



County of Fresno

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

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

- APPLICANT: SCI Fresno Memorial Gardens
- APPLICATION NOS.: Initial Study No. 7948 and Unclassified Conditional Use Application No. 3692
- DESCRIPTION: Amend CUP No. 270 to allow the construction and operation of a 9,952 square-foot funeral chapel with related offices, including an additional 3,977 square feet of covered exterior area, located on the undeveloped portion of the previously approved cemetery in the AE-20 (Exclusive Agricultural, 20-acre minimum parcel size) Zone District.
- LOCATION: The project site is located on the southeast corner of W. Whitesbridge Ave. (State Route 180) and S. Polk Ave. approximately one mile west of the city limits of the City of Fresno (APN:326-030-81S, 07S, & 10)(175 S Cornelia Avenue) (Sup. Dist.: 1).

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:

No scenic vistas or other scenic resources, buildings or other physical features were identified, and the site is not located in the vicinity of a designated scenic drive or state scenic highway.

- 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 site is currently vacant land in an area predominately characterized by agricultural production, with row crops, vineyards and orchards. It is adjacent to the existing cemetery which contains several existing structures. The project proposes the expansion of the existing cemetery, with the construction and operation of the new funeral home. If approved the new structure will alter the visual character of the area particularly as it pertains to public views of the property from State Route 180 and S. Polk Avenue. The project site, including parking areas, internal circulation roads, and new entrance gate onto S. Polk Avenue comprises approximately six and one-half acres. However, the proposed use is consistent and complimentary with the adjacent cemetery, and the proposed building and parking areas will occupy a small portion of the existing 38.55-acre parcel, and therefore not constitute a substantial change in the visual character of the area.

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED:

* **Mitigation Measure(s)**

1. *All outdoor lighting shall be hooded and directed downward and away from 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?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The 38.55-acre parcel on which the funeral chapel is proposed to be constructed is classified as prime farmland according to the 2016 Important Farmlands Map. Available records and applicant submitted photos indicate the property has been recently

cultivated with field (row) crops, but is currently vacant and has been recently tilled. The project site will occupy approximately 3.5-acres of the 38.55-acre parcel. The project will remove a small area of prime farmland from production, leaving the remaining balance, approximately 35.55-acres available for intermittent agricultural production. However, the subject parcel is part of a previously approved master planned cemetery. As such, the property has been approved for expansion of the existing cemetery grounds. As the use has been previously approved, impacts related to conversion of Farmland would be less than significant.

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

The subject property is not restricted under Williamson Act Contract.

C. Conflict with existing zoning for forest land, timberland or timberland zoned Timberland Production; or

D. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The subject property does not contain forest land, timberland or timberland production zoned land.

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: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The project, if approved will not result in the conversion of Farmland as the cemetery use has been previously approved, and may be expanded accordingly. The property may be farmed intermittently until such time that the cemetery is expanded.

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 project will be subject to all San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District rules. The project is not anticipated to result in exceedance of any established Air District thresholds of significance and will therefore not be in conflict with or obstruct implementation of any identified air quality plans, adopted by the Air District.

- 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 Air Quality and Greenhouse gas Analysis prepared for this project by LSA, dated June 8, 2021, analyzed the potential for short term project construction emissions generated by activities such as site preparation, grading, paving, building construction and architectural coatings, as well as reactive organic gases ROG, particulate matter and toxic air contaminants(TAC's) from gasoline and diesel emissions.

Based upon the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) modeling projections, short term (temporary) construction emissions for the anticipated 8–10-month construction schedule, are not anticipated to result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutants, including those for which the San Joaquin Valley Air Basin is in non-attainment, including PM 2.5, PM 10, 1-hour Ozone, and 8-hour Ozone.

Long term operational emissions such as those associated with mobile sources like vehicle trips, and energy consumption of electricity and natural gas, and area sources such as architectural coatings and the use of gas-powered landscape maintenance equipment were also analyzed through CalEEMod. The analysis concluded that no significance threshold for criteria pollutants would be exceeded as a result of project operation.

- C. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The nearest sensitive receptor to the project site is a single-family dwelling located approximately 1,200 feet northwest of the project site, another is located approximately one quarter-mile east northeast of the site. Although project construction emissions may produce airborne pollutants which may affect nearby sensitive receptors; based upon CalEEMod projections in the Air Quality and GHG Analysis, those pollutants are not anticipated to exceed any District significance thresholds, and will therefore no result in the generation of substantial pollutant concentrations. Additionally, the implementation of minimization measures such as control of fugitive dust through the use of dust suppressants like water or chemical stabilizers would further reduce impacts to sensitive receptors.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

Odors generated by construction emissions would be present at the site, however such emissions would be temporary and not anticipated to result in objectionable odors.

Operational emissions are likewise not anticipated to result in objectionable odors as there are no uses proposed which would produce objectionable odors.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

- A. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

According to the California Department of Fish and Wildlife, California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB) BIOS web mapping application, no candidate, sensitive or special-status species have occurred on or near the project site. There were a number of identified occurrences of the San Joaquin Pocket Mouse in a buffer area within one half-mile of the project site, however, the Pocket mouse is not a candidate, sensitive or special status species.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project site is not located in proximity to any identified riparian habitat. There are no natural streams or man-made watercourses on the subject property. A search of the National Wetlands Inventory wetlands mapper did not identify any wetland features on the property, which would support riparian habitat.

- 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:

There are no identified state or federally protected wetlands located in the vicinity of 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:

No migratory fish or wildlife species habitat or nursery sites were identified on or near the project site. The project involves the construction and operation of a new funeral home on an approximately 3.5-acre portion of the northwest quadrant of the 38.55-acre subject parcel. The entire subject parcel is part of a previously approved master plan for the cemetery, although not yet fully developed. The property has been farmed intermittently and as such the ground is highly disturbed and has been irrigated regularly.

- 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 identified local policies protecting biological resources. The project will not include the removal of any protected trees. The project may involve the removal of some existing mature shrubs along the northern property frontage adjacent to State Route 180 (W. Whitesbridge Ave).

- 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:

No habitat conservation plans, community conservation plans, or state habitat conservation plans were identified by any reviewing agencies, which pertain to the project site or immediate vicinity.

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 is not located in an area of the County identified as being at increased sensitivity for archaeological/cultural resources, and no historical resources were identified on the project site. However, in the event that previously undiscovered cultural resources are unearthed during project construction, the following mitigation measure has been included.

* **Mitigation Measure(s)**

1. *In the event that cultural resources are unearthed during ground-disturbing activities, all work shall be halted in the area of the find. An Archeologist shall be called to evaluate the findings and make any necessary mitigation recommendations. If human remains are unearthed during ground disturbing activities, no further disturbance is to occur until the Fresno County Sheriff-Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition. All normal evidence procedures shall be followed by photos, reports, video, and etc. If such remains are determined to be Native American, the Sheriff-Coroner must notify the Native American Commission within 24 hours.*

VI. ENERGY

Would the project:

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project will involve construction of a 9,952 square-foot building to be operated as a funeral chapel adjacent to an existing cemetery. Construction is anticipated to last from eight to ten months, and as such is not expected to cause a significant environmental impact from wasteful, inefficient or unnecessary consumption of energy resources during construction, and will be required to comply with applicable Air Resources Board regulation pertaining to the use of off-road diesel fueled construction equipment, and the energy efficiency provisions of the current California Green Building Standards Code.

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?
 4. Landslides?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project site is not in an area designated as being at an increased risk of strong seismic ground, ground failure including liquefaction or landslides resulting from the rupture of a known earthquake fault, according to Figures 9-5 (Probabilistic Seismic Hazards 10% Probability in 50 years) and 9-6 (Landslide Areas and Areas of Subsidence) of the Fresno County General Plan Background Report.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project site is not located in a Generalized Erosion Hazard Area as identified by Figure 7-4 (Erosion Hazards in Western Fresno County) of the FCGPBR.

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; or

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:

The subject property is not located in an area identified as having soils with a moderately high to high expansion potential according to Figure 7-1 (Expansive Soils) of the Fresno County General Plan Background Report; nor is it in an area identified as being at increased risk of landslide or subsidence according to Figure 9-6 (Landslide Hazards and Areas of Subsidence) of the FCGPBR.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project's proposed septic system will be required to be installed under permit and inspection by the Fresno County Department of Public Works and Planning, Building and Safety Section, and be subject to all applicable requirements related to onsite wastewater treatment systems, including but not limited to proper design, capacity and setbacks from water wells.

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED:

No paleontological resources were identified in the project analysis, however, to address the possibility that previously undiscovered subsurface paleontological resources may be unearthed during ground disturbance, the following mitigation measure has been included.

* **Mitigation Measure(s)**

1. *If a paleontological resource is found, regardless of depth or setting, ground-disturbing activities shall cease within 50 feet of the find and a qualified paleontologist contacted. The qualified paleontologist shall evaluate the significance of the resources and recommend appropriate treatment measures.*

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 project will generate GHG emissions during the projected eight-month construction schedule. According to the conclusions of the Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Analysis prepared for this project construction of the project is anticipated to generate approximately 92.5 metric tons of CO₂e (equivalent). Long term GHG emissions were anticipated to be approximately 144.6 metric tons of CO₂e per year. The San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District has not adopted thresholds of significance for Greenhouse Gas emissions; however, a project's GHG emissions can be evaluated for consistency with applicable state GHG reduction plans. Based upon the anticipated quantity of GHG emissions from both construction and operation, projected by CalEEMod estimates, the project's cumulative contribution to GHG emissions will be less than significant.

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?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project does not propose the use, transport or disposal of any hazardous materials, the accidental release of which would result in a significant hazard to the public.

- 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:

Construction of the project may result in temporary hazardous emissions from the use combustion of diesel fuel used by trucks and off-road construction equipment; however, the project site is not located within one-quarter mile of an existing school. The nearest identified school is located approximately one (1) and one-quarter mile east southeast 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: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

According to the Environmental Protection Agency's NEPAAssist mapping tool, the existing cemetery easterly adjacent to the project is identified as a hazardous waste facility under the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act and regulated under permit.

- 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:

The project site is not located within an identified airport review area or airport land use plan; the nearest public airport is located approximately three (3) and one-third miles east of the project site.

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

The project does not propose any improvements which would interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or evacuation plan.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project site is not located in an area identified as being at risk from wildland fire. The project is located on relatively flat level terrain, within an area characterized by irrigated agriculture and sparse residential development.

X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Would the project:

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project is not anticipated to result in impacts to water quality nor violate any water quality standard. No waste discharge is proposed with this project. The project was reviewed by the State Water Resources Control Board, Division of Drinking Water (Waterboard), which did not express any concerns related to water quality. The Waterboard regulates public water systems and will require the cemetery to obtain a permit to operate as a non-community water system. The cemetery has installed a new domestic well which will serve the existing and proposed facilities.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project proposes minimal ground water use. No concerns were expressed by the groundwater sustainability agency or the County Water and Natural Resources Division.

- 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: NO IMPACT:

The project may alter the drainage of the site due to the addition of new impervious surfaces including the proposed building and parking area which comprises approximately 3.0-acres of the 38.55-acre subject parcel. However, any runoff created by the addition of new impervious surfaces would be directed to a proposed storm water retention basin proposed in the southwest portion of the project site and would not result in off site flooding, on or off-site erosion or siltation, or contribute runoff water in excess of the proposed storm water retention basin. The project site is not in an area prone to flood.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project site is not located in an area prone to tsunami or seiche, or flood from Dam Failure or within a 100-year flood inundation area as per Figures 9-7 and 9-8 of the Fresno County General Plan Background Report.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project is not anticipated to use substantial amounts of water during construction or operation. No conflicts with existing sustainable groundwater management plans, or water quality control plans were identified. The project proposes water supplied by a new onsite well which will be required to be permitted as a transient non-community, public water system through the State Water Resources Control Board, Division of Drinking Water.

XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING

Would the project:

- A. Physically divide an established community; or
- 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:

The project will not physically divide an established community nor conflict with any identified land use plan, policy or regulation adopted for pr

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:

The project site is not located in an identified mineral resources area, according to Figures 7-7 (Mineral Resource Locations) 7-8 (Principal Mineral Producing Locations 1997-1998), and 7-9 (Generalized Mineral Resource Zone Classifications) of the Fresno County General Plan Background Report.

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: NO IMPACT:

Construction of the project may result in some temporary increase in localized ambient noise and ground borne vibration from heavy construction equipment; however, operation of the project is not anticipated to result in a substantial increase existing noise level; additionally, operation of the project will be subject to the provisions of 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 an airport land use plan, nor within two miles of an 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 is not anticipated to induce substantial population growth, nor does the project propose the construction of any new homes or displace any existing housing or people.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project will not require the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities.

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 is not anticipated to result in increased use of existing neighborhood parks or other recreational facilities that would cause substantial physical deterioration of the park or facility. The nearest regional park to the project site is located approximately one and one-quarter mile southwest. The project will not include the development of any recreational facilities.

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 proposes to take primary access from N. Polk Avenue, a County maintained road; and secondary access via a new internal road connecting to the existing cemetery, via S. Cornelia Avenue. There were no issues or concerns expressed by any reviewing agencies with the proposed location of the Polk Avenue access driveway, or the use of the existing access from Cornelia Avenue. However, Polk Avenue is classified as a local road in the County's General Plan requiring a minimum of 60 feet of right-of-way. Polk Avenue currently has 40 feet of right-of-way, therefore the dedication of an additional 10 feet of right-of-way along the parcel frontage of APN 326-030-81s frontage will be required. S. Cornelia Avenue is classified as an arterial in the County's General Plan requiring a minimum of 106 feet of right-of-way. S. Cornelia currently has 40 feet of right-of-way, therefore the dedication of an additional 33 feet of right-of-way along the parcel frontage of APN 326-030-07S will be required, in order to be consistent with the provisions County General Plan Transportation and Circulation Element, and to accommodate any new traffic generated by the proposed development.

The project site also has frontage on State Route (SR) 180 (W. Whitesbridge Avenue). According to Caltrans, SR 180 is ultimately planned to be a four-lane expressway with a 170-foot right of way width. Currently the section of SR 180 along which the subject parcel has frontage, has between 100-110 feet of right-of-way. However, any development must be based upon the ultimate right-of-way.

The project will be required to obtain the necessary encroachment permits for work within the right-of-way and to respect the ultimate right-of-way for the road as indicated in the County's General Plan. The County General Plan provides that a Level of Service (LOS) C is acceptable on non-urban County roads. Based upon the trip generation analysis prepared for this project, there would be no LOS issues as result of the added traffic trips.

* **Mitigation Measure(s)**

1. *In order for the project to be consistent with the provisions of the Fresno County General Plan Transportation and Circulation Element, and to accommodate any new traffic generated by the proposed development, the following Mitigation Measures shall be implemented prior to occupancy of the proposed funeral home:*

- i. Polk Avenue currently has 40 feet of right-of-way, therefore the dedication of an additional 10 feet of right-of-way along the subject parcel frontage, identified as APN 326-030-81s, shall be required along S. Polk Avenue.
- ii. Cornelia currently has 40 feet of right-of-way, therefore the dedication of an additional 33 feet of right-of-way along the subject parcel frontage, identified as APN 329-030-07S, shall be required along S. Cornelia Avenue.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

Vehicle Miles Travelled (VMT) associated with this project were evaluated by the Applicant's consultant LSA and summarized in a Trip Generation and VMT memorandum dated June 8, 2021. The memorandum concluded that the project would generate approximately 250 weekly trips, and approximately ten additional employee trips per day, which is well below the threshold of 110 trips per day established by the State Office of Planning and Research, Technical Advisory On Evaluating Transportation Impacts In CEQA, dated December 2018.

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:

None of the reviewing agencies and departments concerned with traffic and transportation, expressed concern that the project would increase hazards to surrounding roadways. The project was reviewed by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), the Fresno County Department of Public Works and Planning, Design Division, and the Road Maintenance and Operations Division. Because the subject project has frontage along State Route 180 (W. Whitesbridge Ave.). Caltrans has recommended that large events utilize the existing westbound State Route 180 left turn lane at Cornelia avenue for ingress into the projects site, instead of the Polk Avenue entrance; and that the proposed access driveway off of S. Polk be located at least 470 feet south of its intersection with SR 180. The anticipated traffic generated by the proposed operation is not projected to exceed the threshold of 500 new trips and therefore no Traffic Impact Study was required by the County, however, the project is expected to generate up to 100 or more one-way trips, or 50 round trips

during funeral/memorial services; therefore, a Traffic Management Plan is required to address the additional traffic generated by such events.

* **Mitigation Measure**

2. *Prior to issuance of building permits, a Traffic Management Plan, prepared by a licensed Traffic Engineer, shall be submitted for review and approval, to the Design Division and the Road Maintenance and Operations Division of the Fresno County Department of Public Works and Planning. Operation of the proposed Funeral Home shall be in substantial conformance with the Traffic Management Plan, as approved by the Design Division and the Road Maintenance and Operations Division..*

D. Result in inadequate emergency access?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project will be required to comply with the requirements of the current Fire Code and Fresno County Ordinance Code as they pertain to emergency access standards.

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 SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED:

See Mitigation under Section V Cultural Resources.

* **Mitigation Measure(s)**

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

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

XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Would the project:

- A. Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project proposes a new onsite wastewater treatment system (OWTS) to serve the proposed facility. The new septic system will be subject to permits and inspections and be subject to the provisions of the Fresno County Local Area Management Program (LAMP), the Fresno County Ordinance Code.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project proposes to use approximately 200 gallons per day provided by a newly constructed onsite well. The project site is not located in an area designated as being water short. The project was reviewed by the Fresno County Department of Public Works and Planning, Water and Natural Resources Division, which determined that the proposed water supply would be adequate to serve the project.

- 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 will be served by a new onsite wastewater treatment system.

- 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?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project is not anticipated to generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or the capacity of local infrastructure.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project will be required to comply with applicable State and local statutes and regulations with regard to solid waste.

XX. WILDFIRE

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

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project site is not located in a designated State Responsibility Area for purposes of fire protection, nor in an area otherwise at increased risk from 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: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED:

No impacts to fish and wildlife species or their habitat were identified. No historical, cultural or tribal cultural resources were identified, however, in the event the previously undiscovered historical, cultural or tribal cultural resources are found during development, mitigation has been included requiring a halt to work until the origin and disposition of such resources can be ascertained.

* **Mitigation Measure(s)**

1. See Mitigation Measures under Sections V and XVIII 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 WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED:

No cumulatively considerable impacts were identified, however, since the project does have the potential to create impacts through the generation of new traffic during events on surrounding roads, which is in addition to the current traffic counts, and that which may be added by other projects, including transportation infrastructure projects for road widening and the addition of new travel lanes, or new intersection stop control or signalization which may occur in the vicinity in the future.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

No potential for substantial adverse effects on human beings, resulting from the project were identified.

CONCLUSION/SUMMARY

Based upon the Initial Study prepared for Unclassified Conditional Use Permit Application No. 3692, amending CUP 270, 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, Energy, Land Use and Planning, Mineral Resources, Noise, Public Services, Recreation, Utilities and Service Systems, and Wildfire.

Potential impacts related to Agricultural and Forestry Resources, Air Quality, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, and Hydrology and Water Quality have been determined to be less than significant.

Potential impacts relating to Aesthetics, Cultural Resources, Geology and Soils, Transportation and Tribal Cultural Resources have determined to be less than significant with compliance with the included 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.

JS

G:\4360Devs&Pln\PROJSEC\PROJDOCS\CUP\3600-3699\3692\IS CEQA\CUP 3692 Initial Study Writeup.docx