



County of Fresno

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

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

- APPLICANT: Stamoules Produce, Inc.
- APPLICATION NOS.: Initial Study No. 7995 and Classified Conditional Use Permit Application No. 3694
- DESCRIPTION: Allow the operation of a private use airport with a 4,847-foot-long runway, for business, personal and agricultural purposes, including construction of a 10,173 square-foot hangar, on an approximately 8.25-acre portion of 434.93-acre parcel in the AE-20 (Exclusive Agricultural, 20-acre minimum parcel size) Zone District.
- LOCATION: The project site is located on the north side of W. California Avenue, approximately one half-mile northeast its intersection with of W. California Avenue. and S. Lyon Avenue, approximately four miles southwest of the City of Mendota (APN:019-040-28)(904 S. Lyon 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 project site is located in an area of large agricultural parcels and agriculturally related operations. No scenic vistas or scenic resources were identified; there are no historic buildings or scenic resources in the vicinity of the project and the project is not located in the vicinity of a state scenic highway. The nearest state highway is State Route 33 (Derrick Avenue) approximately 4 miles to the east.

- C. In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are

experienced from publicly accessible vantage points.) If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The nearest publicly accessible views of the project site are from California Avenue approximately one quarter mile south of the proposed hangar building, and from S. Lyon Avenue, approximately 400 feet from the north end of the runway. Based on the considerable distances from any publicly accessible vantage points, the project is not anticipated to have an adverse impact on public views.

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED:

The proposed hangar building, and parking area will have new outdoor lighting fixtures, which will be required to be directed away from public streets and adjacent properties. The runway will be lit only during aircraft operations and will be directed away from neighboring properties and the public right-of-way. Airstrip lighting will be low intensity, and because there are no residences in close proximity to the runway, the proposed runway lighting is not anticipated to cause a significant impact, with the implementation of the following Mitigation Measure.

* **Mitigation Measure(s)**

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

II. AGRICULTURAL AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

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

- A. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance, as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

According to the 2016 Fresno County Important Farmland Map, the subject parcel contains land categorized as Farmland of Statewide Importance, which is defined as being similar to Prime Farmland but with minor shortcomings, such as greater slopes or less ability to store soil moisture; and, the land must have been used for irrigated agricultural production at some time during the four years prior to the mapping date.

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The subject parcel is enrolled the Williamson Act Program under Contract No. 3571. Lands enrolled in the Williamson Act program are typically limited to commercial agriculture or uses which are determined to be compatible or incidental to commercial agriculture. Private or special use airports like what is proposed with this application are not a permitted use on contracted land. Accordingly, the subject parcel was required to complete a partial cancellation of the contract on that portion of the property proposed for use as a private airport.

- 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 parcel does not contain forest, or timberland, therefore the project will not result in the loss of any forest land or timberland.

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The project will remove approximately 8.50 acres from productive agriculture, however the remainder of the 484-acre parcel will remain in agricultural production; as such, the project will have a less than significant impact on the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses.

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: NO IMPACT:

The project was reviewed by the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (Air District) and based upon the proposal determined that project construction and operation would not result in emissions of criterial pollutants in excess of Air District thresholds. An Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions Analysis Memorandum was prepared for the project by LSA, dated November 4, 2021. The Air Quality Analysis concluded that no Air District established thresholds of significance for criterial pollutants, would be exceeding by the project.

- C. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations; or
- D. Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The project is not anticipated to result in odors from emissions which would adversely affect a substantial number of people. The proposed airport is located in an area of the County that is sparsely populated and emissions from aircraft utilizing the airport are not expected to be generated in substantial quantities such that people living or working in the vicinity would be adversely affected. No increase in vehicle traffic or other emissions generating activities are anticipated to result from this project proposal.

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?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

A search of the California Department of Fish and Wildlife, California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB) the project site is within the State threatened Swainson's Hawk range and predicted habitat. Additionally, there have been recorded sightings of Swainson's Hawk in the vicinity of the project site.

No comments were received from the California Department of Fish and Wildlife.

- 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?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

Based upon a review of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Wetlands Inventory, Wetlands Mapping Tool, there are no protected wetland features, riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community was identified on or in the vicinity of the subject property.

- 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 project is not anticipated to interfere substantially with the movement of any migratory fish or wildlife species. The project proposes a private airport for corporate and agricultural uses. No wildlife corridors or nursery sites were identified in the vicinity of the project site.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

No local policies or ordinances were identified which would be impacted by the project.

- 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:

No adopted Habitat Conservation, Natural Community, or other habitat conservation plans were identified which would be affected by the project.

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 parcel is not located in an area of the County designated as having a moderate or high potential for the presence of archaeological finds. The property consists of cultivated and irrigated agricultural land engaged in a commercial agricultural operation. The project proposes a private use airport consisting of a 4,845-foot-long by 75-foot-wide runway which has been constructed, and a 9,486 square-foot airplane hanger building which will be constructed. As such there is minimal additional ground disturbance associated with this project, however, to address the potential for previously undiscovered subsurface materials the following Mitigation Measure has been included.

* **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 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.*

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 is not anticipated to result in a potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient or unnecessary consumption of energy resources. Project development will be subject to the applicable requirements of the California Green Building Standards Code related to energy efficiency.

VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Would the project:

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project site is not located in an area at substantially increased risk of strong seismic ground shaking, seismic related ground failure, liquefaction or landslides, according to Figures 9-5 (Probabilistic Seismic Hazards[10% Probability in 50 years) and 9-6 (Landslide Hazards and Areas of Subsidence) of the Fresno County General Plan Background Report, or rupture of a known earthquake fault.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project site is located in an area of the County identified being a Generalized Hazard Area, according to Figure 7-4 (Erosion Hazards in Western Fresno County) of the Fresno County General Plan Background Report, however the site is comprised of relatively flat irrigated farmland and

- 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?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project site is located in an area of deep subsidence as identified by Figure 9-6 (Landslide Hazards and Areas of Subsidence) of the Fresno County General Plan Background Report

- D. Be located on expansive soil as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project site is not located in an area identified as having expansive soils, according to General Plan Background Report Figure 7-1 (Expansive Soils).

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project hangar building proposes the use of an onsite wastewater treatment system (septic). The new septic system will be required to be installed under permit and inspection and be subject to the requirements of the Fresno County Local Area Management Program (LAMP) and the County Ordinance Code.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

No paleontological resources were identified by any reviewing agencies, or during staff's analysis.

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 project by LSA , dated November 4, 2021, the project will generated Greenhouse Gas Emissions, both during construction and operation. Project GHG emissions were estimated using the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) Version 2020.4.0., and land use codes for General Light Industry, Other Asphalt Surfaces, and Parking lot, which analyzed the project based on a worst-case day assuming worker and other vehicle trips to the site, and two (2) complete aircraft operations, which would equal four average daily trips. The analysis also calculated emissions from aircraft activities using the Aviation Environmental Design Tool (AEDT)2d. The analysis assumed one personal use airplane would take off and land at the air strip in addition to one take-off and landing associated with aerial agricultural chemical applications. Based on the conclusions of the GHG analysis, neither project construction emissions nor operational emissions

were estimated to exceed any established thresholds of significance for Greenhouse Gas Emissions or Criteria Pollutants.

IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Would the project:

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The project proposes to have one fuel truck with a 1,500-gallon capacity on-site for aircraft fueling. The project will be required to comply with all applicable regulations related to the use and storage of hazardous materials. Above ground fuel storage tanks or agricultural chemical storage containers will be required to provide a spill prevention control and countermeasure plan (SPCC). For crop dusting operations, the project proposes to have fertilizer and pesticides, herbicides by an independent licensed provider. The storage and use of agricultural chemicals is regulated by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), and the licensing of Agricultural pilots is regulated by the FAA and the California Department of Pesticide Regulation (CDPR). Additionally, the State Licensed business must register annually with the Fresno County Department of Agriculture.

- 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. The nearest identified school is Mendota Hight School, located approximately 4.8 miles west of the runway.

- 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 is not located on a hazardous materials site.

- E. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The project site is not located within an airport land use plan area or within two miles of an existing public airport. The project itself involves the establishment of a private use airport located approximately 1,200 feet east of an existing agricultural processing facility, on an adjacent parcel. The nearest public airport to the project site is the Mendota Airport located approximately five and one-half miles northeast.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project will not impair or interfere with any adopted emergency response or evacuation plan.

- G. Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project site is not located in an area at risk from wildland fires.

X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Would the project:

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project is not expected to increase waste discharge or otherwise affect water quality standards. The project may be required to develop a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) as part of construction general permitting requirements, and comply with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permits. A Notice of Intent (NOI) and Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan are required to be filed with the State Water Resources Control Board before the commencement of any construction activities disturbing one (1.0) acre or more of land area. Copies of the completed NOI with WDID Number and SWPPP shall be provided to the Fresno County Department of Public Works and Planning, Development Engineering Section prior to any grading work being authorized.

- B. Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project is not anticipated to result in increase demand on groundwater supplies. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:

1. Result in substantial erosion or siltation on or off site?
 2. Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on or off site?
 3. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or
 4. Impede or redirect flood flows?
- C. In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

According to FEMA FIRM Panel 1980H, the northwesterly portion of the subject property is under shaded Flood Zone X, which refers to areas prone to the 0.2 percent annual chance flood event, and areas of a 1 percent annual chance flood with average depths of less than one foot or with drainage areas less than one square mile, and areas protected by levees from 1 percent annual chance flood. Any development in the area identified as shaded Flood Zone X shall conform to provisions established in Fresno County Ordinance Code Title 15, Chapter 15.48 Flood Hazard Areas.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

No concerns related to water quality or water supply were expressed by any of the reviewing agencies.

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 is not located within an established community and does not propose any development which would divide an established community. The nearest established community is the city of Mendota located approximately four miles northeast of the project site.

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 subject property is not located in the vicinity of a know mineral resources location as identified by Figure 7-7(Mineral Resource Locations) 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?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The project will generate noise from aircraft idling, take-off and landing. The Fresno County Ordinance Code, Title 8.40.040 (Noise Ordinance) addresses Noise Control, including interior and exterior noise level standards. The Noise Ordinance requires compliance with the Noise level standards, as measured at any affected single or multifamily residence, school, hospital, church or public library, during the daytime hours of between 7:00 a.m. and 10:00 p.m. and the nighttime hours of between 10:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m.

Additionally, the Noise Ordinance states that it is unlawful for any person at any location within the County to create any noise at a residence, school, hospital, church or public library that exceeds 70 dBA between the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. or 65 dBA between the hours of 10:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. According to Title 21, Division 2.5, Chapter 6, Section 5012 (Airport Noise Standard), California Code of Regulations establishes that the acceptable level of aircraft noise for persons living in the vicinity of airports is a community noise level equivalent (CNEL) of 65 decibels.

A Noise Contours and Impact Analysis (Noise Analysis) was prepared for this project by LSA, dated March 23, 2023. The noise contours show anticipated noise levels measured in decibels, at a certain distance from the source, were calculated utilizing the Aviation Environmental Design Tool (AEDT) 2d software. which models aircraft performance in space and time to produce noise contour lines which indicate equal levels of noise; the modeling software was used to model noise contours associated with aircraft operations at the proposed air strip, utilizing specific data such as frequency of flight activity aircraft type, and flight tracks. The aircraft type and frequency of operation were derived from the applicant's submitted operational statement dated January 14, 2020.

For purposes of greatest impact scenario evaluation, the analysis assumed two complete aircraft operations (take-off and landing) would occur per day, including one personal use flight and one agricultural flight for aerial application of chemicals. The modeling assumed for the worst case scenario, that aircraft operations could occur both during night time hours between 10:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m., or daytime hours between 7:00 a.m. and 10:00 p.m., and the CNEL contours assumed that takeoffs would to the north and south. The existing runway is generally oriented southeast and northwest. The modeling also use an aircraft most similar to one of those actually proposed, for modeling purposes.

The noise contours assumed a range of 55 dBA CNEL, 60 dBA CNEL, and 65 CNEL (community noise equivalent level). According to the noise analysis, CNEL represents the time-weighted average noise over a 24-hour time period. The Noise Analysis determined that the predominate land uses in the vicinity of the proposed airport are agricultural, commercial, industrial, and public utility, with sparse residential development.

According to publicly available web based aerial imagery, the nearest residences to the runway are located approximately three quarter miles northwest of the northernmost end of the runway which is also within the 60dBA contour shown in the Noise Memo. There is also one residence located approximately 3,200 feet east of the runway midpoint, and there are additional residences located approximately 2,300 feet southeast. There is also a produce processing plant located approximately 2,000 feet southwest of the runway. The noise analysis memo identified four residences in the vicinity of the proposed airport which may be impacted by aircraft noise; of the four, one was identified which could potentially experience a maximum noise level of 69 dBA which would exceed the maximum nighttime threshold of 65 dBA. Based on this assumption, the noise analysis recommended in its conclusions that aircraft operations be restricted to daytime hours between 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.; or if the ability to conduct nighttime operations is desired, field studies of actual aircraft noise levels at identified receptor locations should be conducted to verify model accuracy and compliance with noise standards. The conclusions of the Noise Memo also recommended that should the aircraft operating at the proposed airport have a louder reference noise level than the aircraft type utilized for the modeling input, additional analysis or aircraft operations monitoring should be conducted to ensure compliance with County noise standards.

* **Mitigation Measure**

1. *All flight operations whether agricultural applications or passenger flights, will be limited to the hours between 7:00 a.m. and 10:00 p.m. seven days per week.*

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The project will involve construction of the proposed hangar building, the runway has already been constructed. Construction activities are not anticipated to generate excessive ground borne vibration or noise. Noise sources associated with construction activities, provided they take place between 6:00 a.m. and 9:00 p.m. on weekdays and between 7:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. on Saturday and Sunday.

C. For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels; or

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The project site is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip, within the boundaries of an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport. The nearest public airport located in the City of Mendota is approximately 4.00-miles east of the project site. The project proposes the construction and operation of a private use airport for both business and agricultural purposes. The project owner also operates a fruit packing/processing operation located approximately one third of a mile west of the airstrip. According to a review of web base aerial imagery, the nearest residence to the project is located approximately one half-mile southwest of the runway.

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 is not anticipated to result in population growth or displacement of substantial number of people or housing. No new housing is proposed with this application.

XV. PUBLIC SERVICES

Would the project:

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project will not require the provision of any new or physically altered governmental 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 does not entail the use of any existing parks or other recreational facilities, as there are no identified parks or recreational facilities in the project vicinity. Therefore, no impacts to such facilities will occur.

XVII. TRANSPORTATION

Would the project:

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The project site will take access from W. California Avenue which is classified as a collector road in the Fresno County General Plan. Rural Collectors require a minimum of 84 feet of right-of-way consistent with the Transportation Element. The segment of W. California Avenue on along which the subject parcel has frontage currently has only 60 feet of right-of-way. The project proponent will be required to irrevocable offer for dedication, of an additional 12 feet of right-of-way along the parcel frontage on the north side of W. California Avenue, to comply with the General Plan. No other conflicts with the circulation system were identified.

- B. Be in conflict or be inconsistent with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project involves the establishment of a private use air strip, and based on the information provided in the Applicant's submitted operational statement, projected traffic generated by the project is not anticipated to exceed the established threshold for VMT of 110 daily trips, therefor the project is unlikely to have a substantial impact on Vehicle Miles Travelled.

- 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 design features which would impact County transportation facilities.

- D. Result in inadequate emergency access?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project site will take access via a new access road connecting to California Avenue. The road will be required to meet applicable Fire Code requirements with regard to width and turnaround area for emergency apparatus.

XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

- A. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:

1. Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k); or
2. A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1? (In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.)

FINDING: Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated:

See Discussion and Mitigation Under Section V Cultural Resources above.

* **Mitigation Measure**

1. *In the event that Tribal 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.*

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 the relocation or construction of new or expanded public utilities.

- 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 is not anticipated to require additional water supplies in excess of current agricultural and domestic use.

- 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 will utilize an onsite septic system, and will not place additional demands on local wastewater treatment providers.

- 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 will comply with federal state and local solid waste management and reduction statutes and regulations, and is not anticipated to generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards or impair the attainment of any State or local solid waste goals.

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 designated as being at increased risk from wildfire hazard. The project site is located in an area of irrigated farmland and relatively flat topography where wildfire risk very low, as is most of the valley floor, according to the CALFIRE Fire Hazard Severity Zone Viewer mapping tool.

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: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED:

* **Mitigation Measure(s)**

- 1. See Mitigation under Sections I, V, XII and XVIII above.

- 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: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

No cumulatively considerable environmental impacts were identified in the analysis. The project proposes a private use airport to be operated in conjunction with an existing agricultural processing facility.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

No environmental effects which would cause substantial adverse impacts to human beings, resulting from the project were identified in the analysis.

CONCLUSION/SUMMARY

Based upon the Initial Study prepared for Classified Conditional Use Permit Application No. 3694, 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 Air Quality, Biological Resources, Energy, Land Use and Planning, Mineral Resources, Public Services, Recreation, Utilities and Service Systems, and Wildfire.

Potential impacts related to Agricultural and Forestry Resources, Energy, Geology and Soils, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Hydrology, Transportation and Water Quality, have been determined to be less than significant.

Potential impacts relating to Aesthetics, Cultural Resources, Noise, and Tribal Cultural Resources have determined to be less than significant with compliance with the included 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.

JS

G:\4360Devs&Pln\PROJSEC\PROJDOCS\CUP\3600-3699\3694\IS CEQA\CEQA DOCS FOR REVIEW\Initial Study 7995 Writeup.docx