



County of Fresno

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

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

- APPLICANT: Summer Bradford
- APPLICATION NOS.: Initial Study Application No. 7719 and Director Review and Approval Application No. 4601
- DESCRIPTION: Allow a truck and trailer storage and maintenance facility when such vehicles are devoted exclusively to the transportation of agricultural products, supplies, and equipment on approximately 14.9 acres of land in the AE-20 (Exclusive Agricultural, 20-acre minimum parcel size) Zone District.
- LOCATION: The project site is located on the north side of Jensen Avenue, approximately 615 feet west of its nearest intersection with West Avenue and is southerly adjacent to the city limits of the City of Fresno (APN 477-100-03 and 04) (1638 W. Jensen Avenue and 1642 W. Jensen Avenue, Fresno, CA).

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 project site is located in a predominantly agricultural area with single-family residences located in the vicinity of the project area. Additionally, the Regional Sports Complex is located on the opposite side of the project site. The surrounding terrain is relatively flat, however a large hill is located directly south of the project site and blocks southern views from the project site. According to Figure OS-2 of the Fresno County General Plan, there are no scenic roadways that front the subject property. There are no scenic vistas or any scenic resources identified as being affected by the project proposal.

- 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 point). 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 proposed use will provide a facility for trucks and trailers related to the transportation of agricultural products, supplies, and equipment to be stored and maintained on the subject parcel. Based on the Applicant's submitted site plan, the trucks and trailers will be stored towards the rear of the property away from public views. Permit records and aerial views of the property indicate that there are single-family residences and accessory structures located on the property to further screen the truck and trailer storage area from public views. Public views of the property are confined to Jensen Avenue. Based on existing conditions of the subject property, the layout of the storage facility which will be located further north away from public views of the site, a less than significant impact is seen in terms of the use degrading the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site.

- 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, the project proposes to shield and direct on-site lighting to keep light and glare contained to the project site and not impact adjacent properties. Additional light and glare produced from trucks and employee vehicles will also be produced. Light and glare produced from vehicles will not have a significant effect as sensitive receptors are located away from the proposed parking areas with existing accessory buildings and mature landscaping acting as buffers to mitigate light and glare produced from vehicles entering and existing the project site. A Mitigation Measure will be implemented with the project to ensure that onsite lighting will be hooded and directed downward so as not to shine on adjacent properties or public right-of-way.

* **Mitigation Measure(s)**

1. *All onsite lighting shall be hooded and directed downward so as not to shine on adjacent properties or public right-of-way.*

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 Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental

effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon 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?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

According to the 2016 Fresno County Important Farmland Map, the subject parcel is designated as Rural Residential Land and Semi-Agricultural and Rural Commercial Land. Based on these designations, the project will not convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance. The project does not conflict with the existing zoning for agricultural use, as the proposed use is allowed subject to a Director Review and Approval application. The subject parcel is not subject to a 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?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The subject parcel is not zoned for forest land, timberland or timberland zoned Timberland Production. The project will not result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The proposed project is considered supportive of agricultural operations. The project proposal will not result in the conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural uses or conversion of forest land to non-forest use as the underlying agricultural zoning that supports agricultural operations and uses supportive of agriculture is not changing.

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; or
- 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:

The San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District has reviewed the subject application and did not express concerns with the subject application. An increase in criteria pollutants may occur resulting from the project proposal in the form of vehicle emissions and dust. Although an increase can occur, the project does not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable Air Quality Plan. Based on the proposed amount of equipment being placed on-site, the resulting increase in criteria pollutant will not be in significant amounts to have a significant negative impact on the environment.

- C. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations; or
- D. Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED:

Aerial imaging of the project site and surrounding area indicate that the area is utilized for agricultural and rural residential uses. There are single-family residences along Jensen Avenue in the immediate vicinity of the project site that could be exposed to the pollutant concentrations and emissions resulting from the project. A Mitigation Measure shall be implemented to reduce dust pollution to a less than significant impact. The Applicant, per their operational statement has stated that all trucks and trailers leave and return to the project site empty, therefore, long term idling of trucks and trailers will not occur resulting in additional emissions. With the recommended mitigation measure, the project will result in a less than significant impact on sensitive receptors.

* **Mitigation Measure(s)**

1. *A dust palliative shall be required on all unpaved parking and circulation areas.*

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?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

Aerial images of the project site from August of 1998 and up to August 2018 suggest that the project site has been occupied and experienced daily human disturbance. Properties in the vicinity of the project site are utilized for agricultural, residential, industrial, and recreational uses, which indicate a high level of human disturbance throughout the area that would deter special status species from occupying the project site. There are no reported occurrences of special status species or in the immediate vicinity of the project site. There are a number of reported occurrences nearby that are associated with the City of Fresno limits, but considering the urban setting and types of use on the outskirts of the occurrences, the noted species are not likely to occur on the project site. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the California Department of Fish and Wildlife did not express concern with the subject application to indicate that the project would result in significant impacts to special status species. Therefore, the project will not have a substantial adverse effect on any special status species.

- 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:

According to the National Wetlands Inventory, there are no identified wetlands located on or near the project site that could be affected by the proposal. The closest identified wetland is a ponding basin located east of the project site. The project does not propose any development that would affect the identified wetland. There are no riparian habitats or other sensitive natural communities located on or near the project site.

- 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 in an area of disturbance caused by human habitation of the site and the surrounding properties. There are no migratory wildlife corridors or native wildlife nursery sites located on or near the project site. The project site does not appear to be suitable for movement of native residents or wildlife species.

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

- 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:

There are no identified local policies or ordinances that would conflict with the project proposal. The project will not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state Habitat Conservation Plan.

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: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED:

The Applicant intends to utilize the existing built improvements towards the proposed operation. Further site improvements proposed with the subject application include proposed parking stalls for employees and truck and trailer storage stalls, and a proposed above ground storage tank. Although large-scale development of the site will not occur, a mitigation measure will be implemented in the event that cultural resources are discovered during ground-disturbing activities related to the subject application.

* **Mitigation Measure(s)**

1. *In the event that cultural resources are unearthed during ground-disturbing activities, all work shall be halted in the area of the find. 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 Sheriff-Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition. All normal evidence procedures should be followed by photos, report, video, etc. If such remains are determined to be Native American, the Sheriff-Coroner must notify the Native American Commission within 24 hours.*

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The proposed use could result in increased consumption of energy resources, but would not result in potentially significant environmental impact due to the increased energy consumption. Onsite equipment and vehicles will be in compliance with state and local plans for energy efficiency and renewable energy and if any conflict would arise, would be subject to enforcement from the responsible agency.

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?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

According to the Earthquake Hazards Zone Application administered by the California Department of Conservation and Figure 9-3 of the Fresno County General Plan Background Report (FCGPBR), the project site is not located on or near identified earthquake hazard zones.

- 2. Strong seismic ground shaking?
- 3. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

Per Figure 9-5 of the FCGPBR, the project site is not located in an area that would be subject to a high peak horizontal ground acceleration. Therefore, the project is not likely to be subject to strong seismic ground shaking or seismic-related ground failure.

- 4. Landslides?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

According to Figure 9-6 of the FCGPBR, the project site is not located in a landslide hazard area. The project site is located in a relatively flat area utilized for agricultural land with the largest grade change being located across West Jensen Avenue at the Fresno Regional Sports Complex. Although there is a change in elevation, the elevation is not extreme to warrant consideration of a potential landslide hazard.

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

Per the Applicant's proposal, the use will not result in substantial soil erosion and will result in minimal loss of topsoil. The Applicant proposes to utilize a dust suppressant throughout the truck and trailer storage area. Loss of topsoil could include any type of new development proposed with the application. The development will not result in a loss of topsoil that will have a negative impact on the environment.

- 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:

No geologic unit or unstable soil was identified on the project site. All proposed improvements will be subject to the current building code and be built in accordance with applicable codes related to reducing risk associated with project site conditions.

- C. 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: NO IMPACT:

Per Figure 7-1 of the Fresno County General Plan Background Report (FCGPBR), the subject site is not located on identified expansive soil areas in the County of Fresno.

- D. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The subject application does not propose additional septic systems to support the proposed operation. Existing building permit records indicate that both subject parcels are improved with permitted septic systems. As no new septic system is proposed, no impact is seen resulting from the project proposal.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

There were no paleontological resource or unique geologic feature identified on the project site.

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; or
- 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:

A Greenhouse Gas Emissions Analysis dated June 10, 2020 by LSA was produced to estimate and quantify greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions produced from the project proposal. GHG emission estimated were produced from the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod). The analysis estimates that the project proposal would produce approximately 91.97 carbon dioxide emissions (CO₂e) per year. The Greenhouse Gas Emissions Analysis concludes that the project would not result in the emission of substantial GHG emissions and with continued implementation of applicable current State regulations highlighted in the analysis, the project would not conflict with the goals and objectives of the State for the purpose of reducing GHG Emissions. Therefore, the proposed project's incremental contribution to cumulative GHG emissions is determine to be not cumulatively considerable. Based off the analysis provided for this project, the project will generate emissions, but the estimated emission amount is considered less than significant and will not conflict with policy's and regulations meant to meet state emission reduction goals.

VIII. 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?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The proposed operation will have trucks and trailers devoted exclusively to the transportation of agricultural products, supplies, and equipment. Per the Applicant's operational statement, the trucks and trailers will return to the project site empty

therefore reducing the potential for creating a significant hazard to the public through the transport of items related to the agricultural industry. A 1,000 gallon diesel fuel tank will be installed on the project site. The Department of Public Health, Environmental Health Division has reviewed the project and has provided comments regarding state and local standards for permitting, reporting, and handling hazardous materials that may be stored on site. The comments provided by the Department of Public Health will be included as project notes which will be considered with the associated land use permit.

- 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: NO IMPACT:

There are no existing or proposed schools within one-quarter mile of the project site. Additionally, the project proposal will not emit hazardous emissions that would cause an adverse impact on the environment or sensitive receptors.

- 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 NEPAassist web application, the project site is not included as a hazardous materials site. The project will not result in a significant hazard to the public or the environment.

- E. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project site is located within two miles of the Fresno Chandler Downtown Airport. Although the project site is located within two miles of an airport, the site is located outside of its planned areas and traffic pattern zone. Therefore, the project will not result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area due to its proximity to the identified airport.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

Reviewing agencies and departments did not express concern with the subject application to indicate that the project proposal would impair implementation or

physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

Aerial images of the project site and surrounding area show the area as being utilized for agricultural and residential uses. The 2007 Fire Hazard Severity Zones in LRA (Local Responsibility Area) from the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection indicates that the project site is not located in an identified fire hazard area. Therefore, the project will not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires.

X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Would the project:

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

Reviewing agencies and departments did not express concern with the project proposal in regard to effects on water quality and waste discharge requirements resulting from the project proposal. Comments received from the Department of Public Health, Environmental Health Division addressed applicable state and local standards with the use, storage, and handling of hazardous materials, which would take into account procedures for hazardous material spills on uncovered ground. Taking into account local and state regulations for hazardous material handling, a less than significant impact is seen.

- 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:

Based on evidence provided by the Applicant, the subject site is serviced by the City of Fresno for potable water. The Applicant's Operational Statement also references to use of an on-site well for fire suppression. Based on the availability of potable water provided by the City of Fresno, the project is not expected to substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge outside of supplies utilized by the City of Fresno for their water system. The onsite well that would be utilized for fire suppression is not expected to have as great an impact on groundwater supplies as it would only be utilized in the event of an emergency which is not expected to occur on

a basis that would have detrimental effects on groundwater supplies. Therefore the potential usage is expected to have a less than significant impact.

- 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 result in substantial erosion or siltation on or off site?
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 offsite?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The project does not propose additional structures to the subject site. Parking stalls and a proposed aboveground diesel fuel storage tank with containment will be the improvements related to the project. It is noted that the County could require at the minimum 100 feet of paved drive approach from Jensen Avenue to minimize tracking and dust pollution on public right-of-way. Per County standards, drainage unless routed to public facilities should remain on the subject property. Based on the proposed and required improvements, the additional impervious surface is not expected to result in substantial erosion, siltation or flooding on- or off-site.

3. 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?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The subject property is located within the district boundaries of the Fresno Metropolitan Flood Control District (FMFCD). FMFCD has reviewed the subject application and has provided comments relating to standards and regulations the project would be subject to in regard to storm water runoff and drainage. FMFCD has indicated that the drainage area has been master planned, but drainage facilities are not at full buildout. FMFCD has provided comments that will be considered with the project application to ensure that runoff water produced from the project proposal would not exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems. Therefore, with consideration and compliance with applicable regulations and requirements from the FMFCD, the project will have a less than significant impact.

4. Impede or redirect flood flows?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The subject site, per FEMA FIRM Panel C2105H, is located in area designated Zone X, Area of Minimal Flood Hazard. Therefore, the project will not impede or redirect flood flows.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

Per FEMA FIRM Panel C2105H, the subject site is not located in special flood hazard areas. The subject site is not located near any body of water to indicate impact from tsunamis or seiche zones and will not risk the release of pollutants due to project inundation. Per Figure 9-8 of the Fresno County General Plan Background Report, the subject site is not located in dam failure flood inundation areas.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The Department of Public Health, Environmental Health Division has provided comment in the event that abandoned water wells and septic systems shall be properly destroyed to protect groundwater, the State Water Resources Control Board and the Water and Natural Resources Division of the Fresno County Department of Public Works and Planning did not express concern with the application, and the Fresno Metropolitan Flood Control District provided comment regarding their facilities and regulations that the project would be subject to. The project will not conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan.

XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING

Would the project:

- A. Physically divide an established community?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project will not physically divide an established community.

- 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 Policy Planning Section of the Department of Public Works and Planning has identified the following policies of the Agriculture and Land Use Element of the Fresno County General Plan that relate to the subject proposal.

General Plan Policy LU-A.3 states that the County may allow by discretionary permit in areas designated Agriculture, special agricultural uses and agriculturally-related

activities, including value-added processing facilities and certain non-agricultural uses. Approval of these and similar uses in areas designated Agriculture shall be subject to the following criteria: a.) The use shall provide a needed service to the surrounding agricultural area which cannot be provided more efficiently within urban areas or which requires location in a non-urban area because of unusual site requirements or operational characteristics; b.) The use should not be sited on productive agricultural lands if less productive land is available in the vicinity; c.) The operational or physical characteristics of the use shall not have a detrimental impact on water resources or the use or management of surrounding properties within at least one quarter (1/4) mile radius; d.) a probable workforce should be located nearby or be readily available; e.) For proposed agricultural commercial center uses the following additional criteria shall apply: 1.) Commercial uses should be clustered in centers instead of single uses; 2.) To minimize proliferation of commercial centers and overlapping of trade areas, commercial centers should be located a minimum of four (4) miles from any existing or approved agricultural or rural residential commercial center or designated commercial area of any city or unincorporated community; 3.) New commercial center uses should be located within or adjacent to existing centers; 4.) Sites should be located on a major road serving the surrounding area; 5.) Commercial centers should not encompass more than one-quarter (1/4) mile of road frontage, or one eighth (1/8) mile if both sides of the road are involved, and should not provide potential for developments exceeding ten (10) separate business activities, exclusive of caretakers' residences; f.) For proposed value-added agricultural processing facilities, the evaluation under criteria "a" above shall consider the service requirements of the use and the capability and capacity of cities and unincorporated communities to provide the required services; g.) For proposed churches and schools, the evaluation under criteria LU-A.3.a above shall include consideration of the size of the facility. Such facilities should be no larger than needed to serve the surrounding agricultural community; h.) When approving a discretionary permit for an existing commercial use, the criteria listed above shall apply except for LU-A.3.b, e.2, e.4 and e.5.

In regard to Policy LU-A.3.a, the proposed use will allow an agricultural transportation operation to be positioned closer to its customer base than if they were to be located in a more urban setting. For Policy LU-A.3.b, aerial images from 1998 to 2018 suggest that the subject parcel has not been actively farmed and utilized towards a truck and trailer storage area similar to what is being proposed. Therefore, the parcel is not sited on productive agricultural land and is not in conflict with General Plan Policy LU-A.3.b. Regarding Policy LU-A.3.c, the Water and Natural Resources Division and the State Water Resources Control Board did not express concern with the subject application to indicate that the project will result in a detrimental impact on water resources. In regard to Policy LU-A.3.d the project site is located within the sphere of influence of the City of Fresno. The City of Fresno can be seen as having a probably workforce located nearby and readily available for the operation. Regarding Policy LU-A.3.e., f., and g, the project does not propose an agricultural commercial center, value-added agricultural processing facility, church, or school. Policy LU-A.3.h does not apply to the project as the proposed use is not a discretionary permit for an existing commercial use.

General Plan Policy PF-C.17 states that the County shall, prior to consideration of any discretionary project related to land use, undertake a water supply evaluation. The

evaluation shall include the following: a.) A determination that the water supply is adequate to meet the highest demand that could be permitted on the lands in question. If surface water is proposed, it must come from a reliable source and the supply must be made “firm” by water banking or other suitable arrangement. If groundwater is proposed, a hydrogeologic investigation may be required to confirm the availability of water in amounts necessary to meet project demand. If the lands in question lie in an area of limited groundwater, a hydrogeologic investigation shall be required; b.) A determination of the impact that the use of the proposed water supply will have on other water users in Fresno county. If use of surface water is proposed, its use must not have a significant negative impact on agriculture or other water users within Fresno County. If use of groundwater is proposed, a hydrogeologic investigation may be required. If the lands in question lie in an area of limited groundwater, a hydrogeologic investigation shall be required. Should the investigation determine that significant pumping-related physical impacts will extend beyond the boundary of the property in question, those impacts shall be mitigated; c.) A determination that the proposed water supply is sustainable or that there is an acceptable plan to achieve sustainability. The plan must be structured such that it is economically, environmentally, and technically feasible. In addition, its implementation must occur prior to long-term and/or irreversible physical impacts, or significant economic hardship, to surrounding water users.

In regard to Policy PF-C.17, the project proposal and water usage was reviewed by the County’s Water and Natural Resources Division and the State Water Resources Control Board. Evidence was presented to indicate that the parcel currently receives water from the City of Fresno. The City of Fresno was included in the review of the project and did not express concerns with the application’s estimated water usage. As no concerns were expressed by reviewing agencies and departments regarding water usage, a water supply evaluation was not completed.

General Plan Policy PF-D.6 states that the County shall permit individual on-site sewage disposal systems on parcels that have the area, soils, and other characteristics that permit installations of such disposal facilities without threatening surface or groundwater quality or posing any other health hazards and where community sewer service is not available and cannot be provided.

The project does not propose the permitting or installation of additional sewage disposal systems. There are two existing septic systems on the project site that service the two existing single-family residences with no additional sewage disposal system being proposed.

General Plan Policy LU-G.1 states that the County acknowledges that the cities have primary responsibility for planning within their LAFCo-adopted spheres of influence and are responsible for urban development and the provision of urban services within their sphere of influence.

The City of Fresno was included in the project routing. The project site abuts the City of Fresno city limits and is located within their Sphere of Influence. Review of the Edison Community Plan indicates that the subject site is designated for Agriculture. As the subject site will be utilized towards a truck and trailer storage and maintenance facility

devoted exclusively to agriculture, the project was not referred for annexation per the Memorandum of Understanding between the County and City as the proposal is not urban type development.

General Plan Policy LU-G.14 states that the County shall not approve any discretionary permit for new urban development within a city's sphere of influence unless the development proposal has first been referred to the city for consideration of possible annexation pursuant to the policies of this section and provisions of any applicable city/County memorandum of understanding.

The project is an allowable use in the agriculture zoned land subject to a Director Review and Approval (DRA) application and is not considered urban development per the definition stated in the Memorandum of Understanding between the City of Fresno and County of Fresno.

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 7-7 and 7-8 of the Fresno County General Plan Background Report (FCGPBR), the project site is not located on or near a mineral resource site principal mineral producing location.

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?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

Reviewing agencies and departments did not express concern to indicate that the project's potential increase in noise generation would have adverse impacts on sensitive receptors. The proposed operation will be subject to the noise thresholds established under the Fresno County Noise Ordinance. If the operation were to exceed thresholds, a complaint would be submitted to the Fresno County Department of Public

Health, Environmental Health Division for enforcement of the Noise Ordinance. The nearest sensitive receptor is approximately 170 feet west of the main access drive that the trucks and trailers will utilize to enter and leave the site. The parking stalls for the trucks and trailers will be located approximately 495 feet north of W. Jensen Avenue towards the rear of the project site away from sensitive receptors. In considering the potential increase in noise levels and established thresholds from the Fresno County Noise Ordinance, a less than significant impact is seen.

- 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:

The project site is located within two miles of the Fresno Chandler Executive Airport. According to County records the project site is out of the boundaries of the noise contours and traffic pattern zones of the identified airport. The project will not expose people residing or working within the project area to excessive noise levels.

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 not induce substantial unplanned population growth as the proposal requests to allow an agricultural truck and trailer maintenance and storage facility with approximately 17 employees (4 employees on site and 13 truck drivers). The project will convert one of the single-family dwelling units to an office to support the proposed operation. The conversion of one single-family dwelling unit is not considered a substantial number and does not necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

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 public services?

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The Fresno County Fire Protection District reviewed the subject application and did not express concern to indicate that the project proposal would adversely impact service, response times or other performance objectives. No other reviewing agencies or departments expressed concern with the project proposal.

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 will not increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities and does not include or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. As a note, the Fresno Regional Sports Complex is located within close proximity of the project site. The proposal will not increase utilization of the sports complex.

XVI. 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. Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

A Trip Generation and Distribution Study (TGD) was produced for the project to address potential project trip generation including A.M. and P.M. Peak Hour trip generation. Per the TGD, there are four employees, 13 truck drivers and two deliveries of packages and supplies expected per day. The estimated trip generation of the project is a total of 46 trips and based on hours of operation no A.M. Peak Hour trips are generated, but 9 P.M. Peak Hour trips will be generated. The Design Division reviewed the subject TGD and determined that the project's trip generation does not trigger County thresholds for a Traffic Impact Study. There were no expressed concerns with reviewing agencies and departments to indicate that the project would conflict with any County program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system. The project's TGD was considered under trip generation and not vehicle miles traveled. In considering vehicle miles traveled (VMT), the projects location among agricultural operations allow them to be located near their customer base potentially reducing VMT for operation related traffic while also being located near the City of Fresno. Therefore the project is not believed to be in conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines.

- 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: NO IMPACT:

Per the Development Engineering Section of the Fresno County Department of Public Works and Planning, Jensen Avenue is classified as an arterial with no new access points to Jensen Avenue allowed without prior approval. Per the submitted site plan, access to and from Jensen Avenue will be from the existing driveway. For an arterial classified road right-of-way, County standards require that on-site turnaround is available for vehicles leaving the site in a forward motion so that vehicles do not back out onto the roadway. County standards also require that any existing or proposed entrance gate should be set back a minimum of 20 feet from the road right-of-way line or the length of the longest truck entering the site and shall not swing outward to allow safe entrance of vehicles on the site from the road right-of-way and reduce the chance of blockage of the right-of-way. With the project's compliance with County standards the project will not substantially increase hazards due to design features. Reviewing agencies and departments did not express concern with regard to emergency access. The Fresno County Fire Protection District reviewed the subject application and did not indicate the project has inadequate emergency access.

XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

- 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:

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: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED:

Per Assembly Bill 52 (AB 52), participating California Native American Tribes were given the opportunity to enter into consultation with the County of Fresno on potential impacts to tribal cultural resources. No participating California Native American Tribe expressed concern with the subject application. Per County records, the subject site is not located in an archaeologically sensitive area. A mitigation measure will be implemented to address tribal cultural resources in the event that they are unearthed during ground disturbing activities.

* **Mitigation Measure(s)**

1. *See Section V. Cultural Resources, Mitigation Measure 1*

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: NO IMPACT:

The proposed operation will result in the parcel being utilized as a truck and trailer storage and maintenance facility for vehicles devoted exclusively to transportation of agricultural products, supplies, and equipment. The project will not require or result in the construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunication 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:

Per the Applicant, water is supplied to the subject parcel by the City of Fresno. The State Water Resources Control Board, the Fresno County Water and Natural Resources Division, and the City of Fresno did not express concern with the subject application to indicate that the project would negatively impact water supplies.

- 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:

Per building permit records and the submitted site plan, the subject parcel is improved with two septic systems that service the existing single-family residences on the site. There is no additional septic system proposed with this application and there is no proposed connection to a wastewater treatment provider.

- 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: NO IMPACT:

The Applicant's Operational Statement declares that the proposed operational will generate a minimum amount of solid waste and estimated the daily solid waste generation to be less than 0.1 cubic yard. The solid waste generated from the project would be placed in a dumpster that is serviced by a private hauler. Reviewing agencies and departments did not express concern with the estimated solid waste generation resulting from the project proposal. No concerns were expressed to indicate that the project would be in conflict with federal, state, and local management and reductions statutes 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:

Per the 2007 Fire Hazard Severity Zones in LRA Map from the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection, the subject site is not located on or near land designated as a fire hazard severity zone. The project site is located in close proximity of the city limits of the City of Fresno and is not likely to be subject to wildfires.

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 site is located within the sphere of influence of the City of Fresno and is located in close proximity of the city limits of the City of Fresno. Aerial images of the site indicate that the parcel has been utilized for similar uses to the proposed use and is not substantially degrading the quality of the environment or reducing habitat for wildlife species. The project does not threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community and will not eliminate examples of California history or prehistory.

- 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:

Potential cumulative impacts related to Aesthetics, Air Quality, Cultural Resources, and Tribal Cultural Resources have been determined to be less than significant based on

compliance with recommended mitigation measures. Potential cumulative impacts from Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Transportation have been assessed through a Greenhouse Gas Emissions Analysis and Trip Generation and Distribution Study. Both analyses concluded that the project would not have cumulative impacts on their respective study areas.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

Based on the conducted analysis, no substantial adverse effects on human beings were identified as a result of the project.

CONCLUSION/SUMMARY

Based upon the Initial Study prepared for Director Review and Approval Application No. 4601, 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 Agricultural and Forestry Resources, Biological Resources, Mineral Resources, Population and Housing, Public Services, Recreation, Utilities and Service Systems, and Wildfire.

Potential impacts related to Energy, Geology and Soils, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Hydrology and Water Quality, Land-Use Planning, Noise, and Transportation have been determined to be less than significant. Potential impacts relating to Aesthetics, Air Quality, Cultural Resources, and Tribal Cultural Resources have determined to be less than significant with compliance of recommended 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" Street, Fresno, California.

TK

G:\4360Devs&Pln\PROJSEC\PROJDOCS\DRA\4600-4699\4601\IS-CEQA\DRA 4601 IS Writeup.docx