



County of Fresno

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

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

- APPLICANT: Art Lancaster
- APPLICATION NOS.: Initial Study No. 8045; Amendment Application No. 3846;
Site Plan Review Application No. 8226
- DESCRIPTION: Allow the rezone of a 19.98-acre parcel from the existing AL-20 (Limited Agricultural; 20-acre minimum parcel size) Zone District to the M-2 (General Industrial) Zone District and approve a Site Plan Review for a commercial truck maintenance facility on a 2.12-acre portion of the said parcel.
- LOCATION: The subject parcel is located on the northeast corner of South Maple Avenue and East American Avenue within 0.5 mile south of the City of Fresno (APN: 330-212-38) (4780 S. Maple Ave., Fresno) (Sup. Dist. 3).

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 subject parcel borders with Maple Avenue and American Avenue which 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 which may be impacted by the project. 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 subject parcel is undeveloped and borders with the City of Fresno Sphere of Influence boundary. The surrounding land consists of industrial, residential, and agricultural uses. Parcels to the north and east are zoned M-3 (Heavy Industrial) and are developed with industrial uses or are fallow. Parcels to the west are zoned M-3 (c) and AE-20 and developed with a single-family residence. Parcel to the south is zoned AE-20 and is planted in vineyard with a single-family residence.

The subject parcel is designated General Industrial in the County-adopted Roosevelt Community Plan. The surrounding area is also designated for General Industrial to provide for the establishment of industrial uses essential to the development of a balanced economic base with the zone change.

The proposed zone change from the AL-20 Zone District to an M-2(c) Zone District is consistent with the General Plan designation for the area and matches with the existing zoning on the adjacent parcels which stands for M-3 (Heavy Industrial). In fact, the proposed M-2 zoning is of lesser intensity than the existing M-3-zoned parcels to the north, east and west of the subject parcel.

Given the existing zoning and improvements in the area, the proposed rezone from Agricultural to Industrial will have a less than significant impact on the existing visual character of the area.

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION
INCORPORATED:

Any outdoor lighting, if installed for the project, has the potential of generating glare in the area. To minimize such impacts, a mitigation measure would require that all lighting shall be hooded and directed downward to not shine toward adjacent properties and public streets.

* **Mitigation Measure**

1. *All outdoor lighting associated with the 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: NO IMPACT:

The subject parcel is not Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance. The parcel is designated by the 2016 Department of Conservation Important Farmlands Map as Vacant or Disturbed Land not qualified for agriculture. The project will have no impact on farmland.

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The subject parcel is currently zoned AL-20 (Limited Agricultural, 20-acre minimum parcel size). The AL-20 Zone District is intended to reserve certain land for future uses by allowing only limited agricultural development to ensure that the land can be ultimately developed for the use contemplated by the General Plan. The Fresno County Zoning Ordinance allows property owners to propose such amendments pursuant to Section 878 (Zoning Division Amendment) and the proposed rezone is not in conflict with the current General Plan Designation (General Industrial) for the parcel. Therefore, the project does not conflict with the existing agricultural zoning on the property which is not enrolled in the Williamson Act Program.

The project was routed to the Fresno County Agricultural Commissioner's Office for comments. The agency did not provide any comments on the project.

- 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 forest land, timberland or land zoned for Timberland Production. The site is non-active farmland designated for future industrial uses in the County-adopted Roosevelt Community Plan. No forests occur in the vicinity of the site and therefore no impacts to forests, conversion of forestland, or timberland zoning would occur from the project.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

Land in the project vicinity is designated General Industrial in the County-adopted Roosevelt Community Plan. The proposed M-2 zoning is compatible with General Industrial in the Roosevelt Community Plan. It is the intent of the Roosevelt Community Plan that parcel designated General Industrial eventually be industrial in nature. As such, the conversion of the subject parcel to that goal will not result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses.

III. AIR QUALITY

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

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The applicant provided an *Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions Analysis Memorandum* (Analysis), completed by LSA Associates, Inc., and dated January 24, 2022. The Analysis was provided to the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD) for review and comments. According to SJVAPCD, the agency has reviewed the health risk assessment-prioritizing screening and determined that the project will not have a significant impact on public health.

Per the Analysis, the construction and operation of the uses allowed in the M-2 Zone District would contribute the following criteria pollutant emissions: reactive organic gases (ROG), carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen dioxide (NO₂), sulfur dioxide (SO₂), and particulate matter (PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}). Project operations would generate air pollutant emissions from mobile sources (automobile activity from employees) and area sources (incidental activities related to facility maintenance). Criteria and Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions were estimated using the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) version 2020.4.0.

An Air Quality Plan (AQP) describes air pollution control strategies to be implemented by county, or region classified as a non-attainment area. The main purpose of AQP is to bring the area into compliance with the requirements of the Federal and State air quality standards.

The CEQA requires that certain proposed projects be analyzed for consistency with the applicable air quality plan. For a project to be consistent with 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 Section B below, construction of the proposed project would not result in the generation of criteria air pollutants that would exceed SJVAPCD thresholds of significance. Implementation of Regulatory Control Measure as discussed in Section III. B. below would further reduce construction dust impacts. Operational emissions associated with the proposed project would also not exceed SJVAPCD established significance thresholds. Therefore, the project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of SJVAPCD air quality plans.

- 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 within the San Joaquin Valley Air Basin (SJVAB), which consist of 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. No single project is sufficient in size to, by itself, result in nonattainment of ambient air quality standards. Instead, a project's individual emissions contribute to existing cumulatively significant adverse air quality impacts. If a project's contribution to the cumulative impact is considerable, then the project's impact on air quality would be considered significant.

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.

The primary pollutants of concern during project construction and operation are ROG, NO_x, CO, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5}. The San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD) *Guidance for Assessing and Monitoring Air Quality Impacts (GAMAQI)* adopted in 2015 contains threshold for CO, NO_x, ROG, SO_x PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}. The SJVAPCD's annual emission significance thresholds used for the project define the substantial contribution for both operational and construction emissions per year are 10 tons for ROG, 10 tons for NO_x, 100 tons for CO, 27 tons for SO_x, and 15 tons for PM₁₀ and 15 tons per year PM_{2.5}.

Per the *Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions Analysis Memorandum*, the short-term project construction emissions (tons per year) are 0.2 for ROG, 1.3 for NO_x, 1.5 for CO, less than 0.1 for SO_x, and 0.1 for PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} which are less than the threshold of significance.

In addition to the construction-period thresholds of significance, the SJVAPCD has implemented Regulation VIII measures for dust control during construction. These control measures are intended to reduce the amount of PM₁₀ emissions during the

construction period and their implementation would ensure that the proposed project complies with Regulation VIII and ensures the short-term construction-period air quality impacts.

Per the analysis above, construction emissions associated with the project would not exceed the significance criteria for annual ROG, NO_x, CO, SO_x, PM₁₀, or PM_{2.5} emissions. Therefore, construction 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 Ambient Air Quality Standards.

Per the *Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emission Analysis Memorandum*, the long-term project operational emission that are associated with mobile sources (e.g., vehicle and truck trips), energy sources (e.g., electricity and natural gas), and area sources (e.g., architectural coatings and the use of landscape maintenance equipment) are less than 0.1 for ROG, 0.3 for NO_x, 0.2 for CO, and less than 0.1 for SO₂, PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} and are below the threshold of significance. Operation of the 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 Ambient Air Quality Standards.

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, daycare centers, nursing homes, hospitals, and residential dwelling units. The closest sensitive receptor is a single-family residence located approximately 121 feet west of the project site.

Per the *Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions Analysis Memorandum*, construction of the project may expose surrounding sensitive receptors to airborne particulates, as well as a small quantity of construction equipment pollutants (i.e., usually diesel-fueled vehicles and equipment). However, construction contractors would be required to implement dust control measure described in Section III. B. above. The project construction pollutant emissions would be below the SJVAPCD significance thresholds, and with the implementation of dust control measure, emissions would be further reduced.

Once constructed, the project would not be a source of substantial pollutant emissions. Based on the diesel emissions anticipated for the project, the project would result in a cancer score of 0.0896 in 1 million cancer cases, which is well below SJVAPCD threshold of significance of 20 in 1 million. Chronic and acute risk scores would also be well below the SJVAPCD thresholds. Therefore, sensitive receptors are not expected to be exposed to substantial pollutant concentrations during the project construction and operation.

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (District) has not established a rule or standard regarding odor emissions; rather, the District Nuisance Rule 4102 (Nuisance) requires that 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 *Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions Analysis Memorandum*, during construction, some odors may be present due to diesel exhaust. However, these odors would be temporary and limited to the construction period. The project would not include any activities or operations that would generate objectionable odors and, once operational, the project would not be a source of odors. Therefore, the project would not result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

- A. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service; 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 fallow and contains no river or stream to hold riparian features that could potentially be impacted by the proposal. The immediate surrounding area is comprised of industrial, agricultural, and residential uses, and its proximity to the City of Fresno urban development reduces the probability that there is habitat to support special-status species.

The project was routed to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the California Department of Fish and Wildlife for review and comments. Neither agency offered any comments nor expressed any concerns regarding the project's impact on biological resources. No impact would occur.

- 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?

D. FINDING: NO IMPACT:

No historic drainages were identified within the project area. A query of the National Wetlands Inventory (NWI) Map shows no drainage pattern, aquatic feature, wetlands, waters of the United States or waters of the State of California present on or near the project site.

- E. 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 is near the City of Fresno and is not designated as a migratory wildlife corridor. Likewise, the project site contains no water feature to provide for the migration of resident or migratory fish.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project site contains no trees which may need to be removed to accommodate industrial uses on the property. The project is not in conflict with the Fresno County Oak Management Guidelines – Policy OS-F.11.

- G. 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 project site is located within the Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E) Habitat Conservation Plan, which specifically applies to PG&E facilities and not the subject 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 project site is not designated as highly or moderately sensitive for archeological resources. However, given the discussion in Section XVIII TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES below, in the unlikely event that cultural resources are unearthed during construction activities on the property, the following mitigation measures would apply to ensure that impacts to such 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 shall be followed by photos, reports, video, and etc. If such remains are determined to be Native American, the Sheriff-Coroner must notify the Native American Commission within 24 hours.*

VI. ENERGY

Would the project:

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

Development of the industrial uses on the property would result in less than significant consumption of energy (gas, electricity, gasoline, and diesel) during construction or operation of the facility. Construction activities and corresponding fuel energy consumption would be temporary and localized. There are no unusual project characteristics that would cause the use of construction equipment to be less energy efficient compared with other similar construction sites in the County. Therefore, construction-related fuel consumption by the project would not result in inefficient, wasteful, or unnecessary energy use compared with other construction sites in the area.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project will 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. 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 for building/structures are submitted.

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; or
 - 2. Strong seismic ground shaking; or
 - 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. Development of industrial uses 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 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 located in an erosion hazard area. 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 Engineered Grading Plans to show how additional storm water runoff generated by the proposed development will be handled without adversely impacting adjacent properties and a Grading Permit 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:

As noted above, the project site is flat with no topographical variations. As a standard practice, a soil compaction report may be required to ensure the weight-bearing capacity of the soils for any proposed structure/building. The project site bears no potential for lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse due to the site development.

- 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:

Per Figure 7-1 of Fresno County General Plan Background Report, the project site is not located in an area where soils have been determined to exhibit moderately high to high expansion potential. However, the project development 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:

The project site is within the Malaga County Water District (MCWD) Sphere of Influence. The MCWD reviewed the project and requires the following: 1) the property shall annex to the Malaga County Water District at such time MCWD boundary extends to become adjacent to the property; 2) at such time that the community water and sanitary sewer systems are within 150 feet of the property, the property owner shall construct water and sewer mains across the frontage of the property and connect to the water and sewer systems; and 3) the existing on-site systems shall be destroyed in accordance with the County of Fresno Environmental Health Department. These requirements will be included as Conditions of Approval.

According to the Local Area Formation Commission (LAFCo), in the event proposed development need sewer services from the Malaga County Water District (MCWD), a Condition of Approval would require that the project site shall be annexed into MCWD. According to the Fresno County Department of Public Health, Environmental Health Division (Health Department) all proposed onsite development that requires sewage disposal systems shall be installed under permit and inspection from the Department of Public Works and Planning, Building and Safety Section.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

No paleontological resources or geologic features were 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?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

Construction and operational activities associated with the project would generate greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. During construction, GHGs would be emitted through the operation of construction equipment and from worker and builder supply vendor vehicles, each of which typically uses 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. In the *Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions Analysis Memorandum* prepared for the project by LSA Associates and dated January 24, 2022, GHG emissions were estimated using the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) version 2020.4.0.

The *Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions Analysis Memorandum* indicates that the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District does not have an adopted threshold of significance for construction related GHG emissions. During construction, the project would generate approximately 261.1 metric tons of CO₂e. Implementation of the Regulatory Requirements included in the Section III. B., AIR QUALITY would reduce GHG emissions by ensuring that the project complies with Regulation VIII to reduce the short-term construction period air quality impacts.

Regarding Operational GHG Emissions, long-term GHG emissions are typically generated from mobile sources (vehicle trips), area sources (maintenance activities and landscaping), indirect emissions from sources associated with energy consumption, and waste sources (land filling and waste disposal). Per the *Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emission Analysis Memorandum*, the project would generate approximately 112.8 metric tons of CO₂e per year of emission.

The San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District has not established a numeric threshold for GHG emissions. As discussed above, the significance of GHG emissions may be evaluated based on locally adopted quantitative thresholds or consistency with a regional GHG reduction plan (such as a Climate Action Plan). Neither Fresno County nor SJVAPCD has developed or adopted numeric GHG significance thresholds.

However, based on the minimal emissions (112.8 metric ton) to be generated by the project, would not result in the generation of substantial GHG emissions.

- 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 Emissions Analysis Memorandum, the project would not conflict with the State's GHG emissions reductions objectives embodied in Assembly Bill (AB) 32 Scoping Plan, Executive Order B-30-15 (GHG emissions reductions target of at least 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030), Senate Bill (SB) 32, and AB 197. Therefore, the proposed project's incremental contribution to cumulative GHG emissions would not be cumulatively considerable.

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?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

The by-right uses allowed in the M-2 Zone District could involve handling of potentially hazardous materials.

According to the Fresno County Health Department, Environmental Health Division, all uses in the proposed M-2 Zone District requiring the use and/or storage of hazardous materials/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. Furthermore, any business that handles a hazardous material or hazardous waste may be required to submit a Hazardous Materials Business Plan pursuant to the HSC, Division 20, and Chapter 6.95. These requirements will be included as Project Notes.

- 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:

Per the Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions Analysis Memorandum, development proposals on the property may contribute to fugitive dust emissions associated with site preparation and grading, and vehicle travel on unpaved surfaces.

Although uncontrolled emissions of resulting fugitive dust may contribute to increased occurrences of Valley Fever, these impacts would be less than significant with the implementation of Regulatory requirements listed in SECTION III. B, AIR QUALITY. above.

Regarding naturally-occurring asbestos, the project site is not located near any areas that are likely to contain ultramatic rock. No impact would occur.

The nearest school, Alice Worsely School, is approximately 3,968 feet east 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 California Department of Toxic Substances Control Site (Envirostor), the project site is not listed as a hazardous materials site.

- E. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, 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, Fresno-Yosemite International Airport, is approximately 7.3 miles north of the project site.

Given the distance between airport and the project site, there will be no safety and noise impacts resulting from flying operations on people working on the project site.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project will not impair the implementation of, or physically interfere with the implementation of an adopted Emergency Response Plan or Emergency Evacuation Plan.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

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. No impact from wildland fire hazards would occur.

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 in Section VII. E. GEOLOGY AND SOILS above regarding waste discharge.

The project will utilize groundwater by constructing a well on the property. According to the Fresno County Department of Public Health, Environmental Health Division (Health Department); 1) in an effort to protect groundwater, all abandoned water wells and/or septic system on the parcel shall be properly destroyed by a licensed contractor; 2) permit shall be obtained from the Health Department to construct water well on the property; and 3) any underground storage tank found during construction shall be removed by obtaining an Underground Storage Tank Removal permit from the Health Department.

According to the State Water Resources Control Board, Division of Drinking Water (SWRCB-DDW), the proposed project does not meet the definition of a public water system and a permit from SWRCB-DDW to operate onsite well is not required.

No concerns were expressed by the Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region regarding the project impact on groundwater quality.

- 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 Water and Natural Resources Division of the Fresno County Department of Public Works and Planning, the project is not located within an area of the County defined as being a water short area. Therefore, the project is expected to have a less than significant impact on the groundwater levels in the area.

The project site is within the Malaga Water District (MCWD) Sphere of Influence. To connect to MCWD water and sanitary sewer systems, the property shall be annexed into MCWD at such time the MCWD boundary extends to become adjacent to the project site.

- 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:

FID's Washington Colony No. 15 runs southwesterly, crosses American Avenue approximately 1,950 feet east of the subject property, crosses Chestnut Avenue approximately 1,460 feet southeast of the subject property, and crosses Maple Avenue approximately 1,196 feet south of the subject property. Any street and/or utility improvements along American Avenue, Chestnut Avenue, Maple Avenue, or in the vicinity, would require FID's review and approval of all plans.

FID's Oleander No. 16 runs southwesterly, crosses American Avenue approximately 2,911 feet east of the subject property. Any street and/or utility improvements along American Avenue, or in the vicinity would require FID's review and approval of all plans.

FID's Viau No. 25 runs southerly then westerly along the west side of Maple Avenue approximately 400 feet north of the subject property. Any street and/or utility improvements along Maple Avenue, or in the vicinity would require FID's review and approval of all plans.

A private facility known as the Peterson Br. No. 524 runs westerly and traverses the subject property. This pipeline is active and should be treated as such.

The project lies within the Fresno Metropolitan Flood Control District (FMFCD) drainage area "CE". The following is required by FMFCD: 1) the project shall pay drainage fees at the time of development based on the fee rates in effect at that time; 2) storm drainage patterns for the development shall conform to the District Master Plan; 3) FMFCD shall review and approve all improvement plans for any proposed construction of curb and gutter or storm drainage facilities area; and 4) construction activity shall secure a storm water discharge permit.

Development of industrial uses on the property will cause no significant changes in the absorption rates, drainage patterns, or the rate and amount of surface run-off with adherence to the mandatory construction practices contained in the Grading and Drainage Sections of the County Ordinance Code.

The above-mentioned requirements will be included as Project Notes and be addressed through mandatory Site Plan Review prior to the establishment of a use on the property.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

Per Figure 9-7 of the Fresno County General Plan Background Report, the project site is not located in a 100 Year Flood Inundation Area and is not subject to flooding from the 100-year storm per the Federal Emergency Management Agency FIRM Panel 2140 H.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

There is no Water Quality Control Plan for Fresno County. As such, the subject proposal would not conflict with any water quality control plan. The project is located within the boundary of North Kings Groundwater Sustainability Area (NKGSA). No concerns related to groundwater sustainability were expressed by NKGSA.

XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING

Would the project:

- A. Physically divide an established community?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

All proposed uses will be confined within the boundary of the subject parcel and will not physically divide an established community. The project site is outside of the boundary of City of Fresno and the community of Malaga.

- 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 proposed project entails the rezone of a 19.98-acre parcel from the AL-20 to M-2 Zone District. The project site is designated General Industrial in the County-adopted Roosevelt Community Plan and is outside of the City of Fresno Sphere of Influence boundary. As such, the project was not referrable to the City for annexation, and it does not conflict with land use plan, policy, or regulation of any agency. The project is consistent with the following General Plan policies.

Regarding consistency with General Plan Policy LU-F.29. Criteria a, b, c & d, all development proposals on the property will comply with Fresno County Noise Ordinance and San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District rules and regulations. The proposal will also comply with the M-2 Zone District development standards and be analyzed against these standards during mandatory Site Plan Review.

Regarding General Plan Policy LU-F. 30, all development proposals will utilize onsite sewage disposal system and onsite water well. The subject property is within the Malaga Water District (District) Sphere of Influence and will require annexation to the District to receive community sewer and water services at such time the District boundary extends to become adjacent to the property.

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 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: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

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

The project could result in an increase in noise level due to construction activities on the property. Noise impacts associated with construction are expected to be temporary and will be subject to the County Noise Ordinance.

- C. For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public

use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

Per the discussion in Section IX. E. above, the project will not be impacted by airport noise.

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 allow industrial uses on the property. As these uses involve no housing, no increase in population would occur from this proposal.

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: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

According to the Fresno County Fire Protection District (CalFire), the project shall adhere to the requirements of the current Fire Code and Building Code when building permit or certificate of occupancy is sought and shall annex to Community Facilities District No. 2010-01 of CalFire. This will be included as a Project Note.

2. Police protection; or
3. Schools; or
4. Parks; or

5. Other public facilities?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project will not impact existing public services, nor will it result in the need for additional public services related to schools, parks, or police protection by the Fresno County Sheriff's Office.

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 will not induce population growth which may require 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:

The Design Division of the Fresno County Department of Public Works and Planning reviewed the subject proposal and required that a Traffic Impact Study (TIS) be prepared to assess the project's potential impacts to County roadways and intersection.

LSA Associates, Inc., prepared a Traffic Impact Study (TIS), dated August 2022. The TIS was provided to Design Division, Road Maintenance and Operations (RMO) Division, City of Fresno Traffic Operations and Planning Division and the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) for review and comments. No comments were received from RMO Division or the City of Fresno.

The TIS evaluated a maximum development of 19.98 acres of manufacturing use to ensure that all allowable uses within M-2 Zoning are captured for traffic operations and LOS (Level of Service). As such, the potential trip generation for the maximum development (manufacturing use) could generate 1,014 daily trips including 123 trips (105 inbound and 18 outbound) in the a.m. peak hour and 127 trips (41 inbound and 86

outbound) in the p.m. peak hour. The proposed commercial truck maintenance facility could be implemented without adversely affecting the study area intersections and roadway segments. The evaluation of the study area intersection and roadway segment LOS showed that the addition of project traffic would not create any LOS impacts. The proposed facility could generate 72 daily trips, including 7 trips (5 inbound and 2 outbound) in the a.m. peak hour and 7 trips (2 inbound and 5 outbound) in the p.m. peak hour.

The Design Division indicated that TIS studied the maximum potential use for the site pertaining to 19.98 acres of manufacturing use which is an appropriate use to study as it is more intense than the proposed commercial truck maintenance facility. The Design Division further indicated that the study of this intense use should allow all by-right uses in the M-2 Zone District as proposed by this application. The proposed rezone will have no adverse transportation-related impacts. No other comments were made by Design Division.

According to the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) the project may impact the northbound SR 99 and Chestnut Avenue off ramp. The cost-per-trip to place a turn lane at the State Route (SR) 99 and Chestnut Avenue exit ramp would be \$1,670 (one trip x \$1,670/trip). The following pro-rata share identified by Caltrans has been included as a Mitigation Measure:

* **Mitigation Measure:**

1. *Prior to the issuance of building permits for the uses allowed on M-2 zoned property, the Applicant shall enter into a Traffic Mitigation Agreement (TMA) with California Department of Transportation agreeing to participate in the funding of future off-site traffic improvements as defined in item 'a' below and pay for the funding deemed appropriate by Caltrans based on the following pro-rata share.*
 - a. *The project will impact the northbound SR 99 and Chestnut Avenue offramp. The cost-per-trip to place a turn lane at the SR 99 and Chestnut Avenue exit ramp would be \$1,670 (one trip x \$1,670/trip) fair share for the improvement of the northbound exit ramp.*

According to the Road Maintenance and Operations Division, American Avenue abutting the southern boundary of the project site is classified as an Arterial in the County General Plan, with an ultimate right-of-way width of 106 feet. The existing right-of-way for American Avenue is 60 feet. Per Precise Plan Line No. 70, the ultimate right-of-way is 30 feet north of section line and varies south of section line. The project requires no additional right-of-way north of American Avenue. Furthermore, according to RMO: 1) the northbound lane of Maple Ave shall be improved with a 6-foot shoulder limited to the frontage of the developed property; 2) the westbound lane of American Ave shall be improved to a 12-foot travel lane and 6-foot shoulder limited to the frontage of the developed property; and 3) a 20-foot by 20-foot corner cutoff shall be provided at the intersection of American and Maple Avenues for visibility purposes.

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

According to the *Traffic Impact Study* prepared for the project, Fresno County SB 743 Implementation Regional Guidelines, projects that generate fewer than 500 daily trips are screened from a VMT analysis. In addition, the Office of Planning and Research (OPR) Technical Advisory on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA (OPR 2018) makes it clear that VMT is measured for “automobiles,” which are “on-road passenger vehicles, specifically cars and light trucks.” As such, heavy trucks are not included in the VMT for the proposed project. The proposed project (4,890 sf commercial truck maintenance building) is anticipated to generate 72 daily trips and would serve heavy trucks. As such, the proposed project would generate fewer than 500 passenger vehicle daily trips. Therefore, the proposed project is screened from a VMT analysis and presumed to have a less than significant transportation impact.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

American and Maple Avenues abut southerly and westerly boundaries of the project site. They are public roads maintained by Fresno County.

A Site Plan Review (SPR) was completed for the proposed commercial truck maintenance facility concurrently with the subject rezone application to ensure that the site is provided with ingress and egress of adequate width and length to minimize traffic hazards and to provides for adequate emergency access acceptable to the local fire agency.

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 not designated as highly or moderately sensitive for archeological resources. Pursuant to Assembly Bill (AB) 52, the project 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. However, Table Mountain Rancheria (TMR) requested that in the unlikely event that cultural resources are identified on the property, the Tribe should be informed. Implementation of the Mitigation Measure included in the CULTURAL ANALYSIS section of this report will reduce impact to tribal cultural resources 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 in Section VII. E. GEOLOGY AND SOILS above.

- 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:

Development proposals in the M-2 Zone District would not generate solid waste more than capacity of local landfill sites. All solid waste disposal will comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

XX. WILDFIRE

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

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project site is not in or near state responsibility area or land classified as very high fire hazard severity zones. No impact would occur.

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 in Section V. CULTURAL RESOURCES above.

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

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 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 and Cultural Resources will be mitigated through compliance with the Mitigation Measures listed in Section I and Section V of this report.

- 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. 8045 prepared for Amendment Application No. 3846, 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, recreation, or wildfire.

Potential impacts related to agriculture and forestry resources, air quality, energy, geology and soils, greenhouse gas emissions, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use and planning, noise, public services, tribal cultural resources and utilities and service systems have been determined to be less than significant.

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

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

EA;JP
G:\4360Devs&PIn\PROJSEC\PROJDOCS\AA\3800-3899\3846\IS CEQA\AA 3846 IS wu.docx