



# County of Fresno

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

## EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

- APPLICANT: CVEAS, Inc.
- APPLICATION NOS.: Initial Study No. 7962 and Director Review and Approval Application No. 4642
- DESCRIPTION: Allow the maintenance and storage of trucks and trailers to be devoted exclusively to the transportation of agricultural products, supplies and equipment, on an approximately 2.5-acre portion of a 34.76-acre parcel in the AE-20 (Exclusive Agricultural, 20-acre minimum parcel size) Zone District.
- LOCATION: The project site is located on the southwest corner of E. Mountain View Avenue and State Route 41, approximately two miles east of the unincorporated community of Caruthers (APN: 042-260-30S) (Sup. Dist. 4).

### 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, other scenic resources, or topographic features were identified in the analysis. The surrounding area is characterized by residential uses, limited commercial uses and farmland. The subject parcel does not contain any historic buildings and according to Fresno County General Plan Figure OS-2, the site is not located near a 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 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 subject parcel is located in an area characterized by a mix of large agricultural parcels and residential uses. The subject parcel is currently unimproved; however, the site has been used for agricultural purposes, historically and is currently. The proposed operation would be limited to the boundaries of the 5.8-acre parcel and would not have a significant aesthetic impact on the surrounding area.

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED:

The proposed truck and trailer parking facility will operate 7 days per week, 24 hours per day. According to the applicant's submitted operational statement dated March 30, 2022, approximately 4 new fixtures, mounted on 25-foot-tall poles, will be installed in the parking area. The new lighting is not anticipated to result in substantial impacts, however, to address that potential, all outdoor lighting associated with this project will be subject to the following Mitigation Measure.

\* **Mitigation Measure(s)**

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

## II. AGRICULTURAL AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California 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?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The subject parcel is currently planted with almonds, formerly vineyards based on review of publicly available web based aerial imagery. According to the 2016 Fresno County Important Farmland Map, the subject parcel is located on land classified as Prime Farmland based on its soil characteristics. In order for a land to remain classified as

Prime Farmland, the property must also have been used for irrigated agriculture production at some time during the four years prior to the mapping date which in this case is 2016. According to available aerial imagery, the subject parcel has had vineyards from approximately 1998.

Approval of this project will result in the conversion of approximately 2.5-acres of land currently classified as Prime Farmland to non-agricultural uses. However, given the small portion of the subject parcel to be developed by the project, and that fact the majority of the parcel's acreage will continue to be dedicated to agricultural uses., impacts related to conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use would be less than significant.

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The proposed operation will be dedicated to the maintenance and storage of trucks and trailers used exclusively for the transportation of agricultural and agriculturally related products; therefore, it should be considered an agricultural support operation, which is consistent with the agricultural zoning and land use designation. The property is not restricted under Williamson Act contract.

- B. Conflict with existing zoning for forest land, timberland or timberland zoned Timberland Production; or
- C. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use; or
- D. 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: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The subject parcel does not contain forest land or timberland; however, as discussed under Section II.A above will involve small-scale changes to the existing environment, which are anticipated to result in the conversion of approximately 2.5 acres of Farmland to non-agricultural uses.

### 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 San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD) is responsible for controlling emissions primarily from stationary sources. The District, along with other transportation agencies, is also responsible for developing, updating, and implementing air quality attainment plans for the Air Basin. The District also has responsibility for regulating air pollutants in the San Joaquin Valley Air Basin under the State of California Implementation Plan (SIP) which is a document prepared by each state describing existing air quality conditions and measures that will be followed to attain and maintain federal ambient air quality standards.

The San Joaquin Valley Air Basin is in non-attainment status for one-hour Ozone, eight-hour Ozone, PM10 and PM2.5. State Implementation Plan is administered by the State Air Resources Board (ARB). The most recent federally approved attainment plans for the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District are the 8-hour Ozone Attainment Plan (2007) and the PM2.5 Plan (2012). Areas designated nonattainment must develop air quality plans and regulations to achieve standards by specified dates. The ARB has adopted standards for emissions from various types of on-road heavy duty vehicles which are contained Section 1956.8, Title 13 of the California Code of Regulations (CCR).

Existing air quality conditions, in terms of levels of criteria pollutants and particulate matter (PM) obtained from several local monitoring stations in the vicinity of the project site were utilized in the evaluation of this project. The evaluation determined that during the three years 2016, 2017 and 2018 the project area has exceeded Federal and State standards for Ozone and Particulate Matter (PM10) and (PM 2.5).

The ARB has also adopted emissions reduction programs for in-use (existing) heavy duty vehicles including the Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicle Idling Reduction Program, and the Heavy-Duty Diesel In-Use Compliance Program, which apply to almost all privately and federally owned diesel-fueled trucks and buses. Recent amendments to these regulations require diesel trucks that operate in California to be upgraded to reduce emissions by meeting Particulate Matter (PM) filter requirements. The ARB's Diesel Risk Reduction Plan has led to the adoption of state regulatory standards for all new on-road, off-road, and stationary diesel-fueled engines, and vehicles to reduce Diesel Particulate Matter (DPM) emissions by about 90 percent overall from year 2000 levels.

An Air Quality and Greenhouse Analysis Technical Memorandum (Air Quality and GHG Memo), was prepared for the project by Johnson-Johnson and Miller Air Quality Consulting Services dated January 18, 2022; based on its conclusions, the project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of any applicable air quality plan, including the above referenced Ozone and PM 10 and PM 2.5 Plans because the proposed operation is not anticipated to result in an increase in the frequency or severity of existing air quality violations or cause or contribute to new violations, or delay timely attainment of air quality standards or emissions reduction goals of applicable air quality plans. The San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD) has published guidance for Land Use Agencies in Addressing GHG Emission Impacts for New Projects under CEQA (December 17, 2009). The guidance includes thresholds

based on whether a project will reduce or mitigate GHG levels by 29 percent from business as usual (BAU) levels when compared with 2005 levels, which is based on the Air Resources Board AB32 Scoping Plan (2008). According to the guidance, GHG emission are considered cumulative, and unless reduced or mitigated their incremental contribution to global climatic change could be considered significant.

The project is also not anticipated to result in carbon monoxide (CO) hot spots that would violate CO standards, nor contribute to any air quality violations. Additionally, the project will be subject to applicable Air District Rules which act as control measures for the air quality plans. For this application, the Air Quality and GHG Analysis modeled construction and operational emissions based on emission assumptions inputs to the CalEEMod 2016.3.2 Emissions Modeling software, using emissions projections for 2020 and 2030, in place of a 2005 baseline year, for BAU conditions. Based on these modeling projections, the project would achieve a reduction of 24.5 percent from BAU by the year 2020 with regulations incorporated, which is above the average reduction of all sources of GHG's required to achieve AB32 emissions reduction goals. Most of the GHG emissions from the project will be generated by heavy-duty trucks, which generally have higher emissions rates because they haul heavy loads and travel long distances and are more difficult to convert into using alternative fuels and electrical vehicle technology advances. The conclusions of the AQ/GHG Analysis were that the project would achieve reductions of 2.8 percent above the Air Resources Board reduction from BAU targets and achieve a reduction of 18.4 percent beyond the 2020 target through 2030 through compliance with existing regulations.

- 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; or

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

This project proposal was reviewed by the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (Air District) which indicated that project specific annual emissions are not expected to exceed any of the District thresholds for criterial pollutants and would therefore have a less than significant impact on air quality when compared with those thresholds.

The Air Quality and GHG Memo found that the proposed trucking operation would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in nonattainment status, under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard. The analysis considered the regional effects of the project's criteria pollutant emissions as compared to Air District thresholds of significance for short-term construction and long-term project operation. Neither construction nor operational emissions of were projected to exceed significance thresholds of significance for reactive organic gases (ROG), nitrogen oxides (NOx), Carbon Monoxide (CO) and Particulate Matter (PM) 10 and 2.5.

- C. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

**FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:**

Based on review of publicly available web based aerial imagery, there appears to be clustered residential and commercial development in the vicinity of the subject parcel, at the intersection of Elm Avenue and E. Mountain View Avenue; additionally, there are approximately ten single-family dwellings within one-quarter mile, including four dwellings on the adjacent parcel to the west of the project site. There is a church located approximately one half-mile north and an elementary school located approximately one-half mile northwest of the project site. It is therefore possible that sensitive receptors could be exposed to pollutants and odors from diesel exhaust fumes and dust generated by the trucking operation. However, based on the limited scale of the operation, it is not anticipated to create significant localized impacts or generate substantial pollutant concentrations in excess of any Air District thresholds for criteria pollutants, therefore the project will not expose any sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.

The Air Quality and GHG Memo also included a health risk screening assessment (HSRA), as per the recommendation of the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (Air District). The Air District recommends such screening analysis include all sources of project emissions, in order to identify projects that may have a significant health impact. The HSRA should include a prioritization score, based on the latest approved California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA) methodology. A prioritization score of 10 or greater is considered to be significant and a refined Health Risk Assessment (HRA) should be performed, using an Air District recommended modeling protocol. The HSRA for this project resulted in a prioritization score of 9.61 which is below the screening threshold of 10, therefore no further health risk assessment was recommended.

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

**FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:**

Emissions occurring at the project site have the potential to create a localized impact or air pollutant hotspots. Localized emissions are considered significant if when combined with background emissions they would result in exceedance of any health-based air quality standards.

Toxic Air Contaminants (TACs) are air pollutants that may cause or contribute to an increase in mortality or serious illness, or that may pose a hazard to human health. TACs are usually present in ambient air; however, their high toxicity or health risk may pose a threat to public health even at low concentrations.

According to the Air Quality and GHG Memo, Diesel Particulate Matter (DPM) is considered a Toxic Air Contaminant (TAC), however DPM differs from other Toxic Air Contaminants in that it is not a single substance, but a complex mixture of hundreds of substances, and no ambient air monitoring data are available for DPM because no routine measurement method currently exists. DPM differs from other TACs in that it is

not a single substance, but a mixture of hundreds of substances. Although DPM is emitted by diesel-fueled, internal combustion engines the composition of the emissions varies, depending on engine type, operating conditions, fuel composition, lubricating oil, and whether an emission control system is present.

The Air District's threshold of significance for TAC emissions is an increased risk of cancer for the maximally exposed individual of 20 in a million. The Air District's guidelines for assessing project air quality impacts recommends that operational emission which would expose sensitive receptors be analyzed. To facilitate this the Air District recommends the preparation of a screening analysis using its health risk prioritization tool to estimate the impacts of TAC emissions on sensitive receptors for projects having substantial number of diesel truck trips. The proposed operation will involve the maintenance and storage of trucks and trailers used for transport agricultural commodities, related supplies, and equipment, and will have up to 14 drivers initially, with the possibility of expanding to 32 drivers.

According to the Applicant's operational statement, the proposed facility will store up to 32 trucks trailers based on the 32 truck parking stalls shown on the applicant's submitted site plan, and based on the VMT Analysis prepared for the project, generate approximately 25 daily truck trips, and . The submitted operational statement indicates that the majority of the trucks involve the transfer of agricultural products, supplies and materials to packing houses within a 150-mile range.

No trucks with Transport Refrigeration Units (TRU's) are proposed, however, for the purposes of the health risk prioritization screening, it was assumed there would be at least one truck equipped with a TRU. The screening analysis completed for this project resulted in a prioritization risk score of 9.61 which is below the Air District's threshold of 10, for requiring a more refined Health Risk Assessment (HRA). The risk score assumes that all emissions sources are within 100 meters from receptors even though in this case a portion of the emissions are expected to occur at a greater distance from the project site.

The project is not anticipated to exceed Air District screening thresholds for localized criteria pollutant impacts or create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. Therefore, the project impacts would be less than significant.

#### IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

According to a search of the California Department of Fish and Wildlife, California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB), there were no occurrences of any special status species on or within one mile of the subject property boundaries, and no predicted habitat for any candidate, sensitive or special status species was identified on or in the vicinity of the subject parcel.

The approximately 34.76-acre subject parcel is currently undeveloped and planted with almonds. The site has been cultivated historically, according to publicly available web-based aerial imagery, which shows that the property has been under cultivation since at least 1998, therefore the ground is highly disturbed. Additionally, the proposed truck parking site would only occupy an approximately 2.5-acre portion, including perimeter landscaping, storm drainage facilities and an internal access road, in the northeast corner of the property, adjacent to the intersection of State Route 41 and W. Mountain View Avenue. The project site will be graded and surfaced with decomposed granite, including the access road. No riparian habitat or sensitive natural communities identified in local or regional plans, policies or regulations were identified in the analysis.

- 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:

No wetlands of any type, on or in the vicinity of the subject property, were identified in the analysis.

- 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; or
- 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:

No habitat or potential habitat supporting migratory fish or other wildlife species were identified in the analysis. The project will not conflict with any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local ordinances, regional or state habitat conservation plans.



## V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The subject parcel is currently undeveloped and contains almond orchards. It is not in an area considered to be archaeologically sensitive. No cultural or historical resources were identified by any reviewing agencies, or in the analysis. This project proposal was routed to local tribal governments who had previously requested to be notified of such projects under Assembly Bill (AB) 52. None of the tribal governments who were notified of this proposal responded or requested consultation on this project. The proposed operation will involve minimal ground disturbance, be confined to the approximately 2.5-acre portion of the subject parcel, and use existing public roadways.

## 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 entails the storage of trucks and trailers which will be used to transport agricultural products in the local area, within approximately 150 miles of the project site. The proposed project will operate 24 hours per day, 7 days per week, therefore, it is possible that trucks equipped with refrigeration units may sit idling on site at different time during operation. However, it is not anticipated to result in the wasteful or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, causing a significant environmental impact.

Any future construction or demolition will be subject to applicable San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District Rules. A project note will be included requiring the applicant to contact the Air District's Small Business Assistance Office, to determine if an Authority to Construct (ATC) permit is needed.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

No conflicts with state or local plans for renewable energy or energy efficiency relating to this application were identified during staff's analysis or by any reviewing agencies.

## 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 subject property is not located in an area of prone to strong seismic activity, liquefaction, or landslide as identified by Figures 9-5 and 9-6 and discussed in Chapter 9-3 through 9-8 of the Fresno County General Plan Background Report (FCGPBR).

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The subject property is not located in an area of generalized erosion hazards as identified by Figures 7-3 and 7-4 of the Fresno County General Plan Background Report (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?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The subject property is not located in a landslide area identified by Figure 9-6 of the Fresno County General Plan Background Report (FCGPBR) or an area prone to lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse, as identified by Figure 9-5 and discussed in Chapter 9.

- 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 of expansive soils as identified by Figure 7-1 of the Fresno County General Plan Background Report (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 was reviewed by the Fresno County Department of Public Health, Environmental Health Division, which indicated that the subject parcel was able to accommodate the existing sewage and disposal systems and expansion areas meeting the mandatory setbacks and policy requirements of the Fresno County Tier 2 Local Area Management Program (LAMP), onsite wastewater treatment systems (OWTS) policy and California Plumbing Code.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The subject property is located in an area that has historically been utilized for farming, and no unique geologic features or paleontological resources were identified by any reviewing agencies, or by staff during the analysis.

## 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 effects of project specific GHG emissions are cumulative, and unless appropriately reduced or mitigated, their incremental contribution to global warming could be considered significant. Valley land use agencies adopting this guidance as policy for addressing GHG impacts, and acting as lead agency under CEQA, will require all new projects with increased GHG emissions to implement performance-based standards, or otherwise demonstrate that project specific GHG emissions have been reduced or mitigated by at least 29 percent, including GHG emission reductions achieved since the 2002-2004 baseline period. Projects achieving at least a 29 percent emissions reduction compared to BAU, would be determined to have a less than significant

individual and cumulative impact. Projects complying with an approved GHG emission reduction plan or GHG mitigation program which avoids or substantially reduces GHG emissions with the geographic area in which the project is located would be determined to have a less than significant individual and cumulative impact for GHG emissions. Projects implementing Best Performance Standards (BPS) would not require quantification of project specific GHG emissions. Project not implementing BPS would require quantification of project specific GHG emissions and demonstration that project specific GHG emissions would be reduced or mitigated by at least 29 percent compared to Business as Usual (BAU). The Air Quality and GHG Memo, discussed under Section III above, sought to determine if greenhouse gas emissions (GHG's) generated by the operation of the project facility would result in significant impacts to and whether it would be consistent with State mandated greenhouse gas reduction goals. The GHG's analyzed are those defined by California Assembly Bill (AB) 32. The following paragraphs summarize the background data and findings of the Air Quality and GHG Memo. The analysis concluded that the project's impacts would be less than significant as they pertain to the relevant questions under this Section of the CEQA checklist. The analysis determined that the project would not generate direct or indirect greenhouse gas emissions that would result in a significant impact on the environment, nor conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation of an agency adopted to reduce the emissions of greenhouse gases.

#### 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 project was reviewed by the Fresno County Department of Public Health, Environmental Health Division, which indicated that the proposed operation will be subject to the following requirements: Facilities proposing to use and or store hazardous wastes shall meet the requirements set forth in the California Health and Safety Code (HSC), and the California Code of Regulations (CCR). Any business that handles a hazardous material or hazardous waste may be required to submit a Hazardous Materials Business Plan pursuant to the Health and Safety Code.

- 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:

The subject property is not located on or near a hazardous materials site as identified by the EPA NEPAAssist Enviro-Mapper tool, nor located within one-quarter mile of an existing school. No data regarding proposed school sites in the project vicinity was available.

- 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:

The subject property is not located on or near a hazardous materials site nor located within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. The proposed operation is not anticipated to generate hazardous emissions or involve the handling of acutely hazardous materials substances or waste; nor is it anticipated to create a significant hazard to the public or the environment.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The subject property is not located within an airport land use plan area or within two miles of a public airport or private airstrip, and therefore will not result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area.

- 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:

The proposed operation is not anticipated to impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. Additionally, the subject property is not located within a Wildland Fire Area and will therefore not expose people or structures to wildland fire risk.

## X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Would the project:

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The proposed operation is not anticipated to violate any waste discharge requirements, violate any water quality standards or otherwise degrade surface or ground water. Water use for the proposed operation will be provided by an on-site domestic water well.

- 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 proposed operation is not anticipated to substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge or impeded sustainable groundwater management of the basin. This application was reviewed by the Fresno County Department of Public Works and Planning, Water and Natural Resources Division, which did not express any concerns related to water use. According to the Applicant's operational statement, the proposed operation will use an estimated 20 gallons per day, based on a 7 day per week operation.

- 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 storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or
4. Impede or redirect flood flows?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

According to a review of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Wetlands Inventory mapper, there are no existing natural drainage channels adjacent to or running through the parcel. A grading permit or grading voucher will be required for any proposed grading, or any grading that has been done without a permit.

The project site includes a 50-foot by 82-foot (4,250 square-foot) storm drainage basin near the southwest corner of the truck parking area, which will be surfaced with decomposed granite which will not result in any new impervious surface on the site that would increase storm water runoff. Additionally, an engineered grading and drainage plan will be required to show how additional storm water runoff will be

conveyed to the proposed drainage basin and elsewhere on the site, without adversely impacting adjacent properties.

Due to the limited size of the approximately 2.5-acre project site and absence of any streams or waterways traversing the property, no impacts to drainage patterns, alteration of watercourses, substantial erosion, or siltation is anticipated.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

According to FEMA FIRM Panel 2625H, the subject property is not located is not subject to flooding from the 100-year (one percent chance) storm event, nor located in an area prone to tsunami or seiche.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The proposed operation is not anticipated to obstruct implementation of any water quality control plan or sustainable ground water management plan.

## 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 proposes to authorize an existing operation consisting of the maintenance and storage of trucks and trailers exclusively dedicated to the transportation of agriculturally related products and equipment. The subject property is located in an agricultural area dominated by large farming parcels and sparse residential development. The proposed operational will not divide and established community, or conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation, nor conflict with any applicable habitat conservation or natural community conservation plan.

## 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 subject parcel is not located in an area of known mineral resources per Figures 7-7 through 7-11 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?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The proposed operation may include the use of refrigerated trailer(s) and thus have the potential for ambient noise generation. However, the number of trucks will be limited to a maximum of 32, consistent with the applicant's submitted site plan and operational statement, and a Condition of Approval will be included, requiring that any trucks equipped with refrigeration units parked at the site, be limited to interior areas of the site away from neighboring property. It should be noted the project site is easterly adjacent to an existing gas station and convenience market where increased ambient noise levels resulting from idling trucks and passenger vehicles is expected. The project is located at least 200 feet away from the nearest residence, and the proposed operation of the truck and trailer parking facility will be subject to the applicable requirements of Fresno County Ordinance Code Chapter 8.40, Noise Ordinance.

- B. Generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The proposed operation would include up to 25 round trip truck trips per day leaving from and returning to the site. The truck trips have the potential to generate some ground-borne vibration; however, given the limited number of trips anticipated, the operation will not generate an excessive amount of ground-borne vibration or noise. The proposed operation will be subject to Chapter 8.40 of the Fresno County Ordinance Code.

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



FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project site is not located within two miles of a private airstrip or airport or within the vicinity of an airport land use plan.

#### 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:

Due to the limited size of the project site and small scale of the operation, this proposal is not anticipated to create substantial job growth in the area and is unlikely to induce substantial population growth. No people or existing housing will be displaced as a result of the proposed operation.

#### XV. PUBLIC SERVICES

Would the project:

- A. Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, or the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services?
  - 1. Fire protection;
  - 2. Police protection;
  - 3. Schools;
  - 4. Parks; or
  - 5. Other public facilities?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

No adverse impacts to the provision of new or physically altered public facilities are anticipated with this application. This application was reviewed by the Fresno County

Sheriff's Department and the Fresno County Fire Protection District/CALFIRE. Neither agency expressed any concerns with the proposed operation.

## 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 subject proposal is not anticipated to increase the use of any existing parks or other recreational facilities, nor require the construction or expansion of any 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?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The proposed operation will not conflict with any existing program, plan or policy addressing the circulation system including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities.

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

According to the trip generation contained in the VMT analysis, the proposed project would generate approximately 25 (12.5 one way) average daily trips per day. The Trip Generation Analysis cites guidance published by the State of California Office of Planning and Research (OPR), which indicates that, absent any substantial evidence indicating that a project would generate a potentially significant level of Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT), inconsistency with a Sustainable Communities strategy (SCS) or general plan; projects generating fewer than 110 trips per day, generally may be presumed to cause a less than significant transportation impact. A VMT analysis was prepared for the project by Precision Civil Engineering, Inc. dated November 24, 2021. The VMT analysis estimated that the project would add approximately 25 average daily

trips, which is well below the 110-trip threshold established by the State. As such, the proposed project would have a less than significant impact on VMT.

- 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:

This application proposes to allow an agriculturally related trucking operation on the subject property, which is located at the intersection of a County-maintained Road and a State Highway; S. Elm Avenue and W. Mountain View Avenue. There are currently two unimproved driveways on the property, one accessing E. Mountain View Avenue and one accessing S. Elm Avenue, providing ingress and egress. Due to the existing of State right-of-way along a portion of E. Mountain View, the project will be required to take access via the driveway on to S. Elm, located approximately 550 feet south of its intersection with E. Mountain View. The first 100 feet of the driveway must be surfaced to control dust and track out onto the road and given the limited number of new traffic trips projected by the proposed project and given that there are no modifications to the existing roadways nor the addition of any new structures or incompatible uses proposed with this application that would increase hazards to traffic on the abutting roadways. There will be no impacts which would substantially increase hazards to traffic.

- D. Result in inadequate emergency access?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The proposed operation will be subject to California Code of Regulations Title 24-Fire Code, which will address emergency access requirements.

## XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

- A. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:
1. Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k); or
  2. A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1? (In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency

shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.)

**FINDING: NO IMPACT:**

The subject parcel is surrounded by larger actively farmed parcels and not in an area considered to be archaeologically sensitive. None of the local tribal governments who were notified of this project, expressed interest in consultation on this project or identified any cultural or tribal cultural resources on the subject parcel or in the vicinity of the subject parcel. Additionally, the proposed operation will be confined to the approximately 34.76-acre site.

The proposed operation will utilize County maintained roads serving the subject property and surrounding area. There is no ground disturbance proposed with this application, as such, no impacts to historical, archaeological or tribal cultural resources is anticipated.

**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 subject property contains a residential septic system to serve the existing single-family dwelling. The proposed operation will not 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.

- 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:**

According to the Applicant's operational statement, the project will use approximately 20 gallons per day, including domestic use, and landscape irrigation supplied by the existing on site well. The project was reviewed by the Water and Natural Resources Division which did not express any concerns with water supply. The subject parcel is not located in an area of the County, identified as being water short.

- 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:

According to the Applicant's operational statement the project will not be served by a wastewater treatment provider. There is a septic system on the property, however the operation does not propose any septic use.

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

According to the Applicant's operational statement, the proposed operation will not generate a substantial quantity of solid waste; the amount of solid waste is anticipated to be approximately one-half cubic yard per month. Waste tires are picked up by an outside hauler on an as-needed basis.

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 subject parcel is not located in a wildland fire area or State Responsibility Area classified as a high fire hazard severity zone.

## 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:

No impacts to biological or historical resources were identified in the analysis or by any reviewing agencies or departments.

- 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 in the analysis or by any reviewing agencies or departments. However, potentially significant impacts to Aesthetics were found to be less than significant with the included Mitigation Measure.

\* **Mitigation Measure(s)**

1. See I. Aesthetics, Section D.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

No environmental effects, which would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings were identified in the analysis.

## CONCLUSION/SUMMARY

Based upon the analysis for Initial Study No. 7962, prepared for Director Review and Approval Application No. 4642, staff has concluded that the project will not have a significant effect on the environment.

It has been determined that there will be no impacts to, biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, hydrology and water quality, land use and planning, mineral

resources, population and housing, public services, recreation, utilities and service systems, wildfire, and tribal cultural resources.

Potential impacts to air quality, agriculture and forestry resources, geology and soils, greenhouse gas emissions, hazards and hazardous materials, noise and transportation have been determined to be less than significant.

Potential impacts to aesthetics have been determined to be less than significant with the identified Mitigation Measure (s).

A Mitigated Negative Declaration/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\DRA\4600-4699\4642\IS CEQA\DRA 4642 IS 7962 wu.docx