



# County of Fresno

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

## EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

- APPLICANT: John Zonneveld
- APPLICATION NOS.: Director Review and Approval Application No. 4688 and Initial Study No. 8185
- DESCRIPTION: Allow a herd size increase of 500 cattle, to an existing herd of 6,200 cattle, for a total permitted herd size of 6,700 animals on an existing dairy on a 140.89-acre parcel in the AE-20 (Exclusive Agricultural, 20-acre minimum parcel size) Zone District.
- LOCATION: The project site is located on Maple Avenue between Maple and Cedar Street, and between Cerini Avenue and E. Harlan, approximately 3.5 miles west-northwest of the unincorporated community of Laton (APN 055-150-22S) (19680 S. Maple Avenue) (Sup. Dist. 4).

### I. AESTHETICS

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

- A. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista; or
- B. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project proposes to expand the operational capacity of the existing dairy through the increase of herd size by 500 heads of cattle. There is no additional development associated with the subject application. The project site is situated in a flat agricultural utilized area. There were no scenic vistas identified as being impacted by the project. Figure OS-2 of the Fresno County General Plan indicates that there are no scenic roadways fronting the project site, and no scenic resources were identified on the project site or being affected by the project.

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

area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project site is already improved with a dairy operation. The project intends to expand their operation through an increase in herd size with no additional development of the project site proposed. The existing visual character of the area would not be changed by this project; therefore, no impacts scenic resources would occur.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

There is no new development proposed with this project and with consideration of the existing dairy operation, no new substantial light of glare is anticipated with this project.

## II. AGRICULTURAL AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

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

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

According to the 2016 Fresno County Important Farmland Map, the project site is comprised of land designated Confined Animal Agriculture. As the project proposal will not expand past the existing footprint, the project would not convert Farmland to non-agricultural use. The project site is not Williamson Act Contracted and per the Fresno County Zoning Ordinance, the existing dairy is an allowed use with the proposed expansion being required to be subject to a Director Review and Approval application.

- 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 zoned for forest land timberland and would not result in the loss or conversion of forest land.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project will be confined to the existing boundaries of the operating dairy and would not result in the conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use.

### III. AIR QUALITY

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

- A. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable Air Quality Plan; or
- B. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD) reviewed the project and determined that project specific annual emissions of criteria pollutants are not expected to exceed District significance thresholds and would not result in a significant impact. Additional District rules and regulations would be applicable to the project proposal but are mandatory regulatory requirements. Based on comments provided by the SJVAPCD and with the projects mandatory compliance with SJVAPCD regulatory requirements, the project would not be in conflict with the applicable Air Quality Plan and would not result in a cumulatively considerable increase in criteria pollutants.

- 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:

Comments from the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD) indicate that the proposed expansion could result in nuisance odors that could

negatively impact sensitive receptors in vicinity of the project site. However, the project site is located in an area of large farming parcels, dairies, and sparse residential development, and the proposed herd size increase does not represent a substantial increase in herd size over the existing baseline number of animals. Therefore, any nuisance odors generated by the increase in herd size of 500 animals is likely to be insignificant and would not adversely affect a substantial number of people. The minor herd size increase is also not anticipated to result in a substantial increase in pollutant concentrations, and no increase in the use of existing dairy related mechanical equipment and machinery is proposed.

#### 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?
- 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:

No habitat for special status species, nor riparian or other sensitive natural communities were identified by any reviewing agencies. Staff review of the California Department of Fish and Wildlife, Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB) web application indicates that the subject property is within the predicted habitat of the federally endangered, and state listed as threatened San Joaquin Kit Fox, with a medium probability, and within the predicted habitat of the burrowing owl with a high probability. However, the project proposes an increase of 500 head of cattle to an existing dairy site where fields are regularly tilled, and inhabited by 6,200 head of cattle. The proposed herd size increase will be accommodated within the existing dairy, and no physical expansion of the existing facilities is proposed, therefore the project will not have a substantial adverse impact on habitat for special species, or sensitive natural community.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

Based on a review of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Wetlands Inventory (NWI) Wetlands Mapper web application, no federally protected wetlands are present on the subject property.

- C. 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 is proposed on land currently occupied by a dairy farm, and proposes a herd size increase to be accommodated within the existing parcel boundaries, therefore no impacts to existing fish and wildlife corridors are anticipated to occur. No native wildlife nursery sites were identified by any reviewing agencies.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

No local biological resource protection policies were identified in the analysis.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

No habitat conservation or natural community conservation plans were identified which the project would conflict with.

## 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: NO IMPACT:

The project is located on an existing dairy farm where the ground is regularly disturbed; additionally, no ground disturbance is proposed which does not already occur, and no cultural or historical resources were identified in the analysis or by any reviewing agencies. Therefore, the project is not anticipated to result in the disturbance of any cultural or historical resources.

## 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: NO IMPACT:

The project entails an increase in animal herd size at an existing dairy; no increase in the use of energy or consumption of energy resources is anticipated to result from this proposal.

## 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: NO IMPACT:

According to Figure 9-5 (Probabilistic Seismic Hazards (10% Probability in 50 years) of the Fresno County General Plan Background Report, the subject property is not located in an area at increased risk (above 20%) from seismic activity.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project does propose to displace or move topsoil in quantities such that substantial erosion or loss of topsoil would occur. Additionally, the subject parcel is not located in an area identified as being prone to erosion, according to Figure 7-4 (Erosion Hazards in Western Fresno County).

- 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
- C. 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:

The subject parcel is not located in an area of expansive soils as identified by Figure 7-1 (Expansive Soils) of the Fresno County General Plan Background Report (FCGPBR).

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project does not propose any increased use of septic tanks or other wastewater disposal systems.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

No paleontological resources on or in the vicinity of the subject property, were identified by any reviewing agencies.

## 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:

according to the Greenhouse Gas Analysis prepared for the proposal by Innovative Ag Services dated October 18, 2022 (revised February 1, 2023), the subject site is an existing dairy operation and the proposed increase of 500 head of cattle would produce an insubstantial additional amount of CO<sub>2</sub>e (Carbon Dioxide Equivalent) per year. The existing dairy operation generates approximately 32,902 tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e annually. With the proposed increase in herd size the dairy operation would generate annual CO<sub>2</sub>e

emissions of approximately 37, 075 metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e, an increase of approximately 4,173 metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e, or 11.3 percent over the baseline.

Moreover, there is no additional land disturbance or construction proposed with this application. The existing facility utilizes Best Available Control Measures (BACT) for all covered processes identified by the Air District's Rule 4570, pertaining to Confined Animal Facilities (CAF), which seeks to limit emissions of volatile organic compounds (VOCs) from CAF. Based on the foregoing information, the project would have a less than significant impact on Greenhouse Gas Emissions.

The Greenhouse Gas Analysis asserts that manure management practices contribute to limiting greenhouse gas emissions, particularly methane. The AB 32 Scoping Plan identifies the strategy for controlling GHG emissions from the agricultural sector as being reliant upon incentive-based approaches, such as alternative manure management practices incorporated into a nutrient management plan, or water use reduction strategies, and the use of anaerobic digesters, and composting.

Based on the dairy's adherence to its existing nutrient management plan, waste discharge plan, and the aforementioned manure handling practices, the proposal to increase the existing herd size by 500 head of cattle, has been determined to have a less than significant impact on GHG emissions.

## VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Would the project:

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project does not propose any use or transport of hazardous materials. The project involves an increase in herd size of 500 cows at an active dairy site and there is no substantial change in the existing operation proposed with this application. The project will be required to comply with its existing waste management plan, which is required by the California Regional Quality Control Board, reissued Dairy General Order.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project site is not located within one quarter mile of an existing school. According to a review of the County's Geographic Information System, the nearest schools are



located approximately three miles southeast, within the unincorporated community of Laton.

- 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:

Based on a review of the U.S. EPA NEPAAssist mapping tool, and NEPAAssist report, the project site is not an identified hazardous material 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, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area; or
- F. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project has no features which would impair implementation of an emergency response plans or emergency evacuation plans. The project was reviewed by the Fresno County Fire Protection District

- 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 subject property is not located in an area identified as being at increased risk from wildfire.

## X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Would the project:

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The existing dairy is regulated by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, under the reissued Dairy General Order, which requires compliance with the waste discharge requirements, a report of waste discharge and with a Waste Management Plan established by the dairy and approved by the Waterboard. With compliance with

applicable regulatory requirements, the project would have a less than significant impact.

- B. Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin; or
- 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 result in substantial erosion or siltation on or off site?
  - 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 offsite?
  - 3. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater 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?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The subject parcel is not located in an area prone to seiche, or tsunami. According to FEMA, FIRM Panel 2900J, a portion of the subject parcel is located with Zone A (0.2 percent chance flood hazard area) and Zone X (0.1 percent, area of minimal flood hazard). According to Figure 9-7 (100-Year Flood Inundation Areas) of the Fresno County General Plan Background Report (FCGPBR) the subject property is not in an area subject to 100-year flood inundation, however, according to Figure 9-8 (Dam Failure Flood Inundation Areas) of the FCGBR, it is in area identified as being at risk from Dam Failure Flood Inundation.

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The dairy is subject to regulation by the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board. The dairy will be required to submit an updated Report of Waste Discharge

## 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 project does not propose any development which would physically divide a community, nor conflict with any land use plan, policy or regulation. The proposed herd size increase is consistent with the existing land use and with surrounding land uses, and may be allowed subject to discretionary review and approval, and also subject to any applicable regulatory controls.

## 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:

According to Figures 7-8 (Principal Mineral Producing Locations (1997-1998), and 7-7 (Mineral Resource Locations), and 7-9 (Generalized Mineral Resource Classifications), of the Fresno County General Plan Background Report (FCGPBR), the subject property is not in an identified mineral producing area. According to Figure 7-7, the property appears to be located in Mineral Resource Zone MRZ-1 (Areas where adequate information indicates that no significant mineral deposits are present, or where it is judged that little likelihood exists for their presence.

## 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: NO IMPACT:

There is no construction proposed with this application and no features of the operation or proposed increase in herd size which would result in a substantial increase in ambient noise levels or excessive ground-borne noise levels. The subject parcel is not located within two miles of a public, or private airport or within the boundaries of an airport land use plan.

#### XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING

Would the project:

- A. Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?; or
- B. Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

There are no features of the project which would induce population growth or displace any people.

#### XV. PUBLIC SERVICES

Would the project:

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project will not require the provision of any new or physically altered, government services, or 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 will not involve the use of or require the construction or expansion of any recreational facilities.

## XVI. TRANSPORTATION

Would the project:

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project will not involve increased use of County roads nor conflict with any County circulation plans

- B. Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project will not result in an increase in vehicle miles travelled (VMT).

- C. Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project does not propose any road design features, and will not increase hazards to traffic.

- D. Result in inadequate emergency access?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

No changes physical changes to access to the existing facilities will occur. The project will be required to comply with applicable provisions of the current Fire Code with regard to emergency access.

## XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project does not involve any new ground disturbance, and is located on a site which has been historically disturbed for agricultural purposes

## 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: NO IMPACT:

No changes, or modification of existing utilities infrastructure are required for this project proposal.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project proposal was reviewed by the County Water and Natural Resources Division of the Department of Public Works and Planning, which had no concerns about project water supply. Additionally, the project site is not located in an identified low water area of the County.

- 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: NO IMPACT:

The project's wastewater discharge is regulated by the State Regional Water Quality Control Board. The Regional Water Quality Control Board reviewed the project proposal to increase the existing herd size by 500 cows. The Waterboard indicate that the project should demonstrate that it has the capacity to handle the increase herd size via submittal of a Waste Management Plan prepared by a Registered Civil Engineer. The dairy will also be required to submit a Report of Waste Discharge to the Regional Water Board for review and approval.

- D. Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals; or
- E. Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project is subject to all applicable state and local solid waste disposal standards.

## 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 located in a State Responsibility Area or area of increased risk from wildfire. The project site is not located in a very

## XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Would the project:

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

No project impacts to wildlife habitat or historical or cultural resources were identified by County staff or any reviewing agencies.

- 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: NO IMPACT:

No reviewing agencies identified the potential for cumulatively considerable impacts resulting from the project.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

No identified environmental effects of the project, such as wastewater discharge to land resulting in impacts to groundwater, or air quality impacts from increased greenhouse gas and criteria pollutants, were anticipated to result in substantial adverse impacts on human beings.



## **CONCLUSION/SUMMARY**

Based upon the Initial Study prepared for Director Review and Approval Application No. 4688, 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 Aesthetics, Agricultural and Forestry Resources, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Energy, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Land Use/Planning, Mineral Resources, Noise, Population/Housing, Public Services, Recreation, Transportation/Traffic, Tribal Cultural Resources, Utilities and Services Systems and Wildfire.

Potential impacts related to Air Quality, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Hydrology and Water Quality have been determined to be less than significant.

A 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.

JS

G:\4360Devs&Pln\PROJSEC\PROJDOCS\DRA\4600-4699\4688\IS CEQA\DRA 4688 IS wu.docx