



MARCH 2, 2023

VIA EMAIL: EAHMAD@FRESNOCOUNTYCA.GOV

County of Fresno, Department of Public Works and Planning
Development Services and Capital Projects Division
Attn: Ejaz Ahmad
2220 Tulare Street, Suite B
Fresno, CA 93721



Dear County of Fresno:

INITIAL STUDY NO. 8042, AMENDMENT APPLICATION NO. 3845, SITE PLAN REVIEW APPLICATION NO. 8286, AND MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION, SCH# 2023020293

The Department of Conservation's (DOC) Division of Land Resource Protection (Division) has reviewed the Initial Study No. 8042, Amendment Application No. 3845, Site Plan Review Application No. 8286, and Mitigated Negative Declaration (Project). The Division monitors farmland conversion on a statewide basis, provides technical assistance regarding the Williamson Act, and administers various agricultural land conservation programs. We offer the following comments and recommendations with respect to the project's potential impacts on agricultural land and resources.

Project Description

The project proposes to allow the rezone of a 38.86- acre parcel from the existing AL-20 (Limited Agricultural, 20-acre minimum parcel size) Zone District to the M-3 (Heavy Industrial) Zone District and approve a Site Plan Review for a 1,312,000 square feet warehouse/distribution center with related improvements on the subject parcel and the adjoining 33-acre parcel and a 1.49-acre parcel currently zoned M-3.

The subject parcels are located on the northwest corner of South Peach Avenue and American Avenue approximately 0.66 mile southeast of the City limits of the City of Fresno (331-110-19 & 23; 331-090-60) (4723, 4591 and 4445 S. Peach Avenue, Fresno) (Sup. Dist. 4).

Comments

The conversion of agricultural land represents a permanent reduction and significant impact to California's agricultural land resources. CEQA requires that all feasible and reasonable mitigation be reviewed and applied to projects. Under CEQA, a lead

agency should not approve a project if there are feasible alternatives or feasible mitigation measures available that would lessen the significant effects of the project.

All mitigation measures that are potentially feasible should be included in the project's environmental review. A measure brought to the attention of the lead agency should not be left out unless it is infeasible based on its elements.

Consistent with CEQA Guidelines, DOC recommends the County consider agricultural conservation easements, among other measures, as potential mitigation. (See Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 15370 [mitigation includes "compensating for the impact by replacing or providing substitute resources or environments, including through permanent protection of such resources in the form of conservation easements."])

Mitigation through agricultural easements can take at least two forms: the outright purchase of easements or the donation of mitigation fees to a local, regional, or statewide organization or agency whose purpose includes the acquisition and stewardship of agricultural easements. The conversion of agricultural land should be deemed an impact of at least regional significance. Hence, the search for replacement lands should not be limited strictly to lands within the project's surrounding area.

A helpful source for regional and statewide agricultural mitigation banks is the California Council of Land Trusts. They provide helpful insight into farmland mitigation policies and implementation strategies, including a guidebook with model policies and a model local ordinance. The guidebook can be found at:

[California Council of Land Trusts](#)

Of course, the use of conservation easements is only one form of mitigation that should be considered. Any other feasible mitigation measures should also be considered. Indeed, the recent judicial opinion in *King and Gardiner Farms, LLC v. County of Kern* (2020) 45 Cal.App.5th 814 ("KG Farms") holds that agricultural conservation easements on a 1 to 1 ratio are not alone sufficient to adequately mitigate a project's conversion of agricultural land. KG Farms does not stand for the proposition that agricultural conservation easements are irrelevant as mitigation. Rather, the holding suggests that to the extent they are considered, they may need to be applied at a greater than 1 to 1 ratio, or combined with other forms of mitigation (such as restoration of some land not currently used as farmland).

Conclusion

DOC recommends further discussion of the following issues:

- Type, amount, and location of farmland conversion resulting directly and indirectly from implementation of the proposed project.

- Impacts on any current and future agricultural operations in the vicinity; e.g., land-use conflicts, increases in land values and taxes, loss of agricultural support infrastructure such as processing facilities, etc.
- Incremental impacts leading to cumulative impacts on agricultural land. This would include impacts from the proposed project, as well as impacts from past, current, and likely future projects.
- Proposed mitigation measures for all impacted agricultural lands within the proposed project area.

Thank you for giving us the opportunity to comment on the Initial Study No. 8042, Amendment Application No. 3845, Site Plan Review Application No. 8286, and Mitigated Negative Declaration Project. Please provide DOC with notices of any future hearing dates as well as any staff reports pertaining to this project. If you have any questions regarding our comments, please contact Farl Grundy, Associate Environmental Planner via email at Farl.Grundy@conservation.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

Monique Wilber

Monique Wilber
Conservation Program Support Supervisor