



County of Fresno

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

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

APPLICANT: Julia Yang, Fresno County Road Maintenance and Operations Division

APPLICATION NOS.: Initial Study No. 8100 and Director Review and Approval No. 4663

DESCRIPTION: Recognize and permit expansion of an existing County Road Maintenance Yard including the installation of a modular office on an 8.03-acre parcel in the AE-160 (Exclusive Agricultural, 160-acre minimum parcel size) Zone District.

LOCATION: The project site is located on the west side of Dunlap Road, 2,122 feet south of Millwood Road, approximately 12.5 miles east of the City of Orange Cove. (40315 Dunlap Road) (APN 190-480-10T) (Sup. Dist. 5).

I. AESTHETICS

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:

A. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The subject site is located in a predominantly agricultural area with rural single-family residential uses pocketed throughout the region. Images of the subject site depict views of the nearby foothill range surrounding the subject site. Underlying development standards established by the Zone District will regulate construction of the structure to a maximum height of 35 feet. In considering the project will be in compliance with development standards of the underlying zone district and that no scenic vista would be negatively impacted by the project, a less than significant impact can be seen.

B. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

In addition, the Fresno County General Plan, Figure OS-2 does not identify a scenic highway or resource located on or near the project site. Aerial images of the subject site indicates that the project would not remove or substantially damage scenic resources.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project site is located in a predominately agricultural area with rural residences located throughout the region. The existing road yard would not change the existing visual character; however, this change is not expected to result in a significant impact where public views and the existing visual character would be substantially degraded.

- 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:

As noted in the submitted Operational Statement, the subject facility will utilize outdoor lighting for security and visibility of the site. A mitigation measure will be implemented to reduce impacts outdoor lighting may have on adjacent parcels and public right-of-way.

* **Mitigation Measure(s)**

- 1. *All outdoor lighting shall be hooded and directed downward so as not to shine on adjacent properties or public right-of-way.*

II. AGRICULTURAL AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:

- A. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance, as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

Per the 2016 Fresno County Important Farmland Map, the subject parcel is designated Rural Residential Land. Therefore, the project would not convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The subject parcel is zoned AE-160 (Exclusive Agricultural, 160-acre minimum parcel size). Per the Fresno County Zoning Ordinance, public facilities are allowed in the AE-160 Zone District subject to approval of a Director Review and Approval Application. The subject parcel is not subject to a Williamson Act Contract. The project will not be in conflict with the existing zoning for agricultural use and would not be in conflict with the Williamson Act Contract.

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

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The subject parcel is not zoned for forest land or timberland and would not result in the loss of forest land or the conversion of forest land to non-forest use.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The subject parcel is located along Dunlap Road and proposes to improve an existing maintenance yard. The project is not expected to involve changes to the existing environment which could result in the conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use.

III. AIR QUALITY

Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management district or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:

A. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable Air Quality Plan; or

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:

The project has been routed to the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD) for review and comment. The SJVAPCD did not express concern with the project to indicate that the project would result in a conflict with an applicable Air Quality Plan or result in cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant. Project construction is anticipated to result in minor temporary increases in criteria pollutants, however, the minor increases resulting from construction are not anticipated to result in a significant impact.

- C. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations; or
- D. Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

Emissions resulting from County equipment and vehicles are regulated through the California Air Resources Board. The recognition of the existing yard will not increase emissions or odors. The nearest sensitive receptor is located approximately 130 feet north of the location of the existing facility. The generator is not expected to only run when the main electrical supply is interrupted and be turned off when electrical supply is restored. In consideration of the limited use of the generator and proximity of the site to sensitive receptors, the project is not anticipated to result in substantial pollutant concentrations or adverse emissions and will have a less than significant impact.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

Per the California Natural Diversity Database, there are no reported occurrences of a special-status species encompassing the project site or located in vicinity of the project site.

The project site is already developed with a maintenance yard that is utilized by the County of Fresno. Additional human disturbance related to the existing agricultural operations and existing paved right-of-way provide further signs that occupation of the site by a special-status species is highly unlikely. The California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) did not express concern with the project to indicate impacts to special-status species. Therefore, development of the project is not expected to negatively impact through habitat

modification as the site is not occupied or has not significant habitat for special-status species.

- B. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service; or
- C. Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally-protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

Review of available records and aerial images indicate that Mill Creek runs directly through the subject site. The only proposed improvements will be the installation of a modular office located 15 feet south of the existing office building. The existing office building is located nearly 840 feet from the creek. Therefore, although the subject site is located near a creek, the project scope is confined to the subject parcel and would not have an impact on Mill Creek. No additional wetlands or sensitive natural communities were identified in proximity of the subject site.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

There was no identified wildlife corridor or wildlife nursery site identified on the project site. As noted, the subject site is already improved with a road maintenance yard. The proposed project would add an office building, but in considering the existing use and built environment, the addition of the building would not result in substantial interference with the movement of native residents.

- 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 State or local policies, ordinances, Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state Habitat Conservation Plan was identified as being in conflict with the project proposal.

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 subject property is located in an area within a 0.5-mile radius of the project site, one of which was identified within the project boundaries however, to address the potential for their existence, the applicant has submitted a Cultural Resources Assessment prepared by Rincon Consultants, Inc. and dated May 2022.

The assessment consisted of a records search by the Southern San Joaquin Valley Information Center (SSJVIC), of the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS), to identify areas that have been previously studied and to identify any known cultural/historical resources that may be present within or in the vicinity of the project area. The records search yielded negative results for historic or prehistoric sites, or structures within the project site and within a one half-mile radius.

There have been three previous cultural/historical resource investigations done within one half-mile, with no cultural resource sites, listed on the:

- National Register of Historic Places,
- California Register of Historic Resources,
- California Points of Historical Interest, State Historic Landmarks, or the
- California Inventory of Historic Resources.

The results of the study were that human remains are recorded and known to be present within 100 feet of the project site. Considering the facility is existing and the job description is not changing, impacts to cultural resources are minimal. If the job description were to change, to include ground-disturbance, cultural resources may be impacted. Implementation of the following Mitigation Measure will reduce potential impacts on cultural and historical resources to a less than significant level.

* **Mitigation Measure(s)**

1. *Human remains are recorded and known to be present within 100 feet of the project site. However, the discovery of human remains is always a possibility during ground disturbing activities. If human remains are found, the State of California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 states that no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made a determination of origin and disposition pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. In the*

event of an unanticipated discovery of human remains, the County Coroner must be notified immediately. If the human remains are determined to be of Native American origin, the coroner will notify the NAHC, which will determine and notify an MLD. The MLD has 48 hours from being granted site access to make recommendations for the disposition of the remains.

VI. ENERGY

Would the project:

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

Project construction will be subject to current local and State building code standards which will also account for energy efficiency standards. The existing use is not expected to result in wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources during project construction or operation.

VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Would the project:

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

According to the Earthquake Hazard Zone Application (EQ Zapp), the subject parcel is not located within an earthquake fault zone.

- 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 (FCGPBR), the project site is located on land designated as having a 0%-20% chance of reaching peak horizontal ground acceleration assuming a 10% probability of a seismic hazard in 50

years. In considering the lower chance of reaching peak horizontal ground acceleration and mandatory compliance of the development with the California Building Code, there is minimal adverse risks associated with the project related to strong seismic ground shaking or seismic-related ground failure.

4. Landslides?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

As depicted in Figure 9-6 of the FCGPBR, the subject site is not located in identified areas of landslide hazards. In addition to the figure, the subject site and surrounding environment is located on relatively flat urban and built-up land.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project will result in the addition of a structure to an existing road maintenance equipment yard. The subject site is located on flat urban and built-up land where the loss of topsoil and change to soil erosion patterns resulting from project construction would not result in significant impact.

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:

No geologic unit or unstable soil was identified on the project site by reviewing agencies and departments.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

According to Figure 7-1 of the Fresno County General Plan Background Report (FCGPBR) the project site is not located in identified locations for soils exhibiting moderately high to high expansion potential.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project does not propose the construction of a septic system or alternative waste water disposal system.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

No unique paleontological resource or unique geologic feature was identified on the project site.

VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Would the project:

- A. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment; or
- B. Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The project proposes to would recognize an existing County of Fresno Road Maintenance Yard and allow a minor the expansion of an existing County of Fresno Road Maintenance Yard with the installation of a 960 square foot modular office building on an 8.03-acre parcel. Existing on-site structures include a 2,880 square foot salt shed, office building, fuel shed, equipment storage building and other outbuildings.

The SJVAPCD's adopted Climate Action Plan does not contain measures that are applicable to development projects. Also, there are no other local or regional climate action plans adopted. Nevertheless, the SJVAPCD has regulations to reduce GHG emissions through standards for medium and heavy-duty engines, construction equipment and vehicles which would apply to any site preparation and unit installation. Also, Title 24 compliance including energy efficient building codes would be applicable and would reduce GHG emissions during unit installation and equipment upgrades for ongoing project operations. The small quantity of additional emissions that would occur during site preparation and installation of the modular office building would not be significant and there are no SJVAPCD CEQA significance thresholds for GHG emitted from construction activities

There would be no or minimal net new operational GHG emissions after project construction is complete (i.e., the new 960 square foot modular office building). Because the project would not contribute any permanent net new operational GHG, it would be consistent with GHG reduction targets adopted by the State of California. The project would not conflict with any plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions nor conflict with any SJVAPCD or State policies to reduce GHG emissions.

Based on the above, it has been determined that any Project-related GHG impacts would be less than significant.

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 Fresno County Department of Public Health, Environmental Health Division indicated through their comments that the project would be subject to local and State standards for handling and reporting hazardous materials/waste. Requirements include update of their hazardous materials business plan with the Department of Public Health. With the project's compliance of local and state regulations for handling and reporting hazardous materials/waste, the project is not expected to result in a significant hazard to the public or environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials, or through accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials.

- 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:

There are no existing or proposed schools within a one-quarter mile of the project site.

- D. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

Per the NEPAssist database, the project site is not included on a hazardous materials site list and would not 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 project site is not located within an airport land use plan and is not located within two miles of the airport where a safety hazard or excessive noise would negatively affect people working in the project site would occur.

- F. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan; or
- G. Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

Reviewing agencies and departments did not express concern for the project with regard to emergency response plans or emergency evacuation plans, or increased risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires.

X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Would the project:

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

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

The subject proposal will utilize an existing on-site domestic water well and was routed to the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB), Division of Drinking water (DDW) for compliance with water quality standards for potable water. According to SWRCB-DDW, the proposal meets the definition of a public water system and shall be permitted as such. SWRCB-DDW also stated that the applicant has complied with all the outstanding issues relating to the current water system on the property and a water supply permit for this proposal has been drafted by that agency.

No impacts on the quality of groundwater were expressed by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board.

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

According to the Applicant's Operational Statement, there is an active water well and two 5,000-gallon water storage tanks on the property. The well produces 150 gallons of water per minute and will supply water for domestic use as well as for landscaping. The property is in a water-short area of Fresno County.

The project proposes minimal use of water resources that would not violate water quality standards, waste discharge requirements or substantially degrade surface or ground water quality. The modular office consists of one restroom. The Water and Natural Resources Division evaluated the proposal and believes the proposed modular office building will have a less than significant impact on groundwater levels in the area.

- C. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:
 - 1. Result in substantial erosion or siltation on or off site?
 - 2. Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on or off site?
 - 3. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or
 - 4. Impede or redirect flood flows?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

According to FEMA FIRM Panel 06019C2275H, the project site is not located within a flood hazard area and would not be affected by flood flows.

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

According to FEMA FIRM Panel 06019C2275H, the project site is not located within a flood hazard area and would not be affected by flood flows. In addition to not be affected by flood hazards, the project site is not located near a body of water where an increased risk from tsunami or seiche would occur.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

Reviewing agencies and departments did not express concern with the application to indicate that the project will conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable management plan.

XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING

Would the project:

A. Physically divide an established community?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project proposes to recognize an existing facility and allow installation of a modular building for office use. The project does not physically divide an established community.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project has been reviewed and determined to be consistent with applicable Policies of the General Plan & Sierra-North Regional 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:

Per Figure 7-8 of the Fresno County General Plan Background Report, the project site is outside of any 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; or

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The Department of Public Health, Environmental Health Division has reviewed the project and commented that the project proposal will be subject to the provisions of the County of Fresno Noise Ordinance. Review of the proposed operation indicate the noise levels would remain at the same level as now. The noise generation is not expected to result in excessive noise levels or deviate from noise normal for the surrounding agricultural area. The project site is not located within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. Therefore, although an increase in noise generation would occur as a result of the project, the noise generation is not expected to exceed thresholds established by the Fresno County Noise Ordinance and would not negatively affect surrounding property owners.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project site is not located within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. The project site is not located in 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:

The project will not result in an increase of housing, nor will it otherwise induce population growth.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The scale of the project is not significant enough to cause an increase in demands for service that would require additional facilities or service resources.

XVI. RECREATION

Would the project:

- A. Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated; or
- B. Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project does not involve residential development which may increase demand for neighborhood and regional parks, or other recreational facilities in the area. The project may be considered a recreational facility but is an enhancement to the public environments and does not physically interact or detract from other facilities or adversely impact the environment.

XVI. TRANSPORTATION

Would the project:

- A. Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities; or
- B. Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?; or

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

Per the Applicant's Operational Statement, there are an average of six visitors that access the existing maintenance yard. The project does anticipate the occasional maintenance trip for the facility; however, the volume of maintenance trips is not expected to result in impacts related to vehicle miles traveled or any County-adopted program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system. Reviewing Agencies and Departments did not express concern with the project in terms of a transportation impact resulting from the project.

- C. Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?; or
- D. Result in inadequate emergency access?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

Reviewing Agencies and Departments did not express concern with the project design or access to indicate that a hazard due to design features or inadequate emergency access will result from the project.

XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED:

Under the provisions of Assembly Bill 52 (AB 52), participating California Native American Tribes were notified of the project proposal and given the opportunity to enter into consultation with the County of Fresno on addressing potential cultural resources. No requests for consultation were received and no concerns were expressed by reviewing tribal governments. As no evidence was supplied to verify presence of tribal cultural resources and in considering the subject sites past use as agricultural production and

supportive of the adjacent dairy, there is minimal likelihood that a cultural resource is present on the subject site. A mitigation measure shall be implemented to properly address a cultural resource in the unlikely event that such a resource is unearthed during ground-disturbing activities associated with the project.

* **Mitigation Measure(s)**

1. See Section V. Cultural Resources A., B., and C. Mitigation Measure #1

XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Would the project:

- A. Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects; or
- B. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years; or
- 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; or
- 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:

Reviewing agencies and departments did not provide concern with the project in terms of solid waste production. As no concerns were expressed and based on the estimated solid waste generation from the proposed operation, the project is expected to generate a less than significant amount of solid waste and would comply with federal, state and local management and reduction statutes for solid waste.

- F. 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:

The Water and Natural Resources Division conducted a water evaluation for the proposed project and determined that the water supply is adequate to support the

project. Additionally, the subject parcel is not located within an area of the county defined as being a water short area.

- G. 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:

Wastewater is processed on site not by a service provider, see discussion in Section VII. E. GEOLOGY AND SOILS above.

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

All solid wastes and recyclables will be sent to local land-fill site through regular trash collection service. The amount of solid wastes will not increase with the recognition of the road yard.

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 subject site is already improved with structures that are proposed to be utilized with the subject operation. In addition, there are additional structures proposed with this project. The additional structure will not expose people or structures to any significant risks, including fires. The project will not substantially degrade the quality of the environment or substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species.

XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Would the project:

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project will have no impact on biological or cultural resources. It would not degrade the quality of the environment; 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; or reduce the number or restrict the range of an endangered, rare, or threatened species.

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

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

The project will be subject 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. The project involves limited new development. As such, no cumulatively considerable impacts relating to Agricultural and Forestry Resources, or Air quality were identified in the project analysis.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

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

CONCLUSION/SUMMARY

Based upon Initial Study No. 8100 prepared for Director Review and Approval No. 4663, 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 agriculture and forestry resources, mineral resources, population and housing, land use and planning, public services, recreation, or transportation.
- Potential impacts related to aesthetics, air quality, biological resources, energy, geology and soils, greenhouse gas emissions, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, noise, utilities and service systems, and wildlife have been determined to be less than significant.
- Potential impacts related to cultural, and tribal cultural resources, have been determined to be less than significant with Mitigation Measures incorporated into the project.

A Mitigated Negative Declaration is recommended and is subject to approval by the decision-making body. The Initial Study is available for review at 2220 Tulare Street, Suite A, street level, located on the southwest corner of Tulare and "M" Streets, Fresno, California.

MP

G:\4360Devs&Pln\PROJSEC\PROJDOCS\DRA\4600-4699\4663\CEQA-IS\CUP 4663IS Writeup.docx