



County of Fresno

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS AND PLANNING
STEVEN E. WHITE, DIRECTOR

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

APPLICANT: County of Fresno, Department of Public Works and Planning, Design Division

APPLICATION NOS.: Initial Study Application No. 7321 (Recirculated)

DESCRIPTION: The subject application proposes to replace an existing two-lane, concrete-slab bridge with a two-lane box culvert bridge. The proposed bridge is fifty-seven feet long and fifty-five feet wide with two twelve-foot travel lanes and two four-foot wide shoulders. It will replace a twenty-nine-foot-long and nineteen-foot-wide bridge with nine-foot travel lanes, and no shoulders. 285 feet of the existing road north of the bridge and 158 feet south of the bridge will be improved and taper widened, and up to 10 feet of additional right-of-way may be acquired on either side of the project area. Overhead utilities will be relocated, and additional utility facilities such as guy wires, anchors, and poles may be installed in or near the project area. A coffer dam will be built for construction purposes, channel work will occur, and four orange trees and ruderal vegetation in the existing right-of-way will be removed.

LOCATION: The project site is located on Englehart Avenue, approximately 0.3 miles north of the intersection of Englehart Avenue and American Avenue in Fresno County. (SUP. DIST. 4).

I. AESTHETICS

A. Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The proposed bridge will be replacing an existing bridge, and the site is surrounded by other development, including houses, fences, and above ground utility lines. No scenic vistas will be impacted.

B. Would the project substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a State scenic highway; or

C. Would the project substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The proposed project is not located on a state scenic highway or a roadway designated as scenic by the Fresno County General Plan (Figure OS-2). No buildings or rock outcroppings will be affected. Four orange trees and ruderal vegetation within the right-of-way will be removed to accommodate construction. Some PG&E facilities may be relocated, and the appearance of the bridge will be different than it is currently. None of these activities are expected to degrade the existing visual character of the area.

- D. Would the project create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

No lighting is proposed. Construction activities will take place during the day and should not require temporary lighting.

II. AGRICULTURAL AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

- A. Would the project convert prime or unique farmlands or farmland of state-wide importance to non-agricultural use; or
- B. Would the project conflict with existing agricultural zoning or Williamson Act Contracts?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The properties surrounding the project site, APN's: 333-310-15, 185-160-92, and 185-160-91, are subject to Agricultural Land Conservation Contract No. 5167, and are located in an area designated as having prime farmland. This area is designated for agricultural land use according to the Fresno County General Plan and is located in the AE-20 (Exclusive Agricultural, 20-acre minimum parcel size) Zone District. The proposed construction will occur in existing right-of-way, but up to 10 feet of right-of-way on each side of the project site could be permanently acquired. The acquisition of right-of-way could convert land from prime farmland and agricultural zoning to a non-agricultural use. However, the maximum area that could be converted is 8,860 square-feet because the project area only extends 285 feet to the north of the bridge and 158 feet south of the bridge, and the maximum right-of-way acquisition would be 10-feet on either side of the road. The project will require the removal of four productive orange trees. Overall, the project will result in a minor conversion of farmland into non-farmland use that is determined to be less than significant.

- C. Would the project conflict with existing zoning for or cause rezoning of forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production; or
- D. Would the project result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The proposed project is not located in a forested area, nor is it designated as a Timberland area by any local plans and policies. No forests or timberland production will be affected.

- E. Would the project involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural uses or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The proposed project will only replace an existing bridge and will not contribute to population growth or increased traffic. It will not contribute indirectly to the conversion of farmland or forestland to other uses.

III. AIR QUALITY

- A. Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable Air Quality Plan; or
- B. Would the project violate any air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation; or
- C. Would the project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under a Federal or State ambient air quality standard; or
- D. Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The only emissions expected to result from the proposed project are emissions related to construction activities. The County of Fresno is a non-attainment area for PM-2.5 and Ozone. However, short-term emission contributions from the proposed project will be minor and will not conflict with applicable Air Quality Plans or contribute to the continued violation of air quality standards in the area.

- E. Would the project create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

No odors will be produced as a result of the proposed bridge project.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

- A. Would the project have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any candidate, sensitive, or special-status species; or

- B. Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The project was reviewed by the Southern San Joaquin Valley Environmental Branch of the California Department of Transportation, and it was determined that no special status species or sensitive habitats are expected to be affected by the proposed project. Previous ground disturbance, various biological databases, and knowledge of the surrounding habitats contributed to this conclusion.

- C. Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on federally-protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption or other means?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

Per the EPA Rule change of April 21, 2020 (effective June 22, 2020), it was clarified that the canal is not “Waters of the United States”, and there are no federally-protected wetlands. The project will occur when the seasonal flows within the canal are not present and as such would not cause hydrological interruption. Any temporary impacts on the dry canal from construction during the project would be temporary and the site would be restored to its original condition prior to flows reoccurring in the canal.

- D. Would the project 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?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED:

The project is not expected to disturb the movement of any native or migratory fish or wildlife if the work window of September 1 – February 1 is used. However, outside of this construction window, nesting swallows at the bridge and nesting birds/raptors in trees could be impacted.

* **Mitigation Measure**

1. In order to avoid impacts to nesting raptors and birds, project activities will occur, where possible, outside the nesting season. The nesting season is generally September 1 – February 1. If project activities must occur during the nesting season (September 1 – February 1), a qualified biologist shall conduct pre-construction surveys within the Biological Study Area (BSA) for active raptor and bird nests within 30 days of the onset of these activities. If no active nests are found within the BSA, no further mitigation is required.

2. Should any active nests be discovered within the BSA, the biologist shall determine the appropriate construction setback distances based on applicable CDFW guidelines and/or the biology of the affected species. Construction-free buffers will be identified on the ground with flagging, fencing, or by other easily visible means, and will be maintained until the biologist has determined that the young have fledged.
- E. Would the project conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance; or
 - F. Would the project conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

No conflicts have been identified between the proposed project and local plans or policies that protect natural resources or habitats.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

- A. Would the project Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?
- B. Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?
- C. Would the project cause a conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED:

This project was reviewed by an archaeologist that meets the Professionally Qualified Staff (PQS) Standards set forth in Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. In this review, it was concluded that the proposed project activities have a low potential to affect historic properties, and it was noted that the area had a high level of previous ground disturbance.

Additionally, this project was routed to all tribes that had expressed interest in the region that this project is located in, and none of the tribes requested consultation with the County on the proposed project. The proposed project is not expected to impact any cultural resources, but the following mitigation measure will ensure that if any cultural resources are discovered, that their presence will be handled properly.

* **Mitigation Measure(s)**

In the event that cultural resources are unearthed during ground-disturbing activities, all work shall be halted in the area of the find, and an Archeologist shall

be called to evaluate the findings and make any necessary mitigation recommendations. If human remains are unearthed during ground-disturbing activities, no further disturbance is to occur until the Fresno County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition. If such remains are determined to be Native American, the Coroner must notify the Native American Commission within 24 hours.

VI. ENERGY

Would the Project:

- A. Result in potential significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources during project Construction or operation?
- B. Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

Direct Energy Use

The project involves replacing the existing bridge with a new bridge. The project is not a capacity increasing project, as no bypass, new or expanded highways, new interchanges, additional lanes, interchange reconfiguration or auxiliary lanes are planned. While energy use would be required for vehicles using the bridge, the project would not result in increased traffic volumes or VMT. The project would not add new roadway lighting or other features requiring electricity which is an ongoing and permanent source of direct energy consumption.

Direct energy use would occur during construction. Energy in the form of gas and diesel would be consumed by construction vehicles and equipment operating on site, trucks delivering equipment and supplies, and construction workers driving to and from the project site. Construction energy would be a necessary commitment or expenditure that is associated with any major infrastructure improvement project. Compared to other roadway projects, this project is fairly small in scope and would not create a noticeable or adverse impact on short-term energy demand during the construction period. Energy consumption during project construction would be temporary and minimized to the maximum extent practicable. As such, the project would not result in an inefficient, wasteful, and unnecessary consumption of energy. Furthermore, various methods would be employed that would conserve energy and nonrenewable resources during construction. Thus, project construction would not have substantial energy effects.

Indirect Use

Indirect impacts represent factors such as the energy consumed to produce materials for construction and ongoing maintenance of the bridge. The project would utilize typical materials to construct bridges, roads, retaining walls and guardrails. All of these materials require energy to make. However, the project is relatively small in scope and

would use these materials in an efficient way. While energy would be consumed during maintenance activities, these activities would not result in an inefficient, wasteful and unnecessary consumption of energy. Furthermore, various methods would be employed that would conserve energy and nonrenewable resources during maintenance activity.

Renewable Energy Plans

The Environmental Protection Agency and the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, on behalf of the U.S. Department of Transportation have issued final rules to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and improve fuel economy by regulating the minimum acceptable miles-per-gallon ratio and other improvements such as air conditioner performance. Since these regulations apply to the manufacture of vehicles, they will be phased in as consumers replace old vehicles, leading to a general increase in fuel efficiency.

VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

A. Would the project expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including risk of loss, injury or death involving:

1. Rupture of a known earthquake?
2. Strong seismic ground shaking?
3. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?
4. Landslides?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The proposed project will not increase the number of people in the area. No structures will be built in addition to the bridge replacement. The project is located in an area of very low seismic hazard probability (Fresno County General Plan Background Report [FCGPBR] Figure 9-5) and is not located in an area of steep slopes that could experience landslides (Figure 7-2).

B. Would the project result in substantial erosion or loss of topsoil; or

C. Would the project result in on-site or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

Excavation and some stream channel work is included in the scope of work. All applicable regulations will be adhered to in an effort to minimize substantial erosion or loss of topsoil during this process. The proposed project is not in an area of high risk for seismic or landslide activity.

- D. Would the project be located on expansive soils, creating substantial risks to life or property?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

According to the Fresno County General Plan Background Report (FCGPBR) Figure 7-1, the proposed project is not in an area of expansive soils.

- E. Would the project have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative disposal systems where sewers are not available for wastewater disposal?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

There are no septic tanks or alternative disposal systems proposed as a part of this project.

- F. Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

There are no known or anticipated a unique paleontological resource at the project site the existing canal channel is a previously disturbed excavation with no history of unique resources or geologic features.

VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

- A. Would the project generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment; or
- B. Would the project conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

During construction activities, greenhouse gas emissions will be released by construction vehicles. After construction is complete, there will be no emissions impact because the bridge will not produce any emissions, and the capacity and level of service of the road will not be affected by the proposed project. Additionally, the San Joaquin Air Pollution Control District (SJAPCD) had no concerns about this project.

IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

- A. Would the project create a significant public hazard through routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials; or

- B. Would the project create a significant public hazard involving accidental release of hazardous materials into the environment?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

According to the Central Region Hazardous Waste and Paleontology Branch of the California Department of Transportation’s assessment of the proposed project, the potential of encountering any hazardous waste materials during this project is minimal. The only possibility of hazardous waste is in the demolition and excavation process, if building materials or soil contains asbestos, lead, heavy metals, or other hazardous materials. The painted guardrails may have been painted or treated with hazardous materials. Additionally, there is no data available that indicates a concentration of heavy metals in the soil, but there are procedures in place to ensure that this is the case. Compliance with the hazardous waste standards set forth by Caltrans, including Non-Standard Special Provision (NSSP) 14-9.02, 14-11.09 and 14-11.11, and Standard Special Provision (SSP) 7-1.02K(6)(j)(iii), will ensure that any hazardous waste materials encountered during construction are identified and handled appropriately.

- C. Would the project create hazardous emissions or utilize hazardous materials, substances or waste within one quarter-mile of a school?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

There are no schools within one quarter-mile of project site. The nearest schools are approximately 2 miles west and 2 miles northeast of the proposed project site.

- D. Would the project be located on a hazardous materials site?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The Central Region Hazardous Waste and Paleontology Branch reviewed the proposed project and did not identify any hazardous waste issues. They concluded that the possibility of encountering hazardous waste materials was minimal.

- E. Would a project located within an airport land use plan or, absent such a plan, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The nearest airport is Reedley Municipal Airport, which is approximately two miles west of the project site. The project site is not located within the airport’s planning area, and the replacement of the Reedley Main Canal Bridge will not change the number of individuals who use the bridge or how exposed they are to hazardous waste from the municipal airport.

- F. Would a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip.

- G. Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted Emergency Response Plan or Emergency Evacuation Plan?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The project was reviewed by the County of Fresno Fire Protection Department and Sherriff's Office, and neither agency expressed any concerns regarding the project and Emergency Response or Emergency Evacuation Plans.

- H. Would the project 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?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project is located in a non-wildland/non-urban fire hazard area. No concerns regarding wildland fires were expressed by the Fresno County Fire Department during their review of this project. The bridge replacement will not generate additional traffic, development, or population growth, therefore no additional people could be exposed to any possible fire risk as a result of this project.

X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

- A. Would the project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise degrade water quality; or
- B. Would the project Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin; or
- C. Would the project Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on or off site?
- i) Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;
 - ii) Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite;

- iii) 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; or
- iv) Impede or redirect flood flows?

- D. Would the project In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation ; or
- E. Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

Demolition of the existing bridge will occur over the canal, a coffer dam will be built for construction purposes, and the canal will be excavated as a part of the proposed project. These activities do not have a significant potential to degrade water quality, alter drainage patterns, and pollute runoff.

XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING

- A. Will the project physically divide an established community?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project will only replace an existing bridge, and it is located in a rural area. No communities will be divided.

- B. Will the project conflict with any Land Use Plan, policy or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project; or
- C. Will the project conflict with any applicable Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Community Conservation Plan?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

There are no conflicts between the proposed project and existing Fresno County plans and policies or applicable Habitat and Natural Community Conservation Plans.

XII. MINERAL RESOURCES

- A. Would the project result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource; or
- B. Would the project result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site designated on a General Plan?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project is not located in an area with known mineral resources (Fresno County General Plan [FCGP] figure 7-7). Additionally, the project is only replacing an existing bridge, and will not further inhibit the extraction of any resources that may be present in the area.

XIII. NOISE

- A. Would the project result in Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies; or
- B. Would the project cause Generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

Construction activities will produce noise and vibration. This disturbance will be temporary, intermittent, and primarily during daylight hours. Construction activities will conform to standards set forth by the County of Fresno and Caltrans regarding the regulation of noise during construction activities, and this will minimize any temporary impacts to the surrounding community. After the bridge is complete, it will not produce noise or vibration above and beyond the noise and vibration produced by vehicles crossing over the existing bridge.

- C. For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The nearest airport in Reedley Municipal Airport, which is approximately two miles west of the project site. The project site is not located within the airport's planning area, and noise should not be excessive at that distance from a small airport. Additionally, the replacement of the Reedley Main Canal Bridge will not change the number of individuals who use the bridge or how exposed they are to noise from the municipal airport.

XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING

- A. Would the project Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure); or
- B. Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The replacement of the Reedley Main Canal Bridge will improve safety for bridge users, not increase usage of Englehart Avenue. Population growth will not be influenced by the proposed project. No one will be displaced from existing housing. The project will not contribute to the construction of new homes.

XV. PUBLIC SERVICES

A. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically-altered public facilities in the following areas:

1. Fire protection;
2. Police protection;
3. Schools;
4. Parks; or
5. Other public facilities?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The proposed bridge replacement will not affect any existing public facilities or future need for additional public facilities.

XVI. RECREATION

- A. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks; or
- B. Would the project require the construction of or expansion of recreational facilities?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project will not change the number of lanes or expected capacity of the road. It will not lead to increased traffic in the area or population growth. The use of parks and recreational activities will not be impacted.

XVII. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

- A. Would the project conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities; or
- B. Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The proposed project will not alter the capacity or expected use of the existing roadway, and will have no long-term impacts on traffic circulation. The average daily trips (ADT) generated for this stretch of road is 200. Due to this low ADT, traffic will be detoured during construction; the total detour is 3 miles. The proposed project will not conflict with any relevant plans, ordinances, or policies, as there will be minimal short-term circulation impacts and no long-term circulation impacts.

The proposed project would add 4-foot-wide shoulders on both sides of the road across the new bridge and widen the existing lanes. This change will help facilitate the shared use of the roadway by both automobiles and pedestrians, and should increase pedestrian safety. The proposed project will not conflict with any pedestrian-related plans, policies, or programs.

- C. Would the project Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

There are no distracting design features proposed by this project. The bridge replacement is not expected to pose any traffic hazards.

- D. Would the project result in inadequate emergency access?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The Fresno County Fire Protection District and Sheriff's Office both reviewed the project and expressed no concerns.

XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

- A. Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:
- i) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or
 - ii) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe?

FINDING: NO IMPACT

This project was reviewed by an archaeologist that meets the Professionally Qualified Staff (PQS) Standards set forth in Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. In this review, it was concluded that the proposed project activities have a low potential to affect historic properties, and it was noted that the area had a high level of previous ground disturbance.

Additionally, this project was routed to all tribes that had expressed interest in the region that this project is located in, and none of the tribes requested consultation with the County on the proposed project. The proposed project is not expected to impact any cultural resources, but the following mitigation measure will ensure that if any cultural resources are discovered, that their presence will be handled properly.

XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

- A. Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects; or
- B. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years ; or
- C. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?

FINDING: NO IMPACT

There will be no new wastewater or storm water produced as a result of the proposed project, and the proposed bridge will not impact the availability, consumption, or supply of water resources. Existing utilities and resource availability will not be affected.

- D. Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste ?

FINDING: NO IMPACT

Solid waste will be produced during the demolition of the existing bridge, but the project will not have any long-term solid waste production impacts. The waste that is produced will be disposed of in a manner that complies with federal, state, and local regulations.

XX. WILD FIRE

If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:

- A. Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?
- B. Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?
- C. Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?
- D. Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?

FINDING: NO IMPACT

The project does not increase any risks of wild fire danger or impede any emergency services. The Fresno County Fire Protection District and Sheriff's Office both reviewed the project and expressed no concerns.

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 prehistory or history?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED:

With the incorporation of the mitigation measures indicated in Section IV (Biological Resources) and Section V (Cultural Resources), any impacts on cultural or biological resources are not expected to be significant according to the project analysis.

- B. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable; or
- C. Does the project have environmental impacts which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The proposed replacement bridge will be functionally superior to the existing bridge but will not serve a greater number of people or lead to additional development in the area. No cumulative impacts, such as traffic congestion, greenhouse gas emissions, water

quality, or aquifer depletion will be impacted by the approval of the proposed project. Additionally, this project will not cause substantial adverse effects on human beings.

XXI. CONCLUSION/SUMMARY

Based upon the Initial Study prepared, staff has concluded that the project will not have a significant effect on the environment. It has been determined that there would be no impacts to land use and planning, mineral resources, population and housing, public services, and recreation, tribal cultural resources, utilities and services systems, wildfires.

Potential impacts related to aesthetics, agricultural and forestry resources, air quality, energy, geology and soils, greenhouse gas emissions, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, noise, transportation and traffic, and have been determined to be less than significant.

Potential impacts relating to biological resources and cultural resources have determined to be less than significant with compliance with the mitigation measures.

A Mitigated Negative Declaration is recommended and is subject to approval by the decision-making body. The Initial Study is available for review at 2220 Tulare Street, Suite A, Street Level, located on the southeast corner of Tulare and "M" Street, Fresno, California.

DTC

\\Pacific\pwp\4360Devs&PIn\PROJSEC\PROJDOCS\Environmental\Initial Studies - Environmental Assessments\7000-7999\IS 7321 Reedley Main Canal Bridge Replacement\Recirculated IS Sept 2020\IS 7321 wu (Recirculated).docx