



County of Fresno

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

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

- APPLICANT: NutriAg USA, Ltd
- APPLICATION NOS.: Initial Study Application No. 7799, Amendment Application No. 3841; Director Review and Approval Application No. 4610
- DESCRIPTION: Rezone two contiguous parcels totaling 2.6 acres from the M-1 (Light Manufacturing) Zone District to the M-3 (Heavy Industrial) Zone District and Director Review and Approval to allow the expansion of an existing inorganic fertilizer manufacturing operation on adjacent parcel onto the subject parcels.
- LOCATION: The subject parcels are located on the south side of 'H' Street between North Biola Avenue (6th Street) and North 7th Street within the unincorporated community of Biola (4460 N. Biola Avenue, Biola) (Sup. Dist.: 1) (APN: 016-300-02, 17S, 18S)

I. AESTHETICS

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:

- A. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista; or
- B. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The subject parcels are currently undeveloped and are surrounded by agricultural land to the east, industrial uses to the south and west, and single-family residences to the north. The parcels front on Biola and 7th Avenues which are not identified as scenic drives in the County General Plan. No scenic vistas or scenic resources including trees, rock outcroppings, or historic buildings exist on or near the site. The project will have no impact on scenic resources.

- C. In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage points.) If the project is in an urbanized

area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The subject proposal would rezone a 2.06-acre undeveloped land from the M-1 Zone District to the M-3 Zone District. The proposal would also construct a warehouse, raw material storage tanks, a basin, future community garden and onsite parking as an expansion of an existing fertilizer manufacturing operation on the adjacent parcel.

The subject parcels are located on the southern edge of the unincorporated community of Biola in an area consist of agricultural, commercial, industrial and residential uses. Vineyards are located to the east, industrial developments to the south and west and single-family residences to the north of the parcel. The proposed 42-foot tall storage building/warehouse will be set back approximately 100 feet from the nearest single-family residence to the north. Given the distance from the nearest development and the fact that the building will complement in height, design and construction to the improvements on adjacent southerly parcel the proposed development, it will have a less than significant visual impact on the surrounding area.

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED:

Per the applicant's Operational Statement, this proposal will use outdoor lighting that has the potential of generating light and glare in the area. To minimize any light and glare impact, the project will adhere to the following Mitigation Measure.

* **Mitigation Measure**

1. *All outdoor lighting shall be hooded and directed downward as to not shine towards adjacent properties and public streets.*

II. AGRICULTURAL AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:

- A. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance, as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use; or
- B. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act Contract; or

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

Classified as Urban and Built-Up Land on the Fresno County Important Farmland Map (2016), the subject parcels are suited for the uses related to residential, industrial, commercial, institutional facilities, including cemeteries, airports, golf courses, sanitary landfills, sewage treatment, and water control structures. The parcels are non-agricultural and therefore are not subject to Williamson Act contract.

- C. Conflict with existing zoning for forest land, timberland or timberland zoned Timberland Production; or
- D. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use; or
- E. Involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forestland to non-forest use?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The subject parcel is not a forestland, timberland, or land zoned for timberland production. The parcel is designated Limited Industrial in the County-adopted Biola Community Plan. The proposed fertilizer manufacturing operation is consistent with this land use designation. No loss of farmland, either individually or cumulatively would occur from this proposal.

III. AIR QUALITY

Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management district or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:

- A. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable Air Quality Plan?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The Air Quality Plan (AQP) contains several control measures that are enforceable requirements through the adoption of rules and regulations. The following rules and regulations apply to the project: Authority to Construct (ATC); District Regulation VIII (Fugitive PM10 Prohibitions), Rule 4102 (Nuisance), Rule 4601 (Architectural Coatings), Rule 4641 (Cutback, Slow Cure, and Emulsified Asphalt Paving and Maintenance Operations) and Rule 4002 (National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants).

The project would comply with all applicable Air Resources Board (ARB) and the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD) rules and regulations noted above and will not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality attainment plan. The project's emissions would be less than significant for all criteria pollutants as discussed in Section III. B below. The project complies with all applicable rules and regulations from the applicable air quality plans, and therefore is not considered inconsistent with the Air Quality Plan.

- B. 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?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

An Air Quality Summary was prepared for the project by LSA, dated June 24, 2020 and a copy was provided to the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District. The Summary concluded, that based on the operational Statement, the proposed "NutriAg project would be expected to result in a less than significant impact on air quality."

- C. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD) identifies a sensitive receptor as a location where human populations (especially children, senior citizens, and sick persons) are present. Additionally, a sensitive receptor location occurs where there is a reasonable expectation of continuous human exposure to pollutants, according to the averaging period for ambient air quality standards, such as 24 hours, eight hours, or one hour.

The nearest sensitive receptor is a single-family residence located approximately 100 north of the nearest project property line. The San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD) reviewed the proposal and expressed no concerns related to substantial pollutant concentrations in reference to sensitive receptor near the project site.

- D. Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (District) addresses odor criteria within the GAMAQI (Guidance for Assessing and Mitigating Air Quality Impacts). The District has not established a rule or standard regarding odor emissions; rather, the District has a nuisance rule (Rule 4102) which states that any project with the potential to frequently expose members of the public to objectionable odors should be deemed to have a significant impact.

The San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD) reviewed the proposal and stated that the project shall be subject to Rule 4102 and required no specific study related to odor. As such, any potential odor related impacts resulting from this proposal are expected to be less than significant.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

- A. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service; or
- B. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service; or
- C. Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The subject parcels are undeveloped and disturbed by a fertilizer manufacturing operation on the adjacent parcel. The surrounding farmland has also been disturbed with industrial and farming operations and do not provide habitat for state or federally listed species. Additionally, the parcels bear no riparian features, wetlands, or waters under the jurisdiction of the United States.

The project was referred to the California Department of Fish and Wildlife and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service for comments. Neither agency offered any comments on the project.

- 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?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project site is located within an urbanized area outside of any designated wildlife movement corridor and contains no wildlife nursery sites, or fisheries resources.

- E. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The subject parcel contains no trees and is not subject to the County of Fresno tree preservation policy or ordinance.

- 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?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project site is located within the Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E) Habitat Conservation Plan, which specifically applies to PG&E facilities and not the subject proposal.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

- A. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to Section 15064.5; or
- B. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5; or
- C. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The subject parcels are located within an area designated for Limited Industrial uses in the County-adopted Biola Community Plan which has been historically developed with commercial, industrial and residential land uses. Considering that the subject parcel is not in an area of high or moderate sensitivity for archeological resources, staff believes that this proposal will not result in any environmental impact to cultural resources.

VI. ENERGY

Would the project:

- A. Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources during project construction or operation?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The project will not result in inefficient, wasteful, or unnecessary energy use. The project involves limited construction activities during construction of warehouse, storage tanks, and parking and circulation areas. As such, the project consumption of energy (gas, electricity, gasoline, and diesel) during construction is expected to be less than significant.

The project will be subject to meeting California Green Building Standards Code (CCR, Title 24, Part 11-CALGreen) to achieve the goals of Assembly Bill (AB) 32, which has established a comprehensive program of cost-effective reductions of greenhouse gases (GHG) to 1990 levels by 2020.

- B. Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project development would not conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency.

VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Would the project:

- A. Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:
1. 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?
 2. Strong seismic ground shaking?
 3. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

Per Figure 9-5 of the Fresno County General Plan Background Report, the project site is in an area which has 10 percent probability of seismic hazard in 50 years with peak horizontal ground acceleration of zero to 20 percent. The project development would be subject to building standards, which include specific regulations to protect improvements against damage caused by earthquake and/or ground acceleration.

4. Landslides?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

Per Figure 9-6 of the Fresno County General Plan Background Report, the project site is not in an area of landslide hazards. The site is flat with no topographical variations, which precludes the possibility of landslides.

- B. Result in substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

Per Figure 7-3 of the Fresno County General Plan Background Report, the project site is not in an area of erosion hazards. Site grading may result in loss of some topsoil due to compaction and overcovering of soil to prepare for the parking and circulation areas and foundation for warehouse and storage tanks. However, the impact would be less than significant with a Project Note requiring that an Engineered Grading and Drainage Plan shall be prepared for the project and a Grading Permit or Voucher be obtained for site grading.

- 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?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

As noted above, the project site is flat with no topographical variations. The site bears no potential for on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse due to the project-related improvements. As a standard requirement, a soil compaction report may be required prior to the issuance of building permits to ensure the weight-bearing capacity of the soils for warehouse and storage tanks.

- D. Be located on expansive soil as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

Per Figure 7-1 of the Fresno County General Plan Background Report, the project site is not in an area of expansive soils. However, the project construction will implement all applicable requirements of the most recent California Building Standards Code and will consider hazards associated with shrinking and swelling of expansive soils.

- 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?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The proposed development will connect to community sewer and water provided by the Biola Community Services District.

- F. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

See discussion in Section V. CULTURAL RESOURCES above.

VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Would the project:

- A. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

Human activities, including fossil fuel combustion and land-use changes, release carbon dioxide (CO₂) and other compounds cumulatively termed greenhouse gases (GHGs). GHGs are effective at trapping radiation that would otherwise escape the atmosphere. The San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD), a California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Trustee Agency for this project, has developed thresholds to determine significance of a proposed project – either implement Best Performance Standards or achieve a 29 percent reduction from Business as Usual (BAU) (a specific numerical threshold). On December 17, 2009, SJVAPCD adopted *Guidance for Valley Land-Use Agencies in Addressing GHG Emission Impacts for New Projects under CEQA* (SJVAPCD 2009), which outlined SJVAPCD’s methodology for assessing a project’s significance for GHGs under CEQA.

Construction and operational activities associated with the proposed project would generate greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. An Air Quality Summary was prepared for the project by LSA, dated June 24, 2020 and a copy was provided to the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District. The Summary concluded, that based on the operational Statement, the proposed “NutriAg project would be expected to result in a less than significant impact on air quality.”

- B. Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The project will be subject to regulations developed under AB (Assembly Bill) 32 and SB (Senate Bill) 32 as determined by CARB (California Air Resources Board). SB 32 focuses on reducing GHGs at least 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030. Pursuant to the requirements in AB 32, CARB adopted the Climate Change Scoping Plan (Scoping Plan) in 2008, which outlines actions recommended to obtain that goal. Per the analysis contained in the Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Impact Analysis prepared for the project by LSA, dated June 24, 2020 and a copy was provided to the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District. The Summary concluded, that based on the operational Statement, the proposed “NutriAg project would be expected to result in a less than significant impact on air quality.”

IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Would the project:

- A. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials; or

- 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; or
- C. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The Fresno County Department of Public Health, Environmental Health Division (Health Department) reviewed the proposal and requires the following to be included as Project Notes. Within 30 days of the occurrence of any of the following events the applicant/operators shall update their online Hazardous Materials Business Plan and site map: 1) there is a 100% or more increase in the quantities of a previously disclosed material; and 2) the facility begins handling a previously undisclosed material at or above the HMBP threshold amounts. Furthermore: 1) the business shall certify that a review of the business plan has been conducted at least once every three years and that any necessary changes were made and that the changes were submitted to the local agency; 2) all hazardous waste be handled in accordance with requirements set forth in the California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 22, Division 4.5.; and 3) an Underground Storage Tank Removal Permit shall be obtained to remove any underground storage tank(s) found during construction.

The project is not located within one-quarter mile of a school. The nearest school, Burrel Elementary School, is approximately 2.7 miles northwest of the project site.

- 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?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

Per the U.S. EPA's NEPAassist, the project site is not listed as a hazardous materials site. The project will not create public hazards.

- 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, result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

Per the Fresno County *Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan Update* adopted by the Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) on December 3, 2018, the nearest public airport, Fresno-Yosemite International Airport, is approximately nine miles northeast of the project site. At such distance, the airport will not be a safety hazard or source of excessive noise for the project.

- F. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project site is in an area where existing emergency response times for fire protection, emergency medical services, and sheriff protection meet adopted standards. The project does not include any characteristics (e.g., permanent road closures) that would physically impair or otherwise interfere with emergency response or evacuation in the project vicinity. These conditions preclude the possibility of the proposed project conflicting with an emergency response or evacuation plan. No impacts would occur.

- G. Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

Per Figure 9-9 of the Fresno County General Plan Background Report, the project site is outside of the State Responsibility area for wildland fire protection. The project will not expose persons or structures to wildland fire hazards.

X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Would the project:

- A. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

See discussion in Section VII. E. GEOLOGY AND SOILS regarding wastewater discharge.

The project will use an approximately 108 gallons of water per day provided by Biola Community Service District. No violation to any water quality standards is expected from this proposal.

The Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region also reviewed the proposal and offered no comments related to impact on groundwater quality.

- B. Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The subject proposal is located within the North Kings Groundwater Sustainability Area (NKGSA). The NKGSA expressed no concerns with the proposal given the fact that the

proposed development will receive community water provided by Biola Community Services District.

Per the State Water Resources Control Board, Division of Drinking Water (SWRCB-DDW), the project does not meet the definition of a public water system and require no permit from the SWRCB-DDW. Likewise, Water and Natural Resources Division of the Fresno County Department of Public Works and Planning stated that there is adequate water supply to support the project.

- C. 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:
 - 1. Result in substantial erosion or siltation on or off site?
 - 2. Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on or off site?
 - 3. 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; or
 - 4. Impede or redirect flood flows?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

No natural drainage channels run through the project site.

Onsite development resulting from this proposal will not cause significant changes in the absorption rates, drainage patterns, or the rate and amount of surface run-off with adherence to the mandatory construction practices contained in the Grading and Drainage Sections of the County Ordinance Code.

- D. In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project site is not subject to flooding from the 100-year storm per the Federal Emergency Management Agency FIRM Panel 1525H.

- E. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

Fresno County has no Water Quality Control Plan. As such, the subject proposal would not conflict with any water quality control plan. The project is located within the North Kings Groundwater Sustainability Area. See discussion in Section X. B. above.

XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING

Would the project:

- A. Physically divide an established community?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

This proposal will not physically divide a community. Subject parcels are located along the southern edge of the unincorporated community of Biola.

- B. Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The subject parcels are designated Limited Industrial in the County-adopted Biola Community Plan and zoned M-1 (Light Manufacturing District) in the County Zoning Ordinance. This proposal entails rezoning of the parcels from the M-1 Zone District to the M-3 (Heavy Industrial) Zone District and is compatible with the Limited Industrial General Plan designation. The parcels located within unincorporated community of Biola are not impacted by land use plan, policy, or regulation of any other agency.

The County General Plan allows the proposed facility in an agricultural area by discretionary land use approval, provided applicable General Plan policies are met. Applicable policies are discussed below.

Concerning Policy 603-01 :2.02. f. of Biola Community Plan, adequate landscape buffering will be provided along north boundary of the site to protect adjoining residential uses from any adverse environmental influences.

Concerning Policy 603-01 :2.02.h, of the Biola Community Plan, the subject parcels, located on the farthest edge of the town, are separated from residential development by a roadway.

Concerning Policy LU-F.29, criteria a. b. c. d., the subject rezone would allow expansion of an existing inorganic fertilizer manufacturing operation. The proposed development mainly involves a storage facility incidental to the farming operations, and will produce the least amount of noise, odor, vibration, smoke, heat and glare to impact the residential area north of the proposal. All other future uses on the property resulting from this proposal will adhere to the M-3 Zone District property development standards and will be analyzed against these standards during mandatory Site Plan Review.

Concerning Policy LU-F.30 the proposed development will connect to Biola Community Services District sewer and water services and will use 108 gallons of water per day which is an insignificant amount.

Concerning Policy PF-C.17, the subject proposal is not located in a water-short area of the Fresno County and will connect to the Biola CSD community water system. provided water by The Water and Natural Resources Division of the Fresno County Department of Public Works and Planning that water supply is adequate to support the project.

XII. 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; or
- 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?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

Per Figure 7-8 of the Fresno County General Plan Background Report, the project site is outside of a mineral-producing area of the County.

XIII. NOISE

Would the project result in:

- A. 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. Generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels; or

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The Fresno County Department of Public Health, Environmental Health Division reviewed the proposal and expressed no concerns related to noise.

The project could result in an increase in noise level due to future construction activities on the property. Noise impacts associated with construction are expected to be temporary and will be subject to the County Noise Ordinance.

- 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: NO IMPACT:

See discussion above in Section IX. E. The project will not be impacted by airport noise.

XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING

Would the project:

- A. 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 project will allow industrial uses involving no housing on the property. As such, the project will not contribute to population growth.

XV. PUBLIC SERVICES

Would the project:

- A. Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically-altered governmental facilities, or the 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 following public services:

- 1. Fire protection?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The North Central Fire Protection District (CalFire) reviewed the proposal and stated that the agency has no comments on the project.

- 2. Police protection; or

- 3. Schools; or

- 4. Parks; or

- 5. Other public facilities?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project will not impact existing public services, nor will it result in the need for additional public services related to schools, parks or police protection by the Fresno County Sheriff's Office.

XVI. RECREATION

Would the project:

- A. Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated; or
- B. Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project involves no residential development which may result in population growth. As such, the project would require no new or expanded recreational facilities in the area.

XVII. TRANSPORTATION

Would the project:

- A. Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities; or
- B. Be in conflict or be inconsistent with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b); or
- C. Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment); or
- D. Result in inadequate emergency access?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The project will not conflict with any policy addressing the circulation system. The project area is not planned for any transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities per the Transportation and Circulation Element of the Fresno County General Plan.

The Design Division and Road Maintenance and Operations Division of the Fresno County Department of Public Works and Planning reviewed the subject proposal in reference to the Operational Statement provided by the applicant. Per the Operational Statement, 24,275 square-foot proposed warehouse will generate 4.16 total AM peak hour trips per day (0.17 AM peak trip per 1,000 square feet of building area) and 4.6 total PM peak hour trips per day (0.19 PM peak trip per 1,000 square feet of building area) which do not will not exceed the County 10 trips per any peak hour threshold.

The Design Division concurred with the applicant's Operational Statement and stated that no trip generation is warranted for the project. The quantities and trips are not in addition to the additional approved operations. All employees and truck trips for the proposed expansion northerly parcel also include employee and truck trips for the southerly parcel with existing improvements.

XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

- A. 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:
1. 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
 2. 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:

Pursuant to Assembly Bill (AB) 52, project information was routed to the Picayune Rancheria of the Chukchansi Indians, Dumna Wo Wah Tribal Government, Table Mountain Rancheria and Santa Rosa Rancheria Tachi Yokut Tribe offering them an opportunity to consult under Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 21080.3(b) with a 30-day window to formally respond to the County letter. No tribe requested consultation, resulting in no further action on the part of the County.

XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Would the project:

- 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?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

See discussion in Section VII. E. GEOLOGY AND SOILS above. The project will not result in the relocation or construction of new electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities.

- B. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

See discussion in Section X. B. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY above.

- 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:

See discussion in Section VII. E. GEOLOGY AND SOILS above.

- D. Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals; or
- E. Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

Development of allowed uses in the proposed M-3 Zone District is not expected to generate solid waste in excess of capacity of local landfill sites. All solid waste will comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

XX. WILDFIRE

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, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects; or
- 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; or
- 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; or
- 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 site is not in or near state responsibility areas or land classified as very high fire hazard severity zones. The North Central Fire Protection District had no comments on the project related to fire hazard.

XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Would the project:

- A. Have 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 a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project would not degrade the quality of the environment; 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; or reduce the number or restrict the range of an endangered, rare, or threatened species. No impacts on biological or cultural resources were identified in the analysis.

- B. 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)?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

Each of the projects located within Fresno County has been or would be analyzed for potential impacts, and appropriate project-specific Mitigation Measures are developed to reduce that project’s impacts to less than significant levels. Projects are required to comply with applicable County policies and ordinances. The incremental contribution by the proposed project to overall development in the area is less than significant.

The project will adhere to the permitting requirements and rules and regulations set forth by the Fresno County Grading and Drainage Ordinance, San Joaquin Air Pollution Control District, and California Code of Regulations Fire Code at the time development occurs on the property. No cumulatively considerable impacts relating to Agricultural and Forestry Resources or Air quality were identified in the project analysis. Impacts identified for Aesthetics will be mitigated with the Mitigation Measure listed in Sections I. of this report.

- C. Have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings either directly or indirectly?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

No substantial impacts on human beings, either directly or indirectly, were identified in the analysis.

CONCLUSION/SUMMARY

Based upon Initial Study No. 7799 prepared for Amendment Application No. 3841 and Director Review and Approval Application No. 4610 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 biological resources, cultural resources, mineral resources, population and housing, recreation, tribal cultural resources, or wildfire.

Potential impacts related to air quality, energy, geology and soils, greenhouse gas emissions, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use and planning, public services, transportation, and utilities and service systems have been determined to be less than significant.

Potential impacts to aesthetics have been determined to be less than significant with the identified 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 southwest corner of Tulare and "M" Streets, Fresno, California.

EA:

G:\4360Devs&PIn\PROJSEC\PROJDOCS\AA\3800-3899\3841-See DRA 4610\CEQA\AA3841 IS wp.doc