



County of Fresno

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

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

- APPLICANTS:** Jack, Frank, and John Zonneveld
- APPLICATION NOS.:** Initial Study No. 8176 and Director Review and Approval Application No. 4685
- DESCRIPTION:** Allow the expansion of an existing Dairy permitted prior to the adoption of the Dairy Ordinance on October 23, 2007 by 500 heads of cattle on a 287.62-acre project site in the AE-20 (Exclusive Agricultural, 20-acre minimum parcel size) Zone District.
- LOCATION:** The project site is located along Cerini Avenue between East Street and Cedar Street, approximately 4.1 miles northwest of the unincorporated community of Laton (APN 055-300-12S, 055-051-04S, 055-340-10S, 055-051-03S, 055-051-09S, and 055-051-02S) (1523 E. Cerini Ave.) (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 would not change from this project, therefore, no impact is seen.

- 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 provided comments. The SJVAPCD has determined that project specific annual emissions from operational 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.

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

Located in an agricultural area, the project site has been disturbed by improvements related to an existing dairy. The site and the neighboring parcels have also been pre-disturbed with farming operations and as such do not provide habitat for state or federally-listed species. Additionally, the site does not contain any riparian features, wetlands, or waters under the jurisdiction of the United States.

The project was routed to the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) for review and comments. No concerns were expressed by either agency.

- 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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

Being a developed site, no wildlife or fish movement features (e.g., waterways, arroyos, ridgelines) or any wildlife nursery sites are present on the property. The project will not impact these resources.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project site contains no biological resources and no trees. The project is not subject to the county tree preservation policy or ordinance.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project site is not within the boundaries of a Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Community Conservation Plan. The project will not conflict with the provisions of such a 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 project site is within an area moderately sensitive to historical, archeological or paleontological resources. As such, a mitigation measure would require that in case archeological resources are uncovered during any ground-disturbance activities, all work must be stopped until a qualified archeologist evaluates the findings, and if human remains are discovered, the Fresno County Sheriff-Coroner shall be notified. Further, if the remains are of Native Americans, the Sheriff-Coroner shall also notify to the Native American Commission (NAHC) within 24 hours of discovery in accordance with California Health and Safety Code 7050.5 and Public Resource Code 5097.98.

* **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 should be followed by photos, reports, video, 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; or
- B. Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?

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 resulting increase in herd size will not create unnecessary consumption of energy resources nor conflict with nor obstruct state and local plans for renewable energies.

VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Would the project:

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project site does not contain any active earthquake faults, nor is it located within a designated Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone.

- 2. Strong seismic ground shaking?
- 3. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The project site is in an area of low probability for exposure to strong ground shaking. The potential for seismic-related ground failure (liquefaction, lateral spreading, and lurching) occurring on the project site is minimal due to the absence of high groundwater levels and saturated loose granular soil on the property. 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.

No agency expressed concerns or complaints related to ground shaking, ground failure, liquefaction or landslides.

4. Landslides?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project site contains naturally flat relief, which precludes the possibility of landslides on site.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project will not result in erosion or loss of topsoil. No concerns were expressed by the Development Engineering Section of the Development Services and Capital Projects Division.

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

D. Would the project have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative disposal systems where sewers are not available for wastewater disposal?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

No wastewater disposal impacts were identified in the analysis. The project will not install an individual sewage disposal system on the property.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project is not located within an area of known risk of landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse, or within an area of known expansive soils.

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:

For emissions associated with the increase of 500 animals, the SJVUAPCD utilizes an animal emission calculator. The post project change in annual emissions is 4,173 tons metric tons CO₂e.

The proposal does not entail any land disturbance or construction. Existing equipment will be used with no change in operations warranted. Current SJVUAPCD BACT is employed as mitigation measures to control process emissions.

Similar dairy projects utilize Tulare County Dairy Climate Action Plan (Dairy CAP) of whom established a significance threshold of 15,000 MT of CO₂e.3

The post project change in annual emissions is 4,173 metric tons CO₂e, which is below the level of significance of 15,000 metric tons CO₂e based in Tulare County.

Dairies have a unique position in the AB 32 Scoping Plan. The Scoping Plan relies on voluntary incentive-based approaches to achieve reductions from dairy operations. The most significant CEQA review of dairy operations in California occurred with the Tulare County environmental review of dairy operations and proposed expansion review process. As a result of that process, in 2020 the Tulare County Dairy Climate Action Plan (Dairy CAP) established a significance threshold of 15,000 MT of CO₂e.3

Comments received from the Air District expressed no specific project-related concerns, supporting the determination that the project will not generate greenhouse gas emissions that may have a significant impact on the environment. The project will adhere to the Air District requirements.

VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Would the project:

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project does not involve transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials and will release no hazardous materials into the environment. The project is not located within one quarter-mile of a school. The nearest school, Laton Elementary School, is approximately 4.8 miles southeast of the project site.

- F. 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: NO IMPACT:

The project is not located on a hazardous materials site. No concerns were expressed by the Fresno County Department of Public Health, Environmental Health Division.

- G. 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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project site is not located within an airport land use plan area, within two miles of a public use airport, or in the vicinity of a private airstrip. The nearest airport, Selma Airport, is approximately 10 miles northeast of the site.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project site is located in an area where existing emergency response times for fire protection, emergency medical services, and sheriff protection meet adopted standards. The project does not include any characteristics (e.g., permanent road closures) that would physically impair or otherwise interfere with emergency response or evacuation in the project vicinity.

- I. 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 not within or adjacent to a wildland fire area. The project will not expose persons or structures to wildland fire hazards.

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; or

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED:

The Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) reviewed the project for impact on groundwater quality. According to the RWQCB, the dairy was enrolled under the Waste Discharge Requirements General Order for Existing Milk Cow Dairies, On 3 May 2007, the Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region (Regional Board) adopted the enclosed Waste Discharge Requirements General Order For Existing Milk Cow Dairies (Order No. R5-2007-0035) (General Order), which applies to milk cow dairies that were in existence as of 17 October 2005 and that filed a Report of Waste Discharge in response to the Regional Board's request of 8 August 2005.

According to the RWQCB, per the 2007 General Order enrollment letter, there is a maximum of 6,210 and 3,450 mature cows currently allowed constitute an expansion of the existing dairy. As such, a Report of Waste Discharge (RWD) would be required prior to starting discharge associated with the expansion. This requirement will be included as a Mitigation Measure.

* **Mitigation Measure**

1. *Pursuant to provision G.4 of the reissued General Order (R5-2013-0122), prior to starting discharge associated with the dairy expansion, the project proponent shall submit a Report of Waste Discharge (RWD) with the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board.*

The State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB), Division of Drinking Water (DDW) also reviewed the subject proposal for water quality standards. Based on the total number of dairy employees, the SWRCB-DDW determined that the existing dairy facility does not meet the definition of a public water system.

- 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 current water use at the dairy facility is estimated to be 205,100 gallons per day based on the existing cows. The increase in water use due to 500 additional cows is estimated to be 32,500 gallons per day. An existing on-site private well provides water for the dairy along with two community watering systems for potable uses (CA 1000627 & CA 1000369)

The project site is not within a designated low-water area of Fresno County. The Fresno County Water and Natural Resources Division of the Department of Public Works and Planning reviewed the proposal and expressed no concerns related to water sustainability for the use. The project will have a less than significant impact on groundwater resources.

- 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?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project will not impact the existing on-site drainage patterns nor substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site. The project will not generate additional runoff beyond that currently generated by the existing improvements on the property.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project is not in a flood hazard area.

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED:

See Section X. A. for details.

XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING

Would the project:

- A. Physically divide an established community; or

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project will not physically divide an established community. The nearest unincorporated community of Laton is approximately 5 miles southeast of the project site.

- 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 subject property is designated Agriculture in the Fresno County General Plan and is located outside of any city's Sphere of Influence (SOI). As such, the subject proposal will not be in conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction (other than County) over the project.

The County General Plan allows the proposed facility in an agriculturally-zoned area as a 'Special Agricultural Use' by discretionary land use approval provided it meets applicable General Plan policies. The project meets the following General Plan policies:

Regarding Policy LU-A.3, Criteria a. b. c. d., the proposed project is an expansion of an existing dairy previously authorized as a by-right use; is not located on a prime farmland; will not utilize a significant volume of water to impact the groundwater table; and, can be provided with adequate workforce from the nearest communities of Lanare and Five Points. Regarding Policy LU-A.12, Policy LU-A.13 and Policy LU-A.14, the project is a compatible use pursuant to Policy LU-A.3 and maintains adequate distance from the adjacent farming operations. Regarding Policy PF-C.17 and Policy PF-D.6, the limited increase in water usage by the project will not affect groundwater resources and the project does not involve installation of on-site sewage disposal systems.

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:

No mineral resource impacts were identified in the analysis. The site is not located in a mineral resource area as identified in Policy OS-C.2 of the General Plan.

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:

The project operation will not expose people to severe noise levels or create substantial increases in ambient noise levels. No concerns were expressed by the Fresno County Department of Public Health, Environmental Health Division related to 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 not result in an increase of housing, nor will it otherwise induce population growth.

XV. PUBLIC SERVICES

Would the project:

- A. Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically-altered governmental facilities, or the need for new or physically-altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services?

1. Fire protection;

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The Fresno County Fire Protection District (CalFire) reviewed the proposal and identified no concerns with the project. However, any future development on the property will be subject to the requirements of the current Fire Code and Building Code and annexation to the Community Facilities District No. 2010-01 of the Fresno County Fire Protection District. These requirements will be included as Project Notes.

2. Police protection;

3. Schools;

4. Parks; or

5. Other public facilities?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project will have no impact on police services, schools, parks or any other public 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 analysis identified no impacts on 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; or
- B. Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?; or

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The Design Division of the Fresno County Department of Public Works and Planning reviewed the proposal and expressed no concerns related to traffic or required a Traffic Impact Study for 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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project will not result in a change in air traffic patterns.

- D. Result in inadequate emergency access?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project will not increase traffic hazards due to design features. There is no change to the current access to the site or on-site improvements. No concerns were expressed by the Road Maintenance and Operations Division and Development Engineering Section of the Fresno County Department of Public Works and Planning.

XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

With the implementation of the aforementioned Mitigation Measure, the project will have a less than significant impact on tribal cultural resources as defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074. The project was routed to the Santa Rosa Rancheria Tachi Yokut

Tribe and Dumna Wo Wah Tribal Government in compliance with Assembly Bill (AB) 52.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

See discussion in Section VII. E. Geology and Soils.

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

See discussion in Section X. B. Hydrology and Water Quality.

- 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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

See discussion in Section X. E. Hydrology and Water Quality.

- 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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

See discussion in Section X. B. Hydrology and Water Quality.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

See discussion in Section VII. E. Geology and Soils.

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 an area at increased risk from wildfire, or in an area designated as a state responsibility area. The project area is already improved with structures associated with existing dairy operations that are proposed to be utilized in conjunction with the subject operation.

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: NO 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 no substantial adverse impacts on human beings would occur.

CONCLUSION/SUMMARY

Based upon the Initial Study (No. 8176) prepared for Director Review and Approval Application No. 4685, 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, hazards and hazardous materials, mineral resources, noise, population and housing, recreation or transportation/traffic.

Potential impacts related to air quality, geology and soils, greenhouse gas emissions, land use and planning, public services, and utilities and service systems have been determined to be less than significant.

Potential impacts to cultural resources and hydrology and water quality 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.

ER

G:\4360Devs&PI\PROJSEC\PROJDOCS\DRA\4600-4699\4685\CEQA-IS\DRA 4685 Initial Study Writeup.docx