



County of Fresno

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

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

APPLICANT: Nick Sahota

APPLICATION NOS.: Initial Study Application No. 7860 & Director's Review and Approval No. 4618

DESCRIPTION: Director Review and Approval to allow for the addition of a 4,227.50 square-foot meeting hall to an existing 3,316.50 square foot temple on a 1.18-acre parcel in the AE-20 (Exclusive Agricultural, 20-acre minimum parcel size) Zone District.

LOCATION: The subject parcel is located on the southwest corner of E. American Ave. and S. Cherry Ave., approximately 1-mile south of the City of Fresno. (APN: 334-140-03) (5025 S. Chestnut Ave.) (Sup. Dist. 1).

I. AESTHETICS

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

- A. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista; or
- B. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway; or
- 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; or
- D. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION
INCORPORATED:

The subject site is in a predominantly agricultural area throughout the region. No scenic vistas that may be impacted by the proposed project were identified on or near the site. Per Figure OS-2 of the Fresno County General Plan, the site is not located along or

near a state scenic highway. The proposed use is characteristic of the existing use and structures, and therefore, will not degrade the existing visual character or quality of site and surroundings.

* **Mitigation Measure(s)**

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

II. AGRICULTURAL AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

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

- A. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance, as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use; or
- B. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act Contract; or
- 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; or
- 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:

The parcel on which the proposed project will be located is not located on or near farmland, forest land, timberland, or land zoned Timberland Production. It is zoned AE-20 (Exclusive Agricultural, 20-acre minimum parcel size) Zone District and is designated Agricultural in the Fresno County General Plan. The proposed project is a use that is allowed on land zoned AE-20 with approval of a Director's Review and Approval.

Per the 2016 Fresno County Important Farmland Map, the parcel is not under a Williamson Act Contract. The proposed project will not result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or forest land to non-forest land. The project does not conflict

with the existing zoning for agricultural use and is not subject to a Williamson Act Contract.

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
- 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:

The applicant provided an Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Impact Analysis, completed by Mr. Sahota on July 11th, 2022. The Analysis was provided to the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD) along with the project information for review and comments. No concerns were expressed by Air District.

Per the Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Impact Analysis, the proposed project's construction and operations 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 2016.3.2 [California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA) 2017], which is the most current version of the model approved for use by SJVAPCD.

Per the Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Impact Analysis, the short-term construction emissions associated with the project would be below SJVAPCD thresholds for ROG, NO_x, CO, SO_x, PM 2.5, or PM₁₀ emissions. In addition to the construction period thresholds of significance, 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. Implementation of Mitigation Measures as noted below would ensure that the proposed project complies with Regulation VIII and further reduces the short-term construction period air quality impacts.

Mitigation Measures

Consistent with San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District Regulation VIII (Fugitive PM10 Prohibitions), the following measures shall be implemented for dust control during construction:

1. All disturbed areas, including storage piles, which are not being actively utilized for construction purposes, shall be effectively stabilized of dust emissions using water, chemical stabilizer/suppressant, covered with a tarp or other suitable cover or vegetative ground cover.
2. All on-site unpaved roads and off-site unpaved access roads shall be effectively stabilized of dust emissions using water or chemical stabilizer/suppressant
3. All land clearing, grubbing, scraping, excavation, land leveling, grading, cut and fill, and demolition activities shall be effectively controlled of fugitive dust emissions utilizing application of water or by presoaking.
4. When materials are transported off site, all material shall be covered, or effectively wetted to limit visible dust emissions, and at least six inches of freeboard space from the top of the container shall be maintained.
5. All operations shall limit or expeditiously remove the accumulation of mud or dirt from adjacent public streets at the end of each workday. (The use of dry rotary brushes is expressly prohibited except where preceded or accompanied by sufficient wetting to limit the visible dust emissions. Use of blower devices is expressly forbidden.)
6. Following the addition of materials to, or the removal of materials from, the surface of outdoor storage piles, said piles shall be effectively stabilized of fugitive dust emission utilizing sufficient water or chemical stabilizer/suppressant.

The Long-Term Operational Emissions are associated with mobile source emissions that would result from vehicle trips associated with the proposed project. Area sources, such as landscape equipment would also result in pollutant emissions. Based on the air quality impact analysis, emission estimates for operation of the project calculated using CalEEMod shows that the total project emission resulting from the project would not exceed San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District thresholds for annual ROG, NOx, CO, SOx, PM10, or PM2.5 emissions; therefore, the proposed project would have a less than significant effect on regional air quality, and thus, operation of the proposed project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment under applicable federal or State ambient air quality standards.

See Greenhouse Gas Emissions analysis for further details.

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; 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; or
- D. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites; or
- E. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance; or
- F. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state Habitat Conservation Plan?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The proposed project was referred to the US Fish and Wildlife Service and the California Department of Fish and Wildlife for review and comments. No concerns were expressed by either agency. According to the California Natural Diversity Database, the project site is not located in any reported occurrence areas of a special status species. Therefore, this analysis identified no impacts regarding: 1.) any candidate, sensitive, or special-status species; 2.) any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community; 3.) any federally protected wetlands; nor 4.) any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species, migratory wildlife corridors, or wildlife nursery sites.

The proposed project will neither conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, nor will it conflict with the provisions of any conservation plan.

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 parcel on which the proposed project will be sited is not located within proximity of any area designated to be moderately or highly sensitive for archeological resources. No historical or paleontological resources, unique geological features, or evidence of possible human remains were identified in this analysis. As such, no impact on historical, archeological, or paleontological resources would result from this proposal. A mitigation measure will be implemented to address cultural resources in the unlikely event that they are unearthed during ground-disturbing activities related to the project.

* **Mitigation Measure(s)**

1. *A qualified professional archaeologist shall conduct a field survey of any vacant land to determine if other cultural resources are present prior to ground-disturbance activities.*
2. *In the event that cultural resources are unearthed during grading or construction activity, all work shall be halted in the area of the find, and an archeologist shall be called to evaluate the findings and make any necessary mitigation recommendations. If human remains are unearthed during construction, no further disturbance is to occur until the Fresno County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition. If such remains are Native American, the Coroner must notify the Native American Commission within 24 hours.*

VI. ENERGY

Would the project:

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The project site will utilize existing and proposed buildings which are subject to local and state standards for building and energy efficiency. The project is expected to have a less than significant impact on energy resources. The project will not conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency.

VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Would the project:

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

According to Figures 9-4 & 9-5 of the Fresno County General Plan Background Report (FCGPBR) and the California Department of Conservation, Earthquake Hazard Zone Application (EQ Zapp), the project site is not located on or near identified earthquake hazard zone areas. The area of the proposed project is not identified as an area which by nature is subject to these types of seismic effects. Figure 9-5 identifies the area to have a probability of seismic hazard of 0-20%. No agencies expressed any concerns related to ground shaking, ground failure, liquefaction, or landslides. Construction of the proposed project will be subject to seismic design standards.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

No geologic unit or unstable soil was identified on the project site according to Figure 9-2 in the Fresno County General Plan Background Report (FCGPBR). The site comprises of existing buildings, with most of the area paved area which lies within a paved parking lot. Therefore, the project will not result in substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil.

- C. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse; or

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

Landslides and other forms of slope failure form in response to long-term uplift, mass wasting, and disturbance of slopes. The project site contains naturally flat relief (slopes of no more than three percent), which precludes the possibility of land sliding on-site.

The potential for seismic-related ground failure (lateral spreading and liquefaction) occurring on the project site is minimal because of the absence of high groundwater levels and saturated loose granular soil. The project site is not in an area identified by Fresno County as being susceptible to liquefaction. In addition, the intensity of ground shaking from a large, distant earthquake is expected to be relatively low on the project site and, therefore, would not be severe enough to induce liquefaction on-site.

The San Joaquin Valley in which Fresno County is located is known to experience subsidence. However, the Water, Geology, and Natural Resources Section of the Fresno County Department of Public Works and Planning reviewed the project and expressed no concerns to the proposed project.

- 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; or

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

Per Figure 7-1 of the FCGPBR, Fresno County General Plan Background Report, the project site is not located within an area of known risk 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; or

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The project will utilize an on-site sewage disposal system. No concerns related to soil capabilities and the septic systems were expressed by the Fresno County Department of Public Health, Environmental Health Division.

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION
INCORPORATED:

The parcel on which the proposed project will be sited is not located within proximity of any area designated to be moderately or highly sensitive for archeological resources. No historical or paleontological resources, unique geological features, or evidence of possible human remains were identified in this analysis. As such, no impact on historical, archeological, or paleontological resources would result from this proposal. A mitigation measure will be implemented to address cultural resources in the unlikely event that they are unearthed during ground-disturbing activities related to the project.

* **Mitigation Measure(s)**

1. *In the event that cultural resources are unearthed during grading or construction activity, all work shall be halted in the area of the find, and an archeologist shall be called to evaluate the findings and make any necessary mitigation recommendations. If human remains are unearthed during construction, no further disturbance is to occur until the Fresno County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition. If such remains are Native American, the Coroner must notify the Native American Commission within 24 hours.*

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:

An Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Analysis was prepared by Nick Sahota dated July 11, 2022, which stated the proposed project would require construction activities, including site preparation, grading, building construction and architectural coating activities were included in the CalEEMod-generated construction tasks. In summary, the project would not exceed SJVAPCD localized emission daily screening levels for any criteria pollutant. The project is not a significant source of TAC emissions during construction or operation. The project is not in an area with suitable habitat for Valley fever spores and is not in area known to have naturally occurring asbestos. Therefore, the project would not result in significant impacts to sensitive receptors

The project proposes the addition of a 3,300 square-foot meeting hall on an 1.18-acre parcel. Existing on-site structures include to an existing 4,040 square-foot religious facility, 329 square foot equipment storage building, and parking.

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 meeting hall 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. 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.

IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Would the project:

- A. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials; or
- B. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment; or

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The Fresno County Department of Public Health, Environmental Health Division (Health Department) reviewed the project and requires the following as Project Notes. The facilities proposing to use and/or store hazardous materials and/or hazardous wastes shall meet the requirements set forth in the California Health and Safety Code (HSC), Division 20, Chapter 6.95, and the California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 22, Division 4.5. The project shall submit a Hazardous Materials Business Plan pursuant to the HSC, Division 20, Chapter 6.95.

- C. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school; or
- 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; or

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The subject parcel is not located within one-quarter mile of a school. The nearest school, Washington Colony Elementary, is located 1-mile south from the project site. The proposed project site is not listed on the Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List (Cortese List) which is maintained by the California Department of Toxic Substances Control. There are no listed sites located within a half-mile radius of the proposed project 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; or

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The Fresno County Department of Public Health, Environmental Health Division review of the proposal states:

The proposed project does not have potential to expose nearby residents to elevated noise levels. Consideration should be given to the County of Fresno Noise Ordinance and the City of Fresno Municipal Code.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

Reviewing Agencies and Departments did not identify any conflict with the project and any 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:

The project site is located in an area of Agricultural Use approximately 1-mile from downtown Fresno, which is not in a wildland fire area, precluding the site from impacts caused by 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; or
- B. Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin; or

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The project does not propose significant use of water resources and would not violate water quality standards, waste discharge requirements or substantially degrade surface or ground water quality. With the project utilizing minor water supplies, less than significant impact to groundwater supplies or groundwater recharge would occur.

- 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?
- D. In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation; or
- E. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

Fresno Metropolitan Flood Control District (FMFCD) states the District’s Master Plan can accommodate the proposed land use. The District bears responsibility for storm water management within the Fresno-Clovis metropolitan area, including the area of the proposed subject site. Within the metropolitan area, storm runoff produced by land development is to be controlled through a system of pipelines and storm drainage retention basins. FMFCD states no on-site retention of storm water runoff is required nor did they express any concern that this project would substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area that would result in flooding on and offsite. In addition, FEMA’S National Flood Hazard Database FIRM Panel No. 06019C2140H indicates the area is not subject to flood conditions.

XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING

Would the project:

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The proposed project will not physically divide an established community nor cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or

regulation. There were no land use plans, policies, or regulations for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect identified in the Fresno County General Plan as being in conflict with the project proposal.

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:

Figure 7-7 and 7-8 of the Fresno County General Plan Background Report (FCGPBR) depicts mineral resource locations and principal mineral producing locations within the County of Fresno. The project site is not located on or near an identified mineral resource or mineral producing site.

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
- 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: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

Per Fresno County Noise Ordinance and the City of Fresno Municipal code, the proposed project has the potential to expose nearby residents to elevated noise levels.

The project involves the construction and operation of a meeting hall in conjunction with an existing religious facility. Noise levels and vibrations associated with the project are not expected to result in significant impacts. The noise level increase is not anticipated to result in significant impacts on sensitive receptors in vicinity of the project site.

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 proposed project will not induce population growth, nor will it displace housing or people. The project consists of utilizing an existing location for the religious facility. It will not induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area directly nor indirectly.

XV. PUBLIC SERVICES

Would the project:

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The project intends to develop a meeting hall to accompany an existing religious facility. The use is not intended to add additional employees or members. Therefore, the project is not expected to increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks and does not include the construction or expansion of recreational facilities.

XVI. RECREATION

Would the project:

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project is not located near any neighborhood or regional parks or recreational centers and does not propose any new recreational facilities or require the construction of such facilities.

XVII. TRANSPORTATION

Would the project:

- A. Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities; or
- B. Be in conflict or be inconsistent with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b); or

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project does anticipate the additional trips to the facility from members; however, the volume of 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: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT 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. 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:

The subject site has been previously developed and surrounds areas zoned for Heavy Agricultural use, suggesting minimal chance of a cultural resources occurring on the project site. 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 on addressing potential tribal cultural resources. No concerns were expressed by notified California Native American Tribes and no consultation request was received. Therefore, mitigation will be implemented to address tribal cultural resources in the unlikely event they are unearthed during ground-disturbing activities related to 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 comments to indicate that the project would result in solid waste generation in excess of State or local standards, or result in a conflict with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste. In addition, the project does not propose the development of a wastewater treatment system and would not have employees onsite where wastewater generation would occur. Therefore, the project does not necessitate a wastewater treatment provider

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. As depicted in the 2007 Fresno County Fire Hazard Severity Zones in LRA Map, produced by the California Department of Forestry and Fire

Protection, the project site is not located within a very high fire hazard severity zone or within a State Responsibility Area (SRA).

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The subject site is not within an area of fish or wildlife species area that would cause a decrease in the wildlife population. The project will not substantially degrade the quality of the environment nor substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species. Responsible agencies and departments concurred with the findings and conclusions of the prepared technical studies and determined that there will be less than significant impact.

CONCLUSION/SUMMARY

Based upon the Initial Study prepared for Director’s Review and Approval Application No. 4618, staff has concluded that the project will not/will 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, or recreation.

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

Potential impacts related to biological resources, cultural, and tribal cultural resources, noise, and transportation have been determined to be less than significant with Mitigation Measures incorporated into the project.

A Mitigated Negative Declaration/Negative Declaration is recommended and is subject to approval by the decision-making body. The Initial Study is available for review at 2220 Tulare

Street, Suite A, street level, located on the southwest corner of Tulare and “M” Street, Fresno, California.

ER

G:\4360Devs&Pin\PROJSEC\PROJDOCS\DRA\4600-4699\4618\CEQA\DRA 4618 - IS wu.docx