



# County of Fresno

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

## EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

APPLICANT: Govinder K. Singh

APPLICATION NOS.: Initial Study Application No. 7705 and Conditional Use Permit Application No. 3657

DESCRIPTION: Allow a religious facility (temple) with related improvements on an approximately 1.52-acre portion of a 5.02-acre parcel in the RR (Rural Residential, two-acre minimum parcel size) Zone District.

LOCATION: The subject parcel is located on the west side of N. Brawley Avenue approximately 435 feet north of its intersection with W. Olive Avenue and 1,864 feet south of the nearest city limits of the City of Fresno (1501 N. Brawley Avenue, Fresno) (SUP. DIST. 1) (APN 312-112-26).

### 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 borders with Brawley Avenue which is not designated as state scenic highway in the County General Plan (Scenic Roadways, Figure OS-2). There are no scenic vistas or scenic resources including trees, rock outcroppings, or historic buildings on or near the site that may be impacted by the subject proposal. No impact on scenic resources would occur.

- 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 project entails construction of a 5,000 square-foot building (comprised of assembly hall, kitchen, and restrooms) with parking and related improvements on a 1.52-acre portion of a 5.02-acre parcel. The building will be used as a place of worship. The existing improvement include a single-family residence on the property.

A condition of approval will be included to require a maintained landscaping buffer within the required thirty-five-foot setback fronting Brawley Avenue on the property's eastern property line. A Project Note would require that pursuant to County Zoning Ordinance Section 855-E. 3. a., a solid masonry wall shall be constructed to screen the parking area and to prevent headlight glare along the property's southern boundary. Staff notes at this time the parcel to the south is undeveloped, so specific impacts to the southern property have been determined to be less than significant.

The project site is in a rural residential area developed with single-family homes and related improvements. Construction of the proposed 14-foot-tall single-story building would not significantly change the visual characteristics of the project area. The building will be set back approximately 278 feet from Brawley Avenue and be comparable in height and construction with existing improvements in the area. The visual impact would be less than significant.

- 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:

Use of outdoor lighting for the project has the potential of generating new sources of light and glare in the area. The potential for headlight glare related to parking area is discussed in subsection C above. To minimize any light and glare impact resulting from this proposal, 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 toward 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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The project will not convert Prime Farmland to non-agricultural use. The project site is designated as Unique Farmland and Rural Residential Land on 2016 Fresno County Important Farmland Map.

Per the Fresno County Department of Agriculture comments on the project, the project site has existing nearby agricultural crops to the north and south. Although properties in the immediate vicinity are also zoned for Rural Residential uses, given the concern that normal agricultural practices may create dust and require scheduled pesticide treatments, which could affect on-site activities and assemblies, a Right-to-Farm Notice shall be recorded for the project. This requirement will be included as a Condition of Approval.

- B. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act Contract?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project is not in conflict with current zoning and is an allowed use on land designated for rural residential with discretionary approval and adherence to the applicable General Plan Policies. The project site is not in Williamson Act Land Conservation 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?

- 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 project site is not in an area designated for timberland or zoned for timberland production. No forests occur in the vicinity; therefore, no impacts to forests, conversion of forestland, or timberland zoning would occur because of the subject proposal.

According to the County Zoning Ordinance, the project site is zoned RR (Rural Residential, two-acre minimum parcel size) for residential development. The project would not result in conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use.

### 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. To identify San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD) rules or regulations that apply to this project including but not limited to Regulation VIII (Fugitive PM10 Prohibitions); Rule 4601 (Architectural Coatings); and Rule 9510-Indirect Source Review, or to obtain information about District permit requirements, the applicant will be required to consult with SJVAPCD.

The project would comply with all applicable Air Resources Board (ARB) and the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD) rules and regulations and would 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 below in Section III. B. The project complies with all applicable rules and regulations from the applicable air quality plans and is not considered inconsistent with the AQP. The impact would be less than significant.

- 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 reviewed the subject proposal and offered no comments except the project proponent shall contact the District to identify District rules/regulations that apply to the project, or to obtain information about District permit requirements.

An Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Analysis Report was prepared for the project by Mitchell Air Quality Consulting, dated February 19, 2020. The Report along with the project information was provided to the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD) for review and comments. Upon receipt by the District, County staff were not advised on any concerns.

Per the Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Analysis Report, the proposed project's construction and operations would contribute the following criteria pollutant emissions: reactive organic gases (ROG), carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>), sulfur dioxide (SO<sub>2</sub>), and particulate matter (PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub>). Project operations would generate air pollutant emissions from mobile sources (automobile activity from employees) and area sources (incidental activities related to facility maintenance). Criteria and Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions were estimated using the California

Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) version 2016.3.2 [California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA) 2017] which is the most current version of the model approved for use by SJVAPCD.

Per the Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Impact Analysis, the District's annual emission significance thresholds used for the project define the substantial contribution for both construction and operational emissions are 100 tons per year of carbon monoxide (CO), 10 tons per year of oxides of nitrogen (NOx), 10 tons per year of reactive organic gas (ROG), 27 tons per year of oxides of Sulphur (SOx), 15 tons per year of particulate matters of 10 microns or less in size (PM<sub>10</sub>), and 15 tons per year of particulate matters of 2.5 microns or less in size (PM<sub>2.5</sub>).

Construction emissions associated with the project from each year of construction activities (year 2020 through 2021) were compared with the significance threshold. Construction Air Pollutant Emission would be 2.85 tons per year of CO, 3.22 tons per year of NOx, 0.43 ton per year of ROG, 0.39 ton per year of PM<sub>10</sub>, and 0.22 ton per year of PM<sub>2.5</sub> which is less than the threshold. The project does not contain sources that would produce substantial quantities of SO<sub>2</sub> emissions during construction and operation. Therefore, the project emissions would be less than significant.

Operational emissions occur over the lifetime of the project and are from primarily from mobile sources. Since the project is normally occupied on one day per week, and expected to be operational in 2021, mobile sources, and energy required for heating or cooling will be limited. Per the emissions modeling results for project Operational Air Pollutant Emissions (both from energy and mobile sources) would be a total of 0.16 ton per year of CO, 0.07 ton per year of NOx, 0.06 ton per year of ROG, 0.04 ton per year of PM<sub>10</sub>, and 0.01 ton per year of PM<sub>2.5</sub> which is less than the annual emission significance thresholds. Therefore, the project emissions would be less than significant.

Speaking of cumulative health impacts, the Air Basin is in nonattainment for ozone PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub> which means that the background levels of those pollutants are at times higher than the ambient air quality standards. Therefore, when the concentration of those pollutants exceeds the standard, it is likely that some sensitive individuals (such as children, the elderly, and the infirm) in the population would experience health effects.

Since the Basin is nonattainment for ozone, PM<sub>10</sub>, and PM<sub>2.5</sub>, it is considered to have an existing significant cumulative health impact without the project. When this occurs, the analysis considers whether the project's contribution to the existing violation of air quality standards is cumulatively considerable. The SJVAPCD regional thresholds for NOx, VOC, PM<sub>10</sub>, or PM<sub>2.5</sub> are applied as cumulative contribution thresholds. Projects that exceed the regional thresholds would have a cumulatively considerable health impact. As discussed earlier, the regional analysis of construction and operational emissions indicate that the project would not exceed the District's significance thresholds and the project is consistent with the applicable Air Quality Attainment Plan. Therefore, the project would not result in significant cumulative health impacts.

C. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

**FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:**

Sensitive receptor is considered a location that houses or attracts children, the elderly, people with illnesses, or others who are especially sensitive to the effects of air pollutants. This includes hospitals, residences, convalescent facilities, and schools. The project may be considered a sensitive receptor location since it serves families with children.

Speaking of Localized Pollutant Analysis, emissions occurring at or near the project have the potential to create a localized impact, also referred to as an air pollutant hotspot. Localized emissions are considered significant if when combined with background emissions, they would result in exceedance of any health-based air quality standard.

Per the Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Impact Analysis, an analysis of maximum daily emissions during construction and operation was conducted to determine if emissions would exceed 100 pounds per day for any pollutant of concern. Per the screening analysis the maximum Daily Air Pollutant Emissions during construction would be 22.37 pounds per day CO, 45.2 pounds per day of NOx, 6.31 pounds per day of ROG, 10.56 pounds per day of PM<sub>10</sub>, and 6.55 pounds per day of PM<sub>2.5</sub> which is less than 100 pounds per day of screening threshold. Likewise, the maximum Daily Air Pollutant Emissions during 2021 operations (generated on-site by area sources such as consumer products, and landscape maintenance, energy use, and motor vehicle operation at the project site) would be 2.9 pounds per day CO, 1.0 pounds per day of NOX, 0.64 pound per day of ROG, 0.66 pound per day of PM<sub>10</sub>, and 0.18 pound per day of PM<sub>2.5</sub> which is less than 100 pounds per day of screening threshold. The project would not exceed SJVAPCD screening thresholds for localized criteria pollutant impacts during construction and operation; therefore, the project's localized criteria pollutant impacts would be less than significant.

Speaking of Carbon monoxide hot spot analysis, localized high levels of CO are associated with traffic congestion and idling or slow-moving vehicles. Construction of the project would result in minor increases in traffic for the surrounding road network during the duration of construction. CO hotspot modeling conducted for the City of Fresno General Plan Master Environmental Impact Report found that no CO hotspot modeling is required unless projects exceed 36,000 peak hourly trips. The project is estimated to generate 183 trips per day on Sundays (the day of the week with the most trips per day) using CalEEMod defaults. This amounts to a small fraction of the peak hourly rate and would not require modeling to demonstrate that a CO hotspot is not possible. In addition, the highest background 8-hour average of carbon monoxide during the latest year CO was monitored is 2.06 ppm, which is 78 percent lower than the state ambient air quality standard of 9.0 ppm. Therefore, the project would not significantly contribute to an exceedance of state or federal CO standards.

Regarding Toxic Air Contaminants (TAC), the project is not a potential source of TAC emissions that would have a potential impact on nearby residences.

Speaking of Valley fever, it is an infection caused by inhalation of the spores of the fungus, *Coccidioides immitis* (*C. immitis*). Activities or conditions that increase the amount of fugitive dust contribute to greater exposure include dust storms, grading, and recreational off-road activities.

Per the Air quality and Greenhouse Gas Analysis Report, the project site is situated on previously disturbed farmland that does not provide suitable habitat for the spores. Therefore, implementation of the project would have a low probability of the site having *C. immitis* growth sites and exposure to the spores from disturbed soil. Although conditions are not favorable, construction activities could generate fugitive dust that contain *C. immitis* spores. The project will minimize the generation of fugitive dust during construction activities by complying with the District's Regulation VIII. Therefore, this regulation, combined with the relatively low probability of the presence of *C. immitis* spores would reduce Valley fever impacts to less than significant. During operations, dust emissions are anticipated to be relatively small, because most of the project area would be occupied by the proposed church building, gravel surfaces, and pavement. This condition would lessen the possibility of the project from providing habitat suitable for *C. immitis* spores and for generating fugitive dust that may contribute to Valley fever exposure. Impacts would be less than significant.

Speaking of Naturally Occurring asbestos, the project site is not located in an area where naturally occurring asbestos in California are likely to occur (U.S. Geological Survey 2011). Development of the project will not expose receptors to naturally occurring asbestos. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

**FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:**

Per the Air quality and Greenhouse Gas Analysis Report, land uses that are typically identified as sources of objectionable odors include landfills, transfer stations, sewage treatment plants, wastewater pump stations, composting facilities, feed lots, coffee roasters, asphalt batch plants, and rendering plants. The project entails establishment of a place of worship and its operation will not generate objectionable odors.

During construction, various diesel-powered vehicles and equipment in use on-site would create localized odors which would be temporary and not likely to be noticed for extended periods of time beyond the project's site boundaries. The potential for diesel odor impacts would therefore be less than significant. Also, no major odor-generating sources were identified within the screening distances of the site as recommended by SJVAPCD.

The project is not a major odor-generating source; therefore, the project would not cause significant odor impacts.

#### **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 project site is near urbanizing areas of the City of Fresno and has been historically developed with single family residences and related improvements both in the incorporated and unincorporated areas. The neighboring parcels are also pre-disturbed with residential development and as such do not provide habitat for state or federally listed species. Additionally, the site contains no riparian features or wetlands or waters under the jurisdiction of the United States.

This proposal was routed 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 during the prescribed comment period. Therefore, no impacts were identified in regard to: 1) Any candidate, sensitive, or special-status species; 2) Any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by CDFW or USFWS; and 3) Federally-protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act.

- 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 area is in proximity to City of Fresno development, has generally been developed with Rural Residential and urban development in the unincorporated areas, and cannot be characterized as an area for migratory wildlife species or suitable for migratory wildlife corridors. As stated earlier, the project site is in a rural residential area developed with single-family homes.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project will not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources.

- 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 subject property is within the PG&E San Joaquin Valley Operation and Maintenance Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) area which applies to the activities related to PG&E's operations. The project is not in conflict with HCP

## 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 project site is not within or near an area sensitive to historical, archeological, or paleontological resources. A record search of the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) Sacred Lands File was completed for the project and the results were negative. Although, Table Mountain Rancheria (TMR) declined participation in AB (Assembly Bill) 52 for the proposal but requested to be notified in the unlikely event that cultural resources are unearthed during ground disturbance. Given TMR concerns, the project will adhere to the following mitigation measure to ensure that impacts to cultural resources remain less than significant.

\* **Mitigation Measure**

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, reports, 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?
- FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The project will not result in inefficient, wasteful, or unnecessary energy use. As such, the energy consumption (gas, electricity, gasoline, and diesel) resulting from construction of 5,000 square feet building and related improvements would 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:

All project related construction activities would comply with the 2019 Building Energy Efficiency Standards effective January 1, 2020. Pursuant to the California Building Standards Code and the Energy Efficiency Standards, the County would review the design components of the project's energy conservation measures when the Project's building plans are submitted. These measures could include insulation; use of energy-efficient heating, ventilation, and air conditioning equipment (HVAC); solar-reflective roofing materials; energy-efficient indoor and outdoor lighting systems; and other measures.

## 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. Grading activities resulting from this proposal may result in loss of some topsoil due to compaction and overcovering of soil to prepare for the foundation for restroom and parking. However, the impact would be less than significant with the project requiring approval of an Engineered Grading and Drainage Plan and obtaining Grading Permit prior to the 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-site or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse due to the project-related improvements. A soil compaction report, may be required prior to the issuance of building permits to ensure the weight-bearing capacity of the soils for the building.

**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: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

According to the City of Fresno, Department of Public Utilities, the nearest sanitary sewer main to serve the proposed project is a 12-inch sewer main located 4,800 feet northeast of the project site at the intersection of N. Valentine and W. McKinley Avenue. The City expressed no concerns with the property utilizing private septic system.

Per the comments provided by the Fresno County Department of Public Health, Environmental Health Division (Health Department), the project will adhere to the following requirements included as Project Notes: 1) sewage disposal system for the proposed building shall be installed under permit and inspection by the Department of Public Works and Planning Building and Safety Section; and 2) the applicant should consider having the existing septic tanks pumped and have the tank and leach lines evaluated by an appropriately licensed contractor if it has not been serviced and/or maintained within the last five years.

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT 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 (CO<sub>2</sub>) 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. In the Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Analysis Report, completed by Mitchell Air Quality Consulting and dated February 19, 2020, GHG emissions were estimated using the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) version 2016.3.2 [California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA) 2017], which is the most current version of the model approved for use by SJVAPCD.

Per the Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Analysis Report, construction Greenhouse Gas Emissions during the construction year 2020 and 2021 would be 260.57 and 293.11 metric tons CO<sub>2</sub>e per year respectively with a total of 553.67 MTCO<sub>2</sub>e. When amortized over 30 years for non-residential, it would be 18.46 metric tons CO<sub>2</sub>e per year which is less than significant.

Operational Greenhouse Emissions may include source of emission from motor vehicles, energy usage, waste generation, and area sources, such as consumer products and landscaping activities.

Per the Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Analysis Report, the project would achieve a reduction of 28.1 percent from BAU (Business As Usual) by the year 2021 with various emission reduction regulations incorporated. This is 6.4 percent above the 21.7 percent average reduction from all sources of GHG emissions now required to achieve AB (assembly Bill) 32 targets. The 28.1 percent reduction from BAU is 6.4 percent beyond the average reduction required by the State from all sources to achieve the AB 32 2020 target. The project would achieve a reduction of 38.9 percent from BAU by the year 2030. This is 17.2 percent reduction and the project will achieve it beyond the 2020 target by 2030 through compliance with the existing regulations.

The project is consistent with the 2017 Scoping Plan and will contribute a reasonable fair-share contribution to achieving the 2030 target through compliance with state regulations that apply to new development, such as Title 24 and CALGreen; regulations on energy production, fuels, and motor vehicles that apply to both new and existing development; and voluntary actions to improve energy efficiency in existing development. In addition, compliance with the VMT targets adopted to comply with SB (Senate Bill) 375 may be considered to adequately address GHG emissions from passenger cars and light-duty trucks. The state's Cap-and-Trade Program whose cost will be passed on to consumers of fuels, electricity, and products produced by regulated industries. Therefore, the greenhouse gas emissions impact on the environment would be less than significant as it relates to this project.

- 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:**

Assembly Bill (AB) 32 adopted by the State of California in 2006 focuses on reducing GHGs (CO<sub>2</sub>, methane, nitrous oxide, hydrofluorocarbons, perfluorocarbons, and sulfur hexafluoride) to 1990 levels by the year 2020. Pursuant to the requirements in AB 32, the Air Resource Board (ARB) adopted the Climate Change Scoping Plan (Scoping

Plan) in 2008, which outlines actions recommended to obtain that goal. The Scoping Plan calls for reduction in California's GHG emissions, cutting approximately 30 percent (currently 21.7 percent) from BAU emission levels projected for 2020, or about 10 percent from 2008 levels. The ARB has updated its emission inventory forecasts and now estimates a reduction of 21.7 percent is required from BAU in 2020 to achieve AB 32 targets.

The Scoping Plan contains a variety of strategies to reduce the State's emissions. The project is consistent with most of the strategies, while others are not applicable to the project.

## 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: NO IMPACT:

Being a religious facility, the project (Sikh temple) does not involve in the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. No Impact would occur.

The nearest school, McKinley Elementary School, is approximately 2, 696 feet (one half-mile) 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 NEPAssist, the project site is not listed as a hazardous materials site. No impact would occur.

- 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 7.4 miles east of the project site. Given the 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:

The project will not expose persons or structures to wildland fire hazards. 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.

## 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:** LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

See discussion in Section VII. E. Geology and Soils regarding waste discharge requirements.

Per the State Water Resources Control Board, Division of Drinking Water (SWRCB - DDW) comments related to water quality, the project will meet the definition of transient non-community public water system and must obtain a drinking water permit from SWRCB-DDW prior to operating the proposed facility (Sikh temple). As such, the project shall require compliance with Senate Bill (SB) 1263 which requires that prior to applying for a water permit for a proposed new public water system, the applicant first shall submit a preliminary technical report at least 6 months prior to initiating construction of any water-related improvement.

A Condition of Approval would require that the applicant shall submit a preliminary technical report to and obtain a drinking water permit from SWRCB-DDW prior to the issuance of building permits for the project by the County.

The Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region also reviewed the subject proposal and expressed no concerns related to the degradation of surface or 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:**

Per the City of Fresno, Department of Public Utilities, the project site is within the City of Fresno Sphere of Influence (SOI) in Growth Area 2 formally named South East Growth Area (SEGA) service zone. According to the Ground Water Sustainability Act (GWSA) of 2014, Growth Area 2, is not allowed new development until the year 2035. Therefore, the City requires that the existing well on the property shall provide for fire flow and domestic needs of the project.

The project will use an estimated 1,200 gallons of water per day. Per the comments provided by the Water and Natural Resources Division of the Fresno County Department of Public Works and Planning, the project is not located in a water short area and the current water supply is adequate 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:**

Development of the project 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. As noted in Section VII. B. Geology and Soils above, the project would require approval of an Engineered Grading and Drainage Plan and a grading permit or voucher prior to any onsite grading work.

No natural drainage channels run through the project site. The Fresno Irrigation District (FID) active Victoria Colony E. Branch No 43 runs approximately 4,600 feet northeast; Victoria Colony W. Branch No 43 runs approximately 2,400 feet northeast; Houghton No. 78 run approximately 3,100 feet southwest of the project site. A Project Note would require that plans for any street and/or utility improvements along or in the vicinity of these facilities shall require FID review and approval. Another Project Note would require that a privately-owned canal (Tracy S. Branch No. 44) which runs 2,000 feet northwest of the project site is an active canal and shall be treated as such.

Furthermore, in accordance with the Fresno Metropolitan Control District comments on the project, a Project Note would require temporary on-site storm water storage facility until permanent FMFCD facilities become available and drainage can be directed to the street.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

Per the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FIRM) Panel 1665H, the project site is not subject to flooding from the 100-year storm.

- 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 within the North Kings Groundwater Sustainability Area (NKGSA) and was reviewed by that agency. As the City of Fresno allows the project to connect with the existing onsite well for fire and domestic needs of the project and the County Water and Geology Division determination that the project is not located in a water short area and the current water supply is adequate to support the project, the preparation of a water demand analysis for the project as suggested by NKGSA was not unnecessary.

## 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. The project is located approximately 1,871 feet south of the nearest boundary of the City of Fresno.

- 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 project will not conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project. The project site is within the City of Fresno Sphere of Influence (SOI). No concerns with the proposal were expressed the City of Fresno Planning and Development Department.

The project site is designated Rural Residential in the County General Plan and zoned RR (Rural Residential, two-acre minimum parcel size) in the County Zoning Ordinance. The proposed religious facility (temple) is considered as a compatible use on residentially zoned property subject to the approval of a discretionary land use application. The project is consistent with the following General Plan policies:

Regarding consistency with General Plan Policy PF-C.17, the project site is not in a water-short area. The project will continue using the existing onsite well as a source of water supply or may connect with the City of Fresno public water system, if deemed available by the State Water Resources, Division of Drinking Water.

Regarding consistency with General Plan Policy PF-D.6, the project site can accommodate a new sewage disposal system for the temple building under permit and inspection from the Department of Public Works and Planning Building and Safety Section.

## 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?

**FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:**

The project has the potential to expose nearby residents to elevated noise levels during construction. A Project Note would require that all construction related noise shall adhere to the Fresno County Noise Ordinance. The project applicant has not proposed amplified outdoor sound equipment as part of their operational statement. To ensure that does not occur, a Condition of Approval will be included stating the use of any outdoor amplification system shall be prohibited.

- 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 is not located within two miles of a public airport or public use airport.

#### 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 population growth in the area. No housing is proposed in addition to the existing single-family residence on the property.

#### 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: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

Per the North Central Fire Protection District (NCFPD), the project shall comply with California Code of Regulations Title 24 – Fire Code and California Code of Regulations Title 19 and construction plans shall be submitted to the County for prior to receiving NCFPD conditions of approval for the project. This requirement will be included as a Project Note.

2. Police protection?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project was routed to the Fresno County Sheriff's office which did not provide any comments. No impact on police protection would occur.

3. Schools; or
4. Parks; or
5. Other public facilities?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project will not impact the existing public services or result in the need for additional public services related to schools, or parks.

## 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 induce population growth which may require 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?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED:

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

The Design Division of the Fresno County Department of Public Works and Planning reviewed the project and required that a Traffic Impact Study (TIS) shall be prepared to assess the project's potential impacts to County and State roadways.

Peters Engineering Group prepared a Traffic Impact Study (TIS), dated February 24, 2021 which determined the following:

The study intersections are currently operating at acceptable LOS (Level of Service) during the Sunday peak hours with acceptable calculated 95th-percentile queues. With construction of the project and other pending projects, the study intersections are expected to continue to operate at acceptable level of Service (LOS) during Sunday peak hours with acceptable calculated 95th-percentile queues. The intersection of Valentine and Olive Avenues is expected to operate at LOS E and F during Sunday peak hours by the year 2040 whether or not the project is constructed. Installation of all-way stop control is expected to result in LOS C or better during Sunday peak hours. The project will generate fewer than an average of 110 trips per day and is responsible for an equitable share of the cost of installing all-way stop control. A left-turn lane at the site access driveway is not warranted based on the cumulative year 2040 traffic volumes

The Design Division and Road Maintenance and Operations (RMO) Division of the Fresno County Department of Public Works and Planning reviewed the TIS, consulted with the Peters Engineering Group and determined that the project is responsible for an equitable share of the cost of installing all-way stop control for a total cost of \$12,000. The project's share would be \$330 and this requirement has been included as a Mitigation Measure.

\* **Mitigation Measure:**

1. *At the time of application for a Site Plan Review for the proposed use, the applicant shall enter into an agreement with the County of Fresno to participate on a pro-rata basis per acreage developed in the funding of future off-site traffic improvement defined in items 'a' below. The traffic improvement and the project's maximum pro-rata share is as follows:*

- a. *Install all-way stop control at Valentine and Olive Avenue. The project's maximum share is \$330.00 for a total cost of \$12,000.00.*

*The County shall update cost estimates for the above specified improvements prior to execution of the agreement. The Board of Supervisors pursuant to Ordinance Code Section 17.88 shall annually adopt a Public Facilities Fee addressing the updated pro-rata costs. The Public Facilities Fee shall be related to off-site road improvements, plus costs required for inflation based on the Engineering New Record (ENR) 20 Cities Construction Cost Index.*

The subject proposal is within City of Fresno Sphere of Influence. The City also commented on the TIS with regards to impact on City roadways/intersections and requires that the project shall be paying Traffic Signal Mitigation Impact (TSMI) Fee per the City's Master Plan Schedule, Fresno Major Street Impact (FMSI) Fee and Regional Transportation Mitigation Fee (RTMF) prior to issuance of building permits.

Per the comments provided by Road Maintenance and Operations (RMO) Division, Brawley Avenue is a Collector road with an existing 30 feet right-of-way west of section line along parcel's easterly frontage. The minimum width for a local right-of-way west of section line is 42 feet. A Condition of Approval would require that a 12-feet in additional right-of-way shall be provided for Brawley Avenue. The City of Fresno, right-of-way standards for Brawley Avenue west of section line is 76 feet.

- B. Be in conflict or be inconsistent with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?

**FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:**

The State of California Governor's Office of Planning and Research document entitled *Technical Advisory on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA* dated December 2018 (OPR Technical Advisory) indicates that projects that generate or attract fewer than 110 trips per day generally may be presumed to cause a less-than-significant transportation impact.

Per the Traffic Impact Study (TIS), the project will operate two times per month. The estimated daily number of trips is up to 132 trips per day that will occur approximately twice per month causes an average daily VMT of approximately nine vehicles (or nine trips per day). Since the Project will generate fewer than 110 trips per day, the impact on transportation as it relates to VMT would be less than significant.

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

**FINDING: NO IMPACT:**

The project site border with Brawley Avenue which intersects McKinley Avenue to the north and Olive Avenue to the south. The project access from Brawley Avenue will not

create traffic hazards due to the current roadway configuration. As noted above, the project will be subject to providing additional right-of-way for Brawley Avenue.

D. Result in inadequate emergency access?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project site will be provided with adequate number of access for general and emergency uses. Out of the two proposed access drives off Brawley Avenue one will be used or ingress and egress by the proposed building (temple).

The Fresno County Fire Protection District expressed no concerns related to the site emergency access and will conduct additional review prior to the issuance of building permits.

## 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: LESS THAN IMPACT:

The project site is not in an area determined to be highly or moderately sensitive to archeological resources. 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. However, Table Mountain Rancheria (TMR) requested that in the unlikely event that cultural resources are identified on the property, the Tribe should be

informed. The Mitigation Measure included in the CULTURAL ANALYSIS section of this report will reduce impact to tribal cultural resources to less than significant.

## 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: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT 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: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT 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: NO IMPACT:

The project development will not generate solid waste more than the capacity of local landfill sites.

All solid wastes produced by the proposed facility will be collected for the local landfill through regular trash collection service and adhere to local and state standards for disposal of solid wastes.

## 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 area or land classified as very high fire hazard severity zones. The Fresno County Fire Protection District expressed no concerns 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: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The project will have no impact on biological resources. Impacts on cultural resources have been reduced to a less than significant level with the incorporation of a Mitigation Measure discussed in Section V. CULTURAL RESOURCES above.

- 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, Air quality or Transportation were identified in the project analysis. Impacts identified for Aesthetics, Cultural Resources, and Transportation will be mitigated by compliance with the Mitigation Measures listed in Sections I., V., and XVII 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. 7705 prepared for Classified Conditional Use Permit Application No. 3657, 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, hazards and hazardous materials, mineral resources, population and housing, recreation, tribal cultural resources, or wildfire.

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

Potential impacts to Aesthetics, Cultural Resources, and Transportation 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&Pln\PROJSEC\PROJDOCS\CUP\3600-3699\3657\IS-CEQA\CUP 3657 IS wu.docx