



County of Fresno

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

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

- APPLICANT: True Organics Products
- APPLICATION NOS.: Initial Study No. 7744 and Classified Conditional Use Permit Application No. 3660
- DESCRIPTION: Allow the production, packaging and storage of organic fertilizer products on a 8.04-acre parcel in the AE-20 (Exclusive Agricultural, 20-acre minimum parcel size) Zone District.
- LOCATION: The project site is located on the north side of W. Kamm Avenue, approximately 950 feet east of its nearest intersection with State Route 145 (S. Lassen Avenue), and is approximately 31,360 feet southeast of the City of San Joaquin.

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 Applicant proposes to utilize existing structures on the property and do not propose any new development. According to Figure OS-2 of the Fresno County General Plan, there area no Scenic Roadways fronting the subject parcel. No scenic resources have been identified on or near the project site and the proposal will bring the existing structures up to code. Therefore, no impact is seen on scenic vistas or scenic resources.

- C. In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage 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 Applicant will utilize existing structures towards the operation of the proposed production, packaging, and storage of organic fertilizer product facility. As the buildings are existing, the project will not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings. The presence of equipment and employees will not have a significant impact on 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:

The Applicants proposes states that the existing structures will be brought up to current building and occupancy code. A Mitigation Measure will be incorporated with the project so that any proposed outdoor lighting shall be hooded and directed downward to avoid glare on adjacent properties or the public right-of-way. The subject parcel is located within an area that is predominately agricultural with a commercial property westerly adjacent. Light and glare produced by operation related vehicles will not have a significant impact as there are minimal to no sensitive receptors in the vicinity to be impacted by the proposed use.

* **Mitigation Measure(s)**

1. *All outdoor 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 located in area identified as Urban and Built-Up Land. The subject parcel is already improved with buildings that will be utilized towards the proposed use. The subject parcel is zoned AE-20 (Exclusive Agricultural, 20-acre minimum parcel size) with the proposed use allowed subject to a Classified Conditional Use Permit. The project site is not subject to a Williamson Act Contract. Based on the project sites designation on the Important Farmland Map and the underlying zone district allowing the subject to the land-use permit, the project will not convert farmland and will not conflict with the existing zoning.

- 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 located in land zoned for forest land, timberland or timberland zoned Timberland Production and 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 use will be housed in an already developed parcel. The project will not result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use as development has already occurred and did not result in further development on adjacent parcels.

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. Would the project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under a Federal or State ambient air quality standard?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

An Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Analysis has been prepared by LSA for the project. Thresholds of significance established by the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control

District were utilized in the Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Analysis to determine if construction and operational criteria pollutants would exceed the threshold. Construction emissions associated with this project were determined to not result in quantifiable construction emissions due to the existing nature of the structures and no additional construction of buildings being proposed. Emissions related to operation of the proposed use were calculated using CalEEMod and determined that project operation emissions in tons per year would not exceed the SJVAPCD thresholds of significance for any criteria pollutants. The Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Analysis was made available to the SJVAPCD with concerns received by staff. Therefore, a less than significant impact is seen when considering the minimal increase in criteria pollutants calculated in the analysis.

- 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:

An Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Analysis identified two main sensitive receptors. One receptor is a single-family residence located approximately 375 feet west of the project site (the closest of any residence in the area) and Helm Elementary School approximately 1,000 feet west of the site. A Health Risk Assessment (HRA) was conducted to calculate possible impacts on nearby sensitive receptors. The HRA calculated that the project would have low risk on sensitive receptors. Review of the project proposal indicates the project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations and would not result in significant other emissions affecting a substantial number or people.

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: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

According to the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB), there has been a reported occurrence of the Swainson's Hawk, encompassing the subject parcel. Per the CNDDDB, the occurrence was reported on April 30, 1913 and the species is presumed to still be in existence. The subject parcel has already been developed and the Applicant proposes to utilize the existing structures towards the proposed use. No additional structures are being proposed from this application. Based on no new structures being proposed with this application, the project will not have a substantial adverse effect on the reported 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 is an identified wetland in the vicinity of the subject parcel. The identified wetland does not traverse through the subject parcel. Existing improvements include a drainage area located on the southern property line which is expected to handle water runoff from the buildings and not runoff to the identified wetlands. No additional structures are being proposed, therefore no impact on the identified wetlands are seen. No riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community has been identified 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:

As the project will utilize existing improvements and does not propose any additional structures, the project will not interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or with migratory wildlife corridors or impede the use of a native wildlife nursery site.

- 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 protecting biological resources that would conflict with the subject project. The project also 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: NO IMPACT:

The project proposes to utilize the existing buildings on the project site, and retrofitting the buildings to address their needs. There is no new development being proposed with the application, therefore no substantial adverse impact is on historical or archaeological resources are anticipated. As there is no ground-disturbance proposed, no disturbance to human remains would occur.

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:

Per the Applicant, the existing buildings will be retrofitted to accommodate the proposed operation. Those retrofits will be subject to the current building code, which takes into consideration energy efficiency. Therefore, the project will not result in significant environmental impacts due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during construction or operation of the project. Reviewing agencies and departments did not express concerns to indicate that the project would conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency.

VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Would the project:

- A. Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:
 - 1. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

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

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

According to Figure 9-5 of the FCGPBR, the project site is not located inside areas identified as having a probabilistic seismic hazard with a substantial peak horizontal ground acceleration. In the absence of substantial seismic hazards occurring on the project site, seismic-related ground failure is not anticipated.

4. Landslides?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

According to Figure 9-6 of the FCGPBR, the project site is not located on or near any identified landslide hazard areas. The project site is located in a relatively flat area with no substantial slopes or grade differences to indicate a landslide hazard is present.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

Per the Applicant's Operational Statement, the project site has already been improved with existing permitted building with no new additional development being planned. The only development involved with the subject application is the retrofitting of the existing building to meet the needs of the proposed operation. The project will not result in additional soil erosion or topsoil loss.

- 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:

Reviewing Agencies and Departments did not identify any geologic unit or soil that would be considered unstable and increase risk to the project site or as a risk, result in on-site or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse.

- 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: NO IMPACT:

According to Figure 7-1 of the FCGPBR, the subject site is not located in area identified as having soils exhibiting moderately high to high expansion potential.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project site is already improved with a septic system that services the existing buildings. The proposed use will utilize the existing buildings and retrofit buildings to current standards. Reviewing Agencies and Departments did not express concern with the soil conditions to indicate incompatibility with septic systems. There were no paleontological resources 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:

The prepared Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Analysis prepared by LSA estimated that operational greenhouse gas emissions resulting from the project proposal. Based on their calculations, the project would result in 101 metric tons of carbon dioxide emissions a year. Other emissions including Methane and Nitrous Oxide will be produced in minimal volumes and is not likely to have a significant impact. The analysis states that as there is no significance threshold for GHG emissions adopted by the County of Fresno or the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD), the analysis evaluates the emissions based on the project's consistency with the SJVAPCD CCAP and other applicable State GHG reduction goals. Based on their analysis, greenhouse gas emissions related to operation would not be cumulatively considerable and would not conflict with the goals of the SJVAPCD CCAP or other state or regional plan, policy, or regulation for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions.

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 Department of Public Health, Environmental Health Division has reviewed the project proposal and indicated that the project will be required to comply with State and Local requirements for reporting and handling hazardous materials/waste. With compliance of these mandatory regulatory requirements, the project is not expected to create a significant hazard to the public or environment. These regulatory requirements also include the preparation of a Hazardous Materials Business Plan that is submitted to the Department of Public Health for compliance with the Health and Safety Code. Therefore, a less than significant impact is seen with compliance with mandatory State and Local requirements.

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

An Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emission Analysis was prepared by LSA and submitted to address emissions resulting from the project proposal. Included in this analysis was a Health Risk Assessment using the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District's (SJVAPCD) Prioritization Calculator determined that the onsite operations of the proposed facility on the nearest resident would not exceed the SJVAPCD screening threshold for hazardous emissions. The closest receptor is located approximately 375 feet from the project site. The nearest school is approximately 1,000 feet east of the project site. Based on the analysis and health risk assessment, project operations are expected to have a less than significant impact in relation to hazardous emissions and the existing school 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 NEPAassist database, the subject site does not contain or is in proximity of a listed hazardous materials site.

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

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

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

Reviewing Agencies and Departments did not express concern with the project to indicate that the proposal would result in the impairment of implementation or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. There were no indicate that the project proposal would 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; or

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The project has been reviewed by the Water and Natural Resources Division, the Stinson Water District, the Regional Water Quality Control Board, and the State Water Resources Control Board. The State Water Resources Control Board states that the project will be subject to Senate Bill 1263 and will require an application for a permit for a new public water system. Comments provided by the State Water Resources Control Board are to be included with the project as a Project Note as this is a regulatory requirement for this project. As there was no additional concerns expressed by reviewing agencies and departments, requirements set forth by the State Water Resources Control Board are to be considered with the project and no indication that this project would violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements, nor is there any evidence that a substantial decrease in groundwater supply would occur.

- 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?
 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; or
 4. Impede or redirect flood flows?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

Review of the submitted site plan and operational statement indicates that there is no new development being proposed with this project. Aerial images indicate that there is a stream located in the northwestern portion of the project site. Although there is a stream located on the subject parcel, as noted, there is no new development involved with the project and the operation will utilize the existing structures. The existing structures will be retrofitted to meet current code standards and meet the operational needs of the project. The project will not result in substantial erosion or siltation, substantially increase the rate of surface runoff, would not contribute runoff that would exceed existing capacity of drainage systems, and will not impede or redirect flood flows.

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

Per FEMA FIRM Panel C2575H, the subject parcel is located within special flood hazard Zone A. The Development Engineering Section of the Department of Public Works and Planning has reviewed the project proposal and indicates that due to the project site being located within an area subject to flooding from a 100-year storm event development shall comply with the County Flood Hazard Ordinance. There is a risk of pollutant release due to project inundation, but the project will be required to comply with the County Flood Hazard Ordinance and State and Local hazardous material handling requirements that will reduce the risk to a less than significant impact.

There are no bodies of water in proximity of the project site that would indicate risk of tsunami or seiche events.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

Reviewing agencies and departments did not indicate that project implementation would conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan. The State Water Resources Control Board will require that the project go through the permitting and analysis associated with a public water system under the provisions of SB 1263. As this is a mandatory regulatory requirement, compliance is expected, therefore no impact is seen.

XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING

Would the project:

- A. Physically divide an established community?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project site is already improved with structures that will be utilized for the proposed operation. 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: NO IMPACT:

Identified policies of the Fresno County General Plan that are relevant to the project include Policy LU-A.3, Policy PF-C.17, and Policy PF-D.6.

- General Plan Policy LU-A.3 relates to allowing certain uses related to agriculture by discretionary permit and include certain criteria that should be considered.

There is no conflict with the project and General Plan Policy LU-A.3. Additional criteria cited in Policy LU-A.3 relate to consideration of alternative sites and available resources including water and employee resources.

- General Plan Policy PF-C.17 reference the undertaking of a water supply evaluation and includes information the evaluation should have.

Reviewing Agencies and Departments did not require preparation of a water supply evaluation. The project will be required by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) to permit their facility with a new public water system. Compliance with the SWRCB (a state regulatory agency) will not be a requirement under the identified General Plan Policy and as stated, no concerns were expressed to require preparation of the evaluation.

- General Plan Policy PF-D.6 provides information regarding permitting of individual on-site sewage disposal systems.

The project proposes to utilize the existing improvements which include an existing septic system. There is no proposal for additional on-site sewage disposal systems, but if a new system is proposed, would be subject to building permits. Therefore, the project is not in conflict with Policy PF-D.6.

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 of the Fresno County General Plan Background Report (FCGPBR), the project site could potentially be located in an identified oilfield. However, due to the existing nature of the buildings and no new development proposed with this application, the project would not result in additional loss of availability of a known mineral resource. According to Figure 7-8 of the FCGPBR, there is no principal mineral producing location in the vicinity of the project site, therefore no impact is seen.

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 will increase noise levels when compared to existing conditions. The nearest sensitive receptor is a single-family residence located approximately 330 feet west of the project site. Review of the proposed operation indicate usage of equipment including front-end loaders/forklifts, but would be in operation during normal operating hours (7:00 AM to 5:00 PM). The Department of Public Health, Environmental Health Division has noted an increase in noise levels, but expects the operation to be compliant with the Fresno County Noise Ordinance. No indication from reviewing agencies or departments relating to significant noise impacts were received, therefore a less than significant impact is seen with mandatory compliance with the Fresno County Noise Ordinance.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project site is not located within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. There does not appear a private airstrip in vicinity of the subject site that would adversely impact people residing or working in the area.

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 proposes to utilize existing structures on the subject site for the operation. The project intends to be utilized as a storage warehouse for an existing fertilizer facility located east of the subject site. The project is not expected to induce substantial unplanned population growth and would not displace a substantial number of people or housing.

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;

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The Fresno County Fire Protection District has reviewed the subject application and did not express concern with the project to indicate the necessity for additional governmental facilities to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

Reviewing agencies and departments did not indicate that the project would result in requiring the provision of new or physically-altered governmental facilities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives.

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 would not result in the increased use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities and would not require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities.

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 Traffic Impact Study (TIS) prepared by the Peters Engineering Group dated April 28, 2020 conducted a trip generation analysis, a traffic index analysis, and previously provided a Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) determination. The Traffic Impact Study concluded that the project would not cause the traffic index to increase on the studied

road segments of Kamm Avenue west of State Route 145 and Kamm Avenue east of State Route 145. Review of the calculations and analysis included with the TIS was completed by the Road Maintenance and Operations Division, the Design Division, and the California Department of Transportation. The reviewing agencies and departments concurred with the conclusions of the Traffic Impact Study. No additional mitigation was required.

In regard to Vehicle Miles Traveled, the scoping letter preceding the Traffic Impact Study noted that the project would generate or attract fewer than 110 trips per day and under the State of California Governor's Office of Planning and Research document entitled Technical Advisory on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA (OPR Guidelines) that fewer than 110 trips may be presumed to cause a less than significant impact. Additional information from OPR Guidelines also indicate that "vehicle miles traveled" refers to the amount and distance of automobile travel attributable to a project. Here the term automobile refers to on-road passenger vehicles, specifically cars and light trucks." Therefore, a VMT analysis was not required as trip generation associated with the project is fewer than 110 trips and is considered to have a less than significant impact.

- 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:

Reviewing agencies and departments did not express concern with the project to indicate that there is inadequate emergency access or hazards due to a design feature of the site. The project is subject to requirements for emergency apparatus accessibility and would be reviewed further for compliance when building permits are issued for this project. The project site currently has site access on Kamm Avenue and is proposed to continue using this access point. No hazard has been identified.

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: NO IMPACT:

As noted in Section V. Cultural Resources, the project proposes to utilize existing structures for their operation and do not propose additional development. The existing structures will be retrofitted for current code compliance and meet their needs. The subject site is not a listed historical resources.

The Table Mountain Rancheria responded to the County's request for consultation under the provisions of Assembly Bill 52 (AB 52) stating that they had concerns with the application. Staff reached out to representative of the Table Mountain Rancheria to clarify the project due to minimal ground disturbance proposed and confirm if the Rancheria would still like to pursue consultation. Staff contacted the representative on January 16, 2020 and again on April 1, 2020 and given a 15-day deadline from April 1, 2020 to confirm consultation. No response was submitted and therefore consultation under AB 52 was closed. No evidence was submitted or discovered to indicate the presence of a cultural resource.

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; or
- 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:

Per the State Water Resources Control Board, the project will be required to submit an application for a permit for a new public water system. Other reviewing agencies and departments including the Water and Natural Resources Division, the Regional Water Quality Control Board, and the Stinson Water District did not express concern with the project proposal to indicate inadequate water supplies to service the project proposal. As the project is already developed, the proposed use would not require additional construction of wastewater treatment, storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities as those improvements are existing and the proposed operation is expected to connect to the existing public utilities.

- 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:

The project site is proposed to be serviced by an existing septic system and no additional system is proposed. Reviewing agencies and departments did not express concern with the project to indicate that there is inadequate capacity to service the operation.

- 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:

Reviewing agencies and departments did not express concern with the operation and proposed increase in waste generation. There were no comments received that indicate the project would result in solid waste generating in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure or impair solid waste reduction goals.

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 Fresno County Fire Hazard Severity in LRA 2007 Map, the subject property is not located in a state responsibility area or land classified as very high fire hazard severity zones. Therefore, the project will have no impact or risk associated with wildfire.

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 subject site is already improved with structures that are proposed to be utilized with the subject operation. There is no additional structure proposed with this project. The project will not substantially degrade the quality of the environment or substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species.

- 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:

No cumulative considerable impact has been identified as a result of this analysis. Impacts related to Aesthetics have been determined to be less than significant with implementation of mitigation measures.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project will not as a result of environmental effect have a substantial adverse effect on human beings.

CONCLUSION/SUMMARY

Based upon the Initial Study prepared for Classified Conditional Use Permit Application No. 3660, 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,

Cultural Resources, Land Use Planning, Mineral Resources, Population and Housing, Public Services, Recreation, Tribal Cultural Resources, and Wildfire.

Potential impacts related to Air Quality, Biological Resources, Energy, Geology and Soils, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Hydrology and Water Quality, Noise, Transportation, and Utilities and Service Systems have been determined to be less than significant. Potential impacts relating to Aesthetics have determined to be less than significant with compliance with listed 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\CUP\3600-3699\3660\IS-CEQA\CUP 3660 IS Writeup.docx