EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

APPLICANT: Donald Miranda

APPLICATION NOS.: Initial Study No. 8319 and Director Review and Approval No. 4720

DESCRIPTION: Directors Review and Approval to allow maintenance and storage of trucks and trailers that transport only agricultural products, supplies and equipment on a 5.02-acre parcel located within the AE-20 (Exclusive Agricultural, 20-acre minimum parcel size) Zone District.

LOCATION: The subject parcel is located on the south side of S. Brawley Ave., approximately 927 feet south of W. Church Ave., 0.9 miles west of the City of Fresno. (APN: 327-120-64) (1594 S. Brawley 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?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The subject property is located in an agricultural area with the majority of land utilized for agriculture with single family residences. There are no scenic vistas impacted by the project proposal. 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: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

As noted above, surrounding land uses are mainly agricultural uses. The project does not involve the development of any new structures. The proposal is to allow maintenance and truck parking. Trucks will be parked towards the rear of the subject parcel and visibility will be low from public view. This is not considered a substantial degradation of the visual character that would negatively impact the surrounding area. Therefore, a less than significant 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: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED:

Per the Applicant's Operational Statement, outdoor lighting would be utilized to illuminate the parking area. However, the outdoor lights would be hooded to ensure that sources of light associated with the proposed operation does not adversely affect views in the area and do not negatively impact adjacent properties or public right-of-way. A mitigation measure for the design and orientation of outdoor lighting will be implemented.

* ***Mitigation Measure(s)***

1. *All outdoor lighting shall be hooded and directed downward so as not to shine on adjacent properties or public right-of-way.*

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?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

Per the California Department of Conservation Farmland Map the subject parcel is not designated Farmland of Statewide Importance, Unique Farmland or Prime Farmland. The project will not result in the conversion of farmland to a non-agricultural use. This

project is determined to be agriculture related and is not likely to conflict with other agricultural users or encourage future non-agricultural uses. The Fresno County Department of Agriculture has reviewed the proposal and did not express concern with the project.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

Per the Fresno County Zoning Ordinance, the proposed use is allowed within the AE-20 (Exclusive Agricultural, 20-acre minimum parcel size) Zone District through a Director Review and Approval. The project does not conflict with the existing zoning for agricultural use and is not subject to a Williamson Act Contract.

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 subject property is not located in or zoned for forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production and would not result in the loss of forestland or conversion of forestland to non-forest use.

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 is not expected to result in conversion of additional farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forestland 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; or

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The project has been routed to the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD) for review and comment. The SJVAPCD did not express concern with the project to indicate that the project would result in a conflict with an applicable Air Quality Plan or result in cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant. SJVAPCD also stated that construction and operation are not expected to exceed any significant thresholds as identified in the District's Guidance for Assessing and Mitigating Air Quality Impacts (GAMAQI).

D. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations; or

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District reviewed the proposed project and expressed no concerns with the proposal. The plan does not conflict with the Air Quality Plan, does not violate any air quality standard, will not result in a cumulative net increase of any criteria pollutant, nor does it expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations or create objectionable odors.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

A. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service; or

B. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project site is not located in any reported occurrence areas of a special status species. The subject site is located in a mainly agricultural area and no sensitive natural community or riparian habitat was identified on the project site. When considering the current use of the project site and surrounding area and, absence of any evidence of a special status species or sensitive natural community, the project does not impact these resources.

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:

Per the National Wetlands Inventory and aerial photos of the project site, there are no wetlands located within the project site. Therefore, the project would not have a substantial adverse effect on protected wetlands.

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?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The area is utilized for agricultural purposes. There are no wildlife corridors or wildlife nursery sites known on the project site. The project has existing fencing along the perimeter of the subject parcel. However, the perimeter fencing would not substantially interfere with movement where an impact can be seen.

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: NO IMPACT:

Department and Agency review of the project did not reveal conflicts with any policies or ordinances for protection biological resources, nor were any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state Habitat Conservation Plan identified as being in conflict with the project proposal.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

A. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to Section 15064.5; or

B. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5; or

C. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED:

The subject property is currently improved a single-family residence and storage structure. The remainder of the parcel is vacant, and no new developments or

structures will be created. Therefore, no grading or excavation will occur. Considering that there will be no new developments, grading or excavation, archaeological or historical resources are not likely to occur. The existing structures were not identified as being historic. 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 ground-disturbing activities, all work shall be halted in the area of the fine. 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:

Reviewing agencies and departments did not express concern that the project would result in unnecessary consumption of energy resources or would conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency. The project proposal is to allow truck storage devoted to agriculture and energy usage will be minimal.

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 California Department of Conservation, Earthquake Hazard Zone web application indicates that the subject parcel is not located within an Earthquake Fault Zone.

2. Strong seismic ground shaking?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

Per Figure 9-5 of the Fresno County General Plan Background Report (FCGPBR), the project site is located on land with a 0-20% chance of reaching peak horizontal ground acceleration assuming a probabilistic seismic hazard with a 10% probability in 50 years. The proposed development will be subject to the most current building code standards and would ensure minimal impact when considering the low likelihood of strong seismic ground shaking.

3. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

4. Landslides?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

Per Figure 9-6 of the FCGPBR, the project site is not located in an area designated for landslide hazards or subsidence. In addition, as noted above, the project site is located in an area with a low likelihood of experiencing strong seismic shaking. Therefore, seismic-related ground failure is not likely to occur.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

Project construction and operation may result in minimal loss of topsoil; However, the subject property is located in a relatively flat agricultural area where no slopes or other changes in elevation occur where occurrences of soil erosion would cause a substantial risk to development.

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 project site is not located in an area of the County identified as an unstable geologic unit, or prone to lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse,

according to Figures 7-1 (Expansive Soils), 9-6 (Landslide Hazards and Areas of Subsidence), 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 proposes to utilize an individual onsite wastewater treatment facility. No concerns were raised by any reviewing agencies or County departments, with wastewater treatment system regulatory authority about the capacity of the project site to accommodate the proposed septic system.

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED:

No paleontological resources were identified in the analysis, however in the unlikely event that paleontological resources area unearthed during ground disturbing activities, the following mitigation measure has been added to address that potential discovery.

* ***Mitigation Measure(s)***

1. *In the event that cultural resources are unearthed during ground-disturbing activities, all work shall be halted in the area of the find. An Archeologist shall be called to evaluate the findings and make any necessary mitigation recommendations. If human remains are unearthed during ground disturbing activities, no further disturbance is to occur until the Fresno County Sheriff-Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition. All normal evidence procedures shall be followed by photos, reports, video, and etc. If such remains are determined to be Native American, the Sheriff-Coroner must notify the Native American Commission within 24 hours.*

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:

Project operation will result in the generation of greenhouse gas emissions; however, such emission is not anticipated to be substantial, nor result in a significant impact on the environment, or conflict with any state or local greenhouse gas emissions reduction goals, policies or plans. The San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District was notified of the subject application and did not express concerns that GHG emission increases would have a significant impact on the environment and did not indicate that the project would conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases.

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?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project will not involve the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials.

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 will not result in hazardous emissions, or involve the handling of hazardous materials, and is not located within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.

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:

The project site is not located on a known hazardous materials site, identified by NEPAssist.

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?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project site is not located in an identified airport land use plan area, or within two miles of a public airport.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project will be required to comply with all applicable emergency access standards of the current Fire Code and Building Code.

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 not located in a State Responsibility Area (SRA) or other area of the County at significant risk from wildfire. The project site is in an area of irrigated agriculture.

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: NO IMPACT:

The project is not anticipated to result in violation of any water quality or waste discharge requirements or degrade surface or ground water.

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?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project does not propose any new developments, alterations to land or water usage. Therefore, the project will not have an impact. No impervious surfaces will be installed.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project is not located in a flood hazard area as identified by Figure 9-7 of the Fresno County General Plan Background Report (FCGPBR); it is located in an area prone to flood inundation due dam failure, as per Figure 9-8 (FCGPBR). In the unlikely event of a dam failure, the project site is not anticipated to result in the release of pollutants.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project was reviewed by the State Water Resources Control Board, Drinking Water Division, the Central Kings Groundwater Sustainability Agency (GSA) and the County Water and Natural Resources Division. None of these agencies expressed concerns that the project would adversely impact water quality, or conflict with a water quality plan, or sustainable groundwater management plan. The project will be required by the State Water Resources Control Board, Division of Drinking Water to be permitted as a public water system and be subject to all applicable regulation of public water systems.

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 has no features which would divide an established community. The project site is already existing and there will be no alterations to the land, or any development.

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:

The project will not impact any known mineral resources and is not located in an area of mineral resources as identified by Figures 7-7 (Mineral Resource Locations), 7-8 (Principal Mineral Producing Locations (1997-1998), and 7-9 (Generalized Mineral Resource Zone Classifications) of the Fresno County General Plan Background Report (FCGPBR).

XIII. NOISE

Would the project result in:

A. Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies; or

B. Generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The project will generate some noise from the operation of trucks however noise will be temporary and is not anticipated to result in generation of a substantial increase in ambient noise levels or generate excessive ground-borne vibration in the vicinity. Additionally, the project does not propose to use refrigerated trucks. Therefore, a less than significant impact is seen. A mitigation measure will be implemented to minimize noise impacts.

* ***Mitigation Measure(s)***

1. *"Noise Ordinance of the County of Fresno" states for commercial districts between 10 pm to 7 am shall not exceed 60 sound level decibels. Between 7 am to 10 pm, the sound level decibels shall not exceed 65. Chapter 10- Regulations*

Regarding Public Nuisances and Real Property Conduct and Use. Article 1-Noise Regulations. Section 10-102 (b).

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 site is not located in the vicinity of a public or private airport, or within the boundaries of an adopted airport land use plan area.

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 has no features which would likely induce population growth in the vicinity, require the construction of any new homes, or extension of infrastructure, 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 for new or physical altered governmental facilities. The project proposes no new developments.

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 increase the use of existing neighborhood parks or other recreational facilities. The project does not attract visitors or any customers to the area.

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: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The project will be consistent with applicable General Plan Policies of the Transportation and Circulation element of the County's General Plan. The project does not create a significant level of additional traffic. A Traffic Impact Analysis was not deemed necessary by Fresno County Staff.

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The project is not anticipated to exceed the daily trip threshold for Vehicle Mile Travelled established by the State Governors Office of Planning and Research (OPR).

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 has no design features which would create a new sharp curve or dangerous intersection or involve incompatible uses.

D. Result in inadequate emergency access?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project has no design features which would create inadequate emergency access entering and exiting the site. There will be no alterations to land or any new developments.

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 MITIGATION INCORPORATED:

Though no Tribal Cultural or Cultural Resources were identified in the analysis, the potential exists for previously unknown subsurface resources to be unearthed during project related ground disturbance. In the event of such discovery of Tribal Cultural or Cultural Resources, the following Mitigation Measure has been included.

* ***Mitigation Measure***

1. See Mitigation Measure under Section V Cultural Resources.

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:

The project will not require new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, natural gas, or telecommunication facilities which would cause significant effects.

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 State Water Resources Control Board and the Water and Natural Resources Division did not provide concerns to indicate that there are insufficient water supplies for the project. Water usage will be minimal for this project.

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 Applicant will be required to meet County permitting standards for the subject building and associated wastewater treatment system. Review of the proposal did not indicate a conflict with County standards for this system, but further review of the proposed system will be conducted if this project is approved.

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 not anticipated to result in the generation of solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or impair the attainment of or be non-compliant with federal, state or local sold waste 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 within a State Responsibility Area or high fire hazard severity zone., therefore the project would not be subject to increased risk from wildfire, or post wildfire conditions.

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

That conversion has been determined to have a less than significant impact on habitat conversion as the surrounding land development will not adversely affect wildlife species or cause wildlife populations to drop below self-sustaining levels.

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

Per the analysis conducted, cumulative impacts regarding Aesthetics, Cultural Resources, and Tribal Cultural Resources have been identified, but with implemented mitigation measures, the impacts have been reduced to a less than significant impact.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

There were no identified environmental effects resulting from the project that will cause substantial adverse effect on human beings, either directly or indirectly.

CONCLUSION/SUMMARY

Based upon the Initial Study prepared for Director Review and Approval No. 4717, 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 Energy, Land Use Planning, Population and Housing, Public Services, Recreation, Utilities and Service Systems, Wildfire, Hydrology and Water, Biological Resources, Agricultural, Mineral and Hazards and Hazardous Material.

Potential impacts related to Air Quality, Biological Resources, Geology and Soils, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, and Transportation have been determined to be less than significant. Potential impacts relating to Aesthetics, Noise, Cultural Resources, and Tribal Cultural Resources have determined to be less than significant with compliance with implementation of listed 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” Street, Fresno, California.

ER
G:\4360Devs&Pln\PROJSEC\PROJDOCS\DRA\4700-4799\4720\CEQA\IS 8319-DRA 4720 IS Writeup.docx