



County of Fresno

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

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

- APPLICANT: Roger Van Groningen
- APPLICATION NOS.: Initial Study Application No. 7504, General Plan Amendment Application No. 555, and Amendment Application No. 3832
- DESCRIPTION: Amend the Land Use Element of the County-adopted Selma Community Plan to redesignate a 18.56-acre parcel and a 9.29-acre parcel from Agriculture to General Industrial; and
- Change the zoning of the said parcels from the AE-20 (Exclusive Agricultural, 20-acre minimum parcel size) Zone District to the M-3 (c) (Heavy Industrial, Conditional) Zone District to allow limited heavy industrial, general industrial, and light manufacturing uses as requested by the Applicant.
- LOCATION: The subject parcels are located on the southwest corner of E. Manning and S. Leonard Avenues approximately 4,025 feet north of the city limits of Selma (8309 E. Manning and 9073 S. Leonard Avenues, Fowler) (APN: 348-050-25S & 29) (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:

The 27.85 acres project site is fallowed and undeveloped. The immediate project area comprised of industrial and agricultural uses with single-family homes. Manning Avenue and Leonard Avenue border the site and are not designated as state scenic highways in the County General Plan. There are no scenic vistas or scenic resources, including trees, rock outcroppings, or historic buildings on or near the site that will be impacted by the subject proposal. The project will have no impact on scenic resources.

- C. In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage points.) If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The project entails rezoning of an 18.56-acre and a 9.29-acre parcel from the existing AE-20 Zone District to an M-3 (c) (Heavy Industrial, Conditional) Zone District to allow limited by-right industrial uses. The subject parcels are designated Agriculture in the County-adopted Selma Community Plan and currently zoned AE-20 (Exclusive Agriculture; 20-acre minimum parcel size required). However, the applicant proposes to change the zoning of the subject parcels from the AE-20 Zone District to the M-3 (c) Zone District to allow limited heavy industrial, general industrial, and light manufacturing uses

The project site is surrounded by industrial and agricultural zoned parcel ranging from one-half acre to 148.88 acres in size. Parcels immediately to the north, south and east are zoned AE-20 and are either fallow with SFR or contain vineyard with single-family residences; and parcels immediately to the west are in Golden State Industrial Corridor (GSIC), zoned M-3 and M-3 (c), and are developed with warehouses, offices, storage buildings, machinery and equipment manufacturing facilities. The proposed M-3 (c) zoning to allow for limited industrial uses on the subject parcels is a compatible zoning with the adjacent M-3 zoned parcels in the GSIC.

Staff notes that the development of the industrial uses on the subject parcel may visually/aesthetically impact the single-family residence located approximately 35 feet south of the southern property line of the subject parcel on an adjacent 10-acre parcel. To minimize any visual/aesthetical impact, a Condition of Approval would require that landscaping, consisting of trees and shrubs for a depth of 15 feet, be provided along the south property line of the subject parcel.

- 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 subject application involves no development and therefore no lighting impacts would occur. However, future development proposals on the property could result in the creation of new sources of light and glare in the area and would be subject to Section 855-I.3. d., of the Zoning Ordinance, which requires outdoor lighting to be hooded and so arranged and controlled so as not to cause a nuisance either to highway traffic or the living environment. With implementation of this requirement, the impacts would be less than significant.

* **Mitigation Measure**

1. *All outdoor lighting associated with development of industrial uses on the property shall be hooded and directed downward so as to not shine toward adjacent property 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 27.8-acre project site is comprised of a 18.56-acre parcel and a 9.29-acre parcel currently zoned AE-20 (Exclusive Agricultural). The project will not convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance to non-agricultural use as the Department of Conservation's Important Farmland Map (2016) classifies both parcels as Farmland of Local Importance. Additionally, as desired by the Applicant, the project will allow a limited number of heavy industrial uses that are incidental to the farming operations in the area and correspond with the industrial use on the adjacent parcel to the west of this proposal.

The property is located within the City of Selma Sphere of Influence and the City's 2035 General Plan designates the subject parcels as Light Industrial Reserve.

The Fresno County Agricultural Commissioners' Office reviewed the project and requires the applicant to acknowledge the Fresno County Right-to-Farm Ordinance regarding the inconveniences and discomfort associated with normal farm activities in the surrounding of the proposed development. This requirement will be included as a Condition of Approval.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The proposed M-3 conditional zoning will not conflict with agricultural use with the approval of the subject General Plan Amendment to allow General Plan compatibility with the zoning. The subject GPA Application No. 555 will allow the change of the

current land use designation from Agriculture to General Industrial and the change of current zoning from the AE-20 (Exclusive Agricultural, 20-acre minimum parcel size) to M-3 (c) (Heavy Industrial; Conditional). The subject parcels are not in Williamson Act Land Conservation Contract.

- C. Conflict with existing zoning for forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production; or
- D. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project site is not identified as forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220[g]) or timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526) and is not zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104[g]). Therefore, the proposed project would not result in the conversion of forest land and would not conflict with forest land, timberland, or Timberland Production zoning. No impacts would occur.

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The subject proposal will convert 27.85 acres of acre agricultural land to limited heavy industrial uses; however, this transition will be subject to the General Plan Amendment of current designation of Agriculture to General Industrial. The industrial uses proposed by the application are less intensive in nature, supportive of agriculture and are incidental to farming operations.

The Fresno County Department of Agriculture (Ag Commissioner's Office) reviewed the proposal and requires that the applicant shall acknowledge Fresno County Right-to-Farm Ordinance regarding the inconveniencies and discomfort associated with normal farm activities in the surrounding of the proposed development.

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:

Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Analysis dated September 29, 2020 was prepared for the project by LSA Associates. The Analysis along with the project information was

provided to the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD) for comments.

According to the *Analysis*, the California Environmental Quality Act requires that projects be analyzed for consistency with the applicable air quality plan. For a project to be consistent with San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD) air quality plans, the pollutants emitted from a project should not exceed the SJVAPCD emission thresholds or cause a significant impact on air quality. In addition, emission reductions achieved through implementation of offset requirements are a major component of the SJVAPCD air quality plans.

As discussed in III. B. below, operation of the proposed project would not result in the generation of criteria air pollutants that would exceed SJVAPCD thresholds of significance. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of SJVAPCD air quality plans.

Per the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District review of the proposal, a District Authority to Construct prior to installation of equipment that controls or may emit air contaminants, including but not limited to emergency internal combustion engines, boilers, and baghouses. Furthermore: The development proposals may also be subject to the District Regulation VIII - (Fugitive PM₁₀, Prohibitions), Rule 4102 (Nuisance), Rule 4601 (Architectural Coatings), Rule 4641 (Cutback, Slow Cure, and Emulsified Asphalt Paving and Maintenance Operations) and District Rule 4002 (National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants). These requirements will be addressed through mandatory Site Plan Review before a use is established on the property.

- 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 project area is located within the San Joaquin Valley Air Basin (SJVAB), which is included among the eight counties that comprise the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District. Under the provisions of the U.S. Clean Air Act, the attainment status of the SJVAB with respect to national and state ambient air quality standards has been classified as non-attainment/extreme, non-attainment/severe, non-attainment, attainment/unclassified, or attainment for various criteria pollutants which includes O₃, PM₁₀, PM_{2.5}, CO, NO₂, SO₂, lead and others.

Per the Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Analysis, in developing thresholds of significance for air pollutants, the SJVAPCD considered the emission levels for which a project's individual emissions would be cumulatively considerable. If a project exceeds the identified significance thresholds, its emissions would be cumulatively considerable, resulting in significant adverse air quality impacts to the region's existing air quality conditions.

Regarding construction emissions, this analysis evaluates potential construction emissions associated with the maximum building that would be allowed with the

proposed rezone. As there are no maximum building requirements for M-3 zones, this analysis is based on closest representative zoning designation of C-3, which stipulates that the maximum coverage of the lot by buildings or structures shall not exceed 33 percent of the total lot area. The project site is approximately 27.85 acres; therefore, this analysis assumes that a warehouse structure of up to 400,388 square feet could be constructed on the project site. Construction emissions associated with construction of the warehouse were estimated using the California Emissions Estimator Model version 2016.3.2 (CalEEMod).

The project construction emissions (tons per day) associated with a future development scenario on the site, assuming the maximum allowable building size, would be 2.8 tons/year for ROG, 3.9 tons/year for NO_x, 3.2 tons/year for CO, 0.1 ton/year for SO_x, 0.8 ton/year for PM₁₀ and 0.4 ton/year for PM_{2.5}. which is below the SJVAPC significant threshold for construction period emission of 10 tons/year for ROG and NO_x, 100 tons/year for CO, 27 tons/year for SO_x and 15 tons/year for PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}.

Regarding operational emissions, long-term air pollutant emission impacts on air quality are those associated with mobile sources (e.g., vehicle trips), energy sources (e.g., electricity and natural gas) and area sources (e.g., architectural coatings and the use of landscape maintenance equipment) related to the proposed project.

Emission estimates for operation of the project were calculated using CalEEMod. This analysis evaluates potential operational emissions associated with the maximum building (440,388 sq. ft. heavy industrial use) that would be allowed with the proposed rezone. Trip generation rates for the project were based on CalEEMod's default rates for heavy industrial land uses. Based on the default construction assumptions, it was assumed that operations would commence in 2023.

The annual emissions associated with project operational trip generation are identified in Table 4 for ROG, NO_x, CO, SO_x, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5}.

The project annual operational emissions (tons per year) consisting of area source emissions, energy source emissions and mobile source emissions would be 2.1 tons/year for ROG, 2.6 tons/year for NO_x and CO, 0.1 ton/year for SO_x, 0.9 ton/year for PM₁₀ and 0.3 ton/year for PM_{2.5}. which is below the SJVAPC significant threshold for construction period emission of 10 tons/year for ROG and NO_x, 100 tons/year for CO, 27 tons/year for SO_x and 15 tons/year for PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}.

The project would not exceed the significance criteria for annual ROG, NO_x, CO, SO_x, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5} emissions; therefore, operation of the proposed project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in nonattainment under an applicable federal or State AAQS.

C. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

Sensitive receptors are defined as people that have an increased sensitivity to air pollution or environmental contaminants. Sensitive receptor locations include schools, parks and playgrounds, day care centers, nursing homes, hospitals, and residential dwelling units. The closest sensitive receptor to the project site includes residences to the north, east, and south. The closest is located approximately 200 feet south of the south edge of the project site.

As discussed above in III. B. above, the project would not be a significant source of long-term operational emissions. Therefore, the proposed project, including any warehousing or other structure allowed under the M-3 zoning, would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The SJVAPCD addresses odor criteria within the GAMAQI and has not established a rule or standard regarding odor emissions. Rather, the District has a nuisance rule: “any project with the potential to frequently expose members of the public to objectionable odors should be deemed to have a significant impact.”

Per the SJVAPCD, the common odor producing land uses are landfills, transfer stations, sewage treatment plants, wastewater pump stations, composting facilities, feed lots, coffee roasters, asphalt batch plants, and rendering plants. The project would not engage in any of these activities. If an odor generating use is constructed, the project would be subject to SJVAPCD Rule 4102 - Nuisance which would result in enforcement actions if confirmed odor complaints are generated by future project uses. Therefore, the potential project odor impacts would be considered less than significant.

The expansion of the existing rail unloading operation will not cause a significant impact regarding objectionable odors. However, any of the included conditional uses as indicated through this Amendment Application will need to be reviewed based on their own merits and project specificity.

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:

The project site is in an area of mixed agricultural and industrial land uses. The site has been fallowed for a decade or so has been disturbed with the industrial activities from an existing industrial use on the adjacent parcel to the west. Further, neighboring properties have been historically utilized for agricultural cultivation and/or residential development and, therefore, have also been previously disturbed.

This proposal was referred to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), which expressed no concerns with the project and offered no comments. This proposal was also referred to the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW), which did not comment on the project. Therefore, no impacts were identified regarding any candidate, sensitive, or special-status species or any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by CDFW or USFWS. The project will have no impact on biological resources.

- C. Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project site has been fallowed for a decade and does not contain any riparian features, wetlands, or waters under the jurisdiction of the United States.

A query of the National Wetlands Inventory (NWI) Map shows that the nearest wetland feature is approximately 0.78 mile southeast of the project site and will not be impacted by the subject proposal.

- D. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project area cannot be characterized as an area for migratory wildlife species or suitable for migratory wildlife corridors. As stated earlier, the project site is vacant and located adjacent to an existing industrial use. Other urban development on the outskirts of Golden State Industrial corridor is located approximately 0.44 miles west of the project site.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

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

- F. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state Habitat Conservation Plan?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

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

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION
INCORPORATED:

The project site is not in an area sensitive to historical, archeological, or paleontological resources. The project was reviewed by the Southern San Joaquin Valley Information Center (SSJVIC) and Native Americans Heritage Commission (NAHC). The SSJVIC indicated that archeological sensitivity of the site is unknown whereas the NAHC conducted a Sacred Lands Search for the site and reported negative results in its search for any sacred sites. Although, Table Mountain Rancheria (TMR) expressed no concerns with the project by declining participation in AB 52, but they requested to be notified in the unlikely event that cultural resources are unearthed during ground disturbance. Given the SSJVIC and TMR comments, the project will adhere to the following mitigation measure to ensure that impacts to cultural resources remain less than significant.

* **Mitigation Measure**

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

remains are determined to be Native American, the Sheriff-Coroner must notify the Native American Commission within 24 hours.

VI. ENERGY

Would the project:

- A. Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources during project construction or operation?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION
INCORPORATED:

Future development proposals on the subject property are unlikely to result in potentially significant environmental impacts due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources. To minimize the potential for wasteful or inefficient consumption of energy resources, all development proposals would require adherence to the following Mitigation Measure.

* **Mitigation Measure**

1. *The idling of on-site vehicles and equipment will be avoided to the most extent possible to avoid wasteful or inefficient energy consumption during project construction.*

The project will also be subject to meeting California Green Building Standards Code (CCR, Title 24, Part 11-CALGreen), effective January 1, 2020, to meet the goals of AB (Assembly Bill) 32 which established a comprehensive program of cost-effective reductions of greenhouse gases to 1990 levels by 2020.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

Development of industrial uses on the property would not conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency.

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

VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Would the project:

- A. Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:
1. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priola Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault?
 2. Strong seismic ground shaking?
 3. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

Per Figure 9-5 of the Fresno County General Plan Background Report, the project area has 10 percent probability of seismic hazard in 50 years. Future development proposals on the property would be subject to building standards at the time of development, which include specific regulations to protect against damage caused by earthquake and/or ground acceleration.

4. Landslides?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

Per Figure 9-6 of the Fresno County General Plan Background Report, the project site is not located in an area of landslide hazards. The project site is flat with no topographical variations, which precludes the possibility of landslides.

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

Per Figure 7-3 of the Fresno County General Plan Background Report, the project site is not in an area of erosion hazards. Grading activities resulting from future development proposals may result in loss of some topsoil due to compaction and over covering of soil for construction of buildings and structures for the project. However, the impact would be less than significant with a Project Note requiring that Engineered Grading Plans shall be approved, and a Grading Permit shall be obtained from the Development Engineering Section of the Development Services and Capital Projects Division prior to any on-site grading activities.

- 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:

Per Figure 9-6 of Fresno County General Plan Background Report, the project site is not in an area at risk of landslides. Also, the subject proposal involves no underground materials movement and therefore poses no risks related to subsidence.

- D. Be located on expansive soil as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

Per Figure 7-1 of the 2000 Fresno County General Plan Background Report, the project site is not in an area of expansive soils. However, future development proposals on the property will implement all applicable requirements of the most recent California Building Standards Code and will consider any potential hazards associated with shrinking and swelling of expansive soils.

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

No community sewer is currently available to the property. The project lies within the Selma-Kingsburg-Fowler (SKF) Sanitation District and City of Selma Sphere of Influence but outside of their existing corporate boundaries.

According to SKF Sanitation District, the property is not contiguous to the District boundaries and no accessible public sewer is available within 200 feet of the parcels. To receive District sewer services, the parcels will require to be annexed with the City of Selma through LAFCo's (Local Agency Formation Commission) approval.

Per LAFCo review of the project, annexation to the City of Selma is difficult due to the project site not being contiguous to the city limit. However, as the same restriction doesn't apply to an annexation to the SKF Sanitation District, the property shall be annexed to the SKF Sanitation District as a condition of sewer service by the District. This requirement will be included as a Condition of Approval.

Per the Fresno County Public Health Department, Environmental Health Division (Health Department) review of the project, only low water uses and uses that generate small amounts of liquid waste shall be permitted until the property is served by a community sewer and water system or adequate information is submitted to the Health Department to demonstrate that the property can accommodate higher volumes of liquid wastes. This will be included as a Project Note.

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The project site is not in an area highly or moderately sensitive to archeological resources. However, in the unlikely event of paleontological or archaeological materials being exposed during ground-disturbance activities related to development proposals on the property, the Mitigation Measure identified in the Cultural Resources section of this report will reduce impacts to less than significant.

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

Human activities, including fossil fuel combustion and land-use changes, release carbon dioxide (CO₂) and other compounds cumulatively termed greenhouse gases (GHGs). GHGs are effective at trapping radiation that would otherwise escape the atmosphere. The San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD), a California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Trustee Agency for this project, has developed thresholds to determine significance of a proposed project – either implement Best Performance Standards or achieve a 29 percent reduction from Business as Usual (BAU) (a specific numerical threshold). On December 17, 2009, SJVAPCD adopted *Guidance for Valley Land-Use Agencies in Addressing GHG Emission Impacts for New Projects under CEQA* (SJVAPCD 2009), which outlined SJVAPCD's methodology for assessing a project's significance for GHGs under CEQA.

During construction, GHGs would be emitted through the operation of construction equipment and from worker and builder supply vendor vehicles, each of which typically use fossil-based fuels to operate. The combustion of fossil-based fuels creates GHGs such as CO₂, CH₄, and N₂O. Furthermore, CH₄ is emitted during the fueling of heavy equipment. Exhaust emissions from on-site construction activities would vary daily as construction activity levels change. Using CalEEMod, it is estimated that construction activities would generate approximately 1,456.1 metric tons of CO₂e.

Long-term operational GHG emissions are typically generated from mobile sources (e.g., cars, trucks, and buses), area sources (e.g., maintenance activities and landscaping), indirect emissions from sources associated with energy consumption, waste sources (land filling and waste disposal), and water sources (water supply and conveyance, treatment, and distribution). Mobile source GHG emissions would include project-generated vehicle and truck trips to and from the project. Area-source emissions would be associated with activities such as landscaping and maintenance on the project site. Energy source emissions would be generated at off-site utility providers as a result of increased electricity demand generated by the project. Waste source emissions generated by the proposed project include energy generated by land filling and other methods of disposal related to transporting and managing project generated waste. In addition, water source emissions associated with the proposed project are generated by

water supply and conveyance, water treatment, water distribution, and wastewater treatment.

This analysis evaluates potential operational emissions associated with the maximum building that would be allowed with the proposed rezone. The CalEEMod analysis assumed 440,388 square feet of heavy industrial uses. Trip generation rates for the project were based on CalEEMod's default rates for heavy industrial land uses and it was assumed that operations would commence in 2023. Operational GHG emissions were estimated using CalEEMod and the results are presented in Table 4.

The project would generate 2,598.8 metric tons of CO₂e per year based on emissions source category of energy, mobile, waste and water. The project is not expected to be exempt from CEQA requirements and the County has not adopted a CAP or GHG thresholds of significance; therefore, the first two GHG significance criteria would not apply. Therefore, SJVAPCD guidance would require the proposed project to demonstrate a 29 percent reduction in GHG emissions compared to BAU.

The project's estimated annual GHG emissions are approximately 3,769.1 metric tons of CO₂e under BAU Conditions (2005) and 2,598.8 metric tons of CO₂e in 2020 for project operations. This represents a 31.1 percent decrease in emissions, which meets the SJVAPCD reduction criteria of 29 percent reduction from BAU. Therefore, the project would not result in emissions exceeding the SJVAPCD criteria for GHG emissions.

At this time no additional measures are required from the proposed project beyond those already established by the State to achieve the AB (Assembly Bill) 32 target. Therefore, a BAU analysis that shows the project would achieve the reductions required by regulations to meet the AB 32 target and demonstrates that the project GHG emissions would be less than significant. As 2020 passes, new post-2020 thresholds will be necessary. As the project would be operational in 2023, the 2020 target would not be applicable. Operation of the project would comply with any new measures established to achieve post-2020 reductions.

- 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:

Per the *Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Analysis* prepared for the project, the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District adopted Climate Change Action Plan (CCAP) which includes suggested BPS for proposed development projects. The Action Plan contains GHG reduction measures that would be applicable to the proposed project. The project would be consistent with the applicable CCAP measures which requires idling time for commercial vehicles, including delivery and construction vehicles. The proposed project was analyzed for consistency with CARB's adopted Scoping Plan and would be consistent with the Scoping Plan measures, including the following: 1) California Light-Duty Vehicle Greenhouse Gas Standards which apply to light-duty vehicles that would access the project site; and 2) Low Carbon Fuel Standard. Vehicles that require that

access to the project site comply with the standard, by way of consuming transportation fuel that will meet the goal of a 10 percent reduction in carbon intensity by 2020.

The project would not conflict with the goals and objectives of the SJVAPCD's CCAP or any other State or regional plan, policy or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions.

IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Would the project:

- A. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials; or
- B. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment; or
- C. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The uses allowed under the proposed M-3 conditional zoning could involve the handling of potentially hazardous materials. The Fresno County Public Health Department, Environmental Health Division (Health Department) reviewed the project and requires the following to be included as Project Notes. Future tenants may be required to comply with hazardous materials business plan reporting requirements. Facilities proposing to use and/or store hazardous materials and/or hazardous wastes shall meet the requirements set forth in the California Health and Safety Code (HSC), Division 20, Chapter 6.95, and the California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 22, Division 4.5. Any business that handles a hazardous material or hazardous waste may be required to submit a Hazardous Materials Business Plan pursuant to the California Health and Safety Code (HSC), Division 20, Chapter 6.95. Any tenant proposing to utilize underground or aboveground petroleum storage tank shall contact Certified Unified Program Agency, obtain permit from FCHD regarding the installation of any underground storage tanks, and contact local Fire authority for construction of aboveground tanks. Future tenants may require obtaining a permit from the California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery (CalRecycle) pursuant to the State of California Public Resources Code, Division 30; Waste Management, Chapter 16; Waste Tire Facilities, Chapter 19; and Waste Tire Haulers.

- 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 project site is not included in the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) Hazardous Waste and Substances Sites (Cortese) List compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

Per the Fresno County *Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan Update* adopted by the Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) on December 3, 2018, the nearest public airport, Selma Airport, is approximately 1.4 miles southwest of the project site. At that distance, the airport 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?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The subject proposal would not modify the existing street system in the area. Therefore, interference with any adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan would not occur. The Fresno County Sheriff's Department and the Fresno County Fire Protection District identified no concerns related to emergency access.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

Per Figure 9-9 of the Fresno County General Plan Background Report, the project site is outside of the State Responsibility area for wildland fire protection. No persons or structures will be exposed to wildland fire hazards.

X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Would the project:

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

See discussion above in Section VI. E. Geology and Soils for waste discharge requirements.

The subject proposal will use an onsite well for water supply. The State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB), Division of Drinking Water (DDW) reviewed the proposal and stated that the as the well will be used to serve more than 25 people on the property (35 employees will be added as part of the subject proposal), it would meet the definition of a public water system and will need a drinking water permit from SWRCB-DDW. This requirement will be included as a Project Note.

Per the Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region review of the proposal, a Project Note would require that construction storm water permit shall be obtained for all ground disturbing activities that exceed one-acre

- 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 site is located within the Central Kings Groundwater Sustainability Area (CKGSA). The project was referred to but was not commented on by CKGSA. The subject property is not located in a water-short area. The Water and Natural Resources Division of the Fresno County Department of Public Works and Planning reviewed the proposed project and had no concerns relating to water availability and sustainability for future development related to this proposal.

- 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; or
 2. Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on or off site; or
 3. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or
 4. Impede or redirect flood flows?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

According to the United States Geological Survey Quad Maps, no natural drainage channels run through the subject parcels.

Although no development is proposed under this proposal, future development proposal pertaining to the uses allowed by this application could compact and over-cover soil and reduced area available for infiltration of storm water, potential runoff, flooding, erosion, and siltation. However, these effects are not considered significant due to each

development adhering to mandatory construction practices contained in the Grading and Drainage Sections of the County Ordinance Code which will be implemented through mandatory Site Plan Review.

The Development Engineering Section of the Fresno County Department of Public Works and Planning reviewed the proposal and pursuant to their comments a Project Note would require a grading permit and an engineered grading and drainage plan shall be obtained for the grading that has been done without a permit and any additional grading proposed with this application.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

According to FEMA FIRM Panel 2125H, the project site is not subject to flooding from the 100 year storm.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The subject proposal would not conflict with Water Quality Control Plan as there is none for Fresno County. The subject property is located within the Central Kings Groundwater Sustainability Area (GSA) which expressed no concerns related to groundwater resources.

XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING

Would the project:

- A. Physically divide an established community?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

Located in an agricultural area, the project site is approximately 0.75-mile northwest of the nearest city limits of the City of Selma. No public road traverses the project site nor does it block any designated roads or pathways. The project would not divide any established communities and no impact would occur.

- B. Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The project site is designated Agriculture in the County-adopted Selma Community Plan, zoned AE-20 (Exclusive Agriculture, 20-acre minimum parcel size district) and is located within the City of Selma Sphere of Influence.

The subject proposal involves amendment to the Land use Element of the County-adopted Selma Community Plan to redesignate two contiguous parcels totaling 27.85 acres from Agriculture to General Industrial and rezone them from the AE-20 Zone District to the M-3 (c) (Heavy Industrial; Conditional) Zone District for limited by-right uses.

The subject parcels are located within the Selma-Kingsburg-Fowler Sanitation District and the City of Selma Sphere of Influence but outside of their respective corporate boundaries. The project is not in conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation of these entities. The project is consistent with the following policies of the County General Plan.

Regarding General Plan Policy LU-A.1 the subject parcels are not designated as Prime Farmland in the 2016 Fresno County Important Farmland Map and are located within Golden State Industrial Corridor Sphere of Influence (SOI) near established industrial development within the Corridor and will eventually be developed with industrial uses. Also, located within City of Selma SOI the 2035 Selma General Plan designates this project area as Light Industrial reserve for future industrial uses.

Regarding General Plan Policy LU-A.12, Policy LU-A.13 and Policy LU-A.14, the subject proposal is consistent Policy LU-A.1 as discussed above, will not convert productive agricultural land to non-agricultural use, and needed landscaping will be provided as part of future development proposals on the property.

Regarding General Plan Policy LU-F.29. Criteria a, b, c & d, future development proposals on the property will comply with Fresno County Noise Ordinance and Air District rules and regulations. The proposals will also comply with the M-3 Zone District development standards and be analyzed against these standards during Site Plan Review.

Regarding General Plan Policy LU-F. 30, the subject property will annex into the Selma-Kingsburg-Fowler Sanitation District to receive the District's sewer service. Regarding water supply, the subject property can be allowed with only low water uses and the uses that generate small amounts of liquid waste until such time the property is served by community water system.

Regarding General Plan Policy LU-F.31, landscaping will be required and be provided along Manning Avenue frontage of the property due to it carrying significant non-industrial, farming-related traffic through the area.

Regarding General Plan Policy LU-G.7, the City of Selma was consulted by soliciting comments on the subject proposal with no response provided by the City from the lands use perspective of the project.

Regarding General Plan Policy LU-G.14 the subject proposal is within the City of Selma Sphere of Influence (SOI) and was asked for possible annexation per the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the City and the County. The City released the project to the County for processing on June 26, 2018 with no comments.

Regarding General Plan Policy TR-A.7, the proposed project will contribute towards its fair share regarding signalization at the intersection of Golden State Blvd and Manning Avenue.

Regarding General Plan Policy PF-A.2: the future development proposals will be served by community sewer from SKF and community water when it becomes available and can feasibly be provided.

Regarding General Plan Policy PF-C.17 the subject parcels are not located within low water area of Fresno County and the Water and Natural Resources Division of Fresno County Department of Public Works and Planning offered no comments relating to the water availability/consistency for the project.

XII. MINERAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

- A. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state; or
- B. Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local General Plan, Specific Plan, or other land use plan?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

Per Figure 7-8 of the Fresno County General Plan Background Report, the project site is not located within a mineral-producing area of the County.

XIII. NOISE

Would the project result in:

- A. Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies; or
- B. Generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The subject proposal involves no development. The Fresno County Department of Public Health, Environmental Health Division reviewed the proposal and expressed no concerns related to noise.

- 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:

See discussion in Section IX. E. above.

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 would not induce population growth, displace housing, or displace a substantial number of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

XV. PUBLIC SERVICES

Would the project:

- A. Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, or the need for new or physically-altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the following public services:

- 1. Fire protection?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

Fresno County Fire Protection District (CalFire) reviewed the subject proposal and offer no comments related to fire.

- 2. Police protection; or

- 3. Schools; or

4. Parks; or

5. Other public facilities?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The future industrial uses on the property resulting from this proposal will not impact existing public services, nor will they result in the need for additional public services related to schools, parks, or police protection.

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 future industrial uses on the property will not induce population growth to require construction of new or expanded recreational facilities in the area.

XVII. TRANSPORTATION

Would the project:

- A. Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION
INCORPORATED:

The Design Division of the Fresno County Department of Public Works and Planning and the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) reviewed the subject proposal and required that a Traffic Impact Study (TIS) be prepared to determine impact on County roadway and intersections.

A Traffic Impact Study (TIS) was prepared for the project by Peters Engineering Group and dated November 17, 2020. According to the TIS, the project contributes to future year 2040 levels of service below the target Level of Service (LOS), as well as excessive queuing, and will be responsible for payment of an equitable share of the cost of the future improvements at Manning Avenue/DeWolf Avenue.

The Project will cause no increase in the Traffic Index (TI) on the study road segments, and a left-turn lane at the site access driveway is not warranted.

The County Design Division and the Road Maintenance and Operations Division reviewed the TIS and the following mitigation measure, pro-rata share percentage and estimated cost identified by the County Design Division shall apply to the project to ensure potential traffic impacts are mitigated /addressed to less than significant levels:

* **Mitigation Measures:**

1. *Prior to the issuance of building permits for the uses allowed on M-3 zoned property, the applicant shall enter into an agreement with the County of Fresno agreeing to participate on a pro-rata basis per acreage developed in the funding of future off-site traffic improvements defined in items 'a' below. The traffic improvements and the project's maximum pro-rata share based on 27.85 acres of the associated costs are as follows:*

a. *The project shall add a signal at the intersection of Manning Avenue and DeWolf Avenue. The project's maximum share for the 2040 scenario is \$21,255 (includes 1.5% of the total cost of construction, 15% preliminary engineering, and 15% construction engineering)*

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

The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) reviewed the TIS, concurred with its findings, and required no mitigation measure to mitigate the project's impact on state highway.

The subject parcels front on Leonard Avenue and Manning Avenue. According to the Road Maintenance and Operations Division, Leonard Avenue is classified as a Local Road requiring an ultimate right-of-way of 60 feet (30 feet each side of centerline line). To meet ultimate ROW for Leonard Avenue, a Condition of Approval would require that 10-foot of the property along east property line of 9.29-acre parcel identified by APN 348-050-25S shall be dedicated in additional road right-of-way. Manning Avenue requires no additional right-of-way. It currently has 53 feet right-of-way south of section line.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

According to the Traffic Impact Study (TIS) prepared by Peters Engineering Group and dated November 17, 2020, truck trips typical of those that will be generated by the proposed Project are generally excluded from the requirements of CEQA as they pertain to transportation impacts and VMT. Considering that the daily employee trips are expected to be less than 110, the project will cause a less than significant transportation impact based on Vehicle Mile Travel (VMT). As such, the project will not conflict with or be inconsistent with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b).

- 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: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

Access to the project site for future development proposals will be from Leonard Avenue. Due to being classified as expressway, access to the site from Manning Avenue is not allowed. Given that restriction, impact of any traffic hazard due to site access will be reduced to less than significant.

- D. Result in inadequate emergency access?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

All development proposals on the property will be subject to mandatory Site Plan Review to ensure that the design of each use proposed on the property incorporates adequate emergency access acceptable by local fire agency. As noted above, access to the subject properties will be restricted to Leonard Avenue.

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:

The project site is in an area not designated as highly or moderately sensitive for archeological resources. Pursuant to Assembly Bill (AB) 52, the subject proposal was routed to the Santa Rosa Rancheria Tachi Yokut Tribe, Picayune Rancheria of the Chukchansi Indians, Dumna Wo Wah Tribal Government, and Table Mountain Rancheria offering them an opportunity to consult under Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 21080.3(b) with a 30-day window to formally respond to the County letter. No tribe requested consultation, resulting in no further action on the part of the County. The Table Mountain Rancheria (TMR), however, requested to be informed in the unlikely event that cultural resources are identified on the property. With the Mitigation Measure included in the CULTURAL ANALYSIS section of this report any potential impact to tribal cultural resources will be reduced to less than significant.

XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Would the project:

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

See discussion in Section VII. E. GEOLOGY AND SOILS above. The project will not result in the relocation or construction of new electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities.

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

See discussion in Section X. B. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY above.

- C. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

See discussion above in Section VII.E. GEOLOGY AND SOILS.

- D. Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals; or

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The subject proposal involves no developments, besides the installation of railroad tracks. The waste disposal resulting from future development proposals will be through regular trash collection service.

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: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The project site is not within or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones.

XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Would the project:

- A. Have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number, or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

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

- B. Have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable (“cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

Each of the projects located within Fresno County has been or would be analyzed for potential impacts, and appropriate project-specific Mitigation Measures are developed to reduce that project’s impacts to less than significant levels. Projects are required to comply with applicable County policies and ordinances. The incremental contribution by the subject proposal to overall development in the area is less than significant.

The subject proposal will adhere to the permitting requirements and rules and regulations set forth by the Fresno County Grading and Drainage Ordinance, San Joaquin Air Pollution Control District, and California Code of Regulations Fire Code at the time development occurs on the property. No cumulatively considerable impacts relating to Agricultural and Forestry Resources, Air Quality, or Transportation were identified in the project analysis. Impacts identified for Aesthetics, Cultural Resources, Energy, and Transportation will be addressed with the Mitigation Measures discussed above in Section I, Section V, Section VI, and Section XVII.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

No substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly were identified in the analysis.

CONCLUSION/SUMMARY

Based upon the Initial Study (IS) No. 7504 prepared for General Plan Amendment Application No. 555 and Amendment Application No. 3832, 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, Mineral Resources, Population and Housing, Public Services, Recreation and Tribal Cultural Resources.

Potential impacts related to Agricultural and Forestry Resources, Geology and Soils, Greenhouse Gas Emission, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Hydrology and Water Quality, Land Use and Planning, Noise, Utilities and Service Systems, and Wildfire have been determined to be less than significant.

Potential impacts to Aesthetics, Cultural Resources, Energy and Transportation have been determined to be less than significant with the identified Mitigation Measure.

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.

EA:jp

G:\4360Devs&PIn\PROJSEC\PROJDOCS\AA\3800-3899\3832 - See GPA 555\IS-CEQA\AA 3832 IS wu (Final Final) 6.17.22.docx