQA comparison outlined above?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>No additional impacts were identified in the NEPA/CEQA Comparison Guidelines or the Mandatory Findings of Significance.</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Yes. Potential additional impacts were identified in the NEPA/CEQA Comparison Guidelines. See PR SOP for next steps.</b></p> <p>Example for Yes: The proposed project would not create any impacts with respect to: Agriculture and Forestry Resources, Cultural Resources, Energy Resources, Land Use and Planning, Mineral Resources, Recreation, Tribal Resources and Wildfire. The project may create impacts to other resource areas and mitigation measures have been identified for Air Quality, Geology and Soils, Biological Resources, and Noise. To determine the level of impact to these resources, the PM recommends additional environmental review.</p> |
|--|---|