



County of Fresno

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

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

- CONSULTANT: Leesa Gendel
- APPLICATION NOS.: Initial Study No. 8405 and Unclassified Conditional Use Permit No. 3766
- DESCRIPTION: Allow the installation of a new freestanding 80-foot-tall monopole style co-locatable wireless telecommunications facility on a 10.28-acre parcel within the AE-20 (Exclusive Agricultural, 20-acre minimum parcel size) Zone District.
- LOCATION: The subject parcel is located on the south side of W. Belmont Ave., 700-feet west of N. Brawley Ave., approximately 0.52-miles east from the City of Fresno.(APN: 326-110-09), (4141 W. Belmont Ave.) (Sup. Dist. 1).

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 anticipates the placement of new unmanned telecommunications facility consisting of an 80' foot-tall monopole wireless communication tower (monopine design) with related facilities on a 50' x 50' fenced site leased area of a 10.28-acre parcel in the AE-20 (Exclusive Agricultural, 20-acre minimum parcel size) Zone District. Per Figure OS-2 of the Fresno County General Plan, there are no scenic roadways fronting the project site. The development of the permanent tower will be placed within an already disturbed area and would not be impacted by the project. Therefore, the project will not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista or scenic resource.

- 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:

The project site is located westerly adjacent to the City of Fresno of which consists of rural residences and tentative tract homes within the immediate vicinity. The placement and construction of the project would create a new communications tower on the project site that would change the existing visual character, however, this change is not expected to result in a significant impact as the designed incorporated will adhere to the surrounding landscape (monopine designed tower) intended on reducing any unsightly visual character which would degrade the surroundings.

- 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, the project would utilize a Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) approved lighting system for safety purposes where a red strobe light would operate during nighttime hours and a white strobe light would operate during daytime hours. The project does not anticipate the use of outdoor lighting, however in the event that outdoor lighting is installed, mitigation measures related to the design and orientation of the lighting shall be implemented to ensure that no new source of substantial light would adversely affect day or nighttime views of the area.

* **Mitigation Measure(s)**

1. *Ground equipment for the telecommunication tower shall be screened from view behind slatted fencing utilizing a non-reflective or earth-tone color and shall be located, designed, and landscaped to reasonably minimize their visual impact on the surrounding area.*
2. *All outdoor lighting shall be hooded and directed downwards 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 2016 Fresno County Important Farmland Map, the subject parcel is designated as grazing land. Therefore, the project would not convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The subject parcel is zoned AE-20 (Exclusive Agricultural, 20-acre minimum parcel size) Zone District and is not subject to a Williamson Act Contract. The project will not conflict with the existing zoning for agricultural use and would not conflict with the 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 project site is not located on land zoned for forest land, timberland or timberland zoned Timberland Production and would not result in the loss or conversion of forest land. The area proposed is small in nature (2,500 square feet in size) in an already disturbed area.

- 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 intends to construct a permanent tower for communication purposes. The footprint of the permanent tower is small and would not result in the off-site 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 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. Project construction is anticipated to result in minor temporary increases in criteria pollutants, however, the minor increases resulting from construction are not anticipated to result in a significant impact.

- 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:

Emissions resulting from the use of the tower will not result in significant noise and pollutant concentrations. The nearest sensitive receptor is located approximately 300 feet west of the location of the communication facility. In consideration of the proximity of the site to sensitive receptors, the project is not anticipated to result in substantial pollutant concentrations or adverse emissions and will have a less than significant impact.

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: NO IMPACT:

Per the California Natural Diversity Database, there are no reported occurrences of a special-status species encompassing the project site or located in vicinity of the project site.

Portions of the project site are already developed. Additional human disturbance related to the existing agricultural operations and existing paved right-of-way provide further signs that occupation of the site by a special-status species is highly unlikely. The California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) did not express concern with the project to indicate impacts to

special-status species. Therefore, development of the project is not expected to negatively impact through habitat modification as the site is not occupied or has not significant habitat for special-status species.

- 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:

According to the National Wetlands Inventory mapper web application, the project site does not contain wetlands. The project will not be located or affect any wetlands. No riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community was identified on the project site.

- 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 intends to construct a communications tower on the subject parcel. The project does not cut off movement of the site for any wildlife resident. No migratory wildlife corridor or native wildlife nursery site was identified on the project site.

- 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:

Reviewing Agencies and Departments did not identify a local policy or ordinance adopted for the protection of a biological resource that would be in conflict with the project proposal. No Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan or other approved local, regional, or state Habitat Conservation Plans were 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 project intends to develop a telecommunications tower on land that has already be disturbed. No reviewing Agencies and Departments express concern with the project to indicate that a cultural or historical resource is present on the site and would be affected by the project proposal. However, a mitigation measure will be implemented in the event that a cultural resource is identified during ground-disturbing activities related to project development.

* **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 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 will be built to current building code standards which would take into consideration applicable energy efficiency standards. The project construction and operation would not result in a potentially significant impact due to wasteful, inefficient,

or unnecessary consumption of energy resources. No state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency was identified during Agency and Department review.

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:

According to Figure 9-2 of the Fresno County General Plan Background Report and the California Department of Conservation Earthquake Hazard Zone Application (EQ Zapp), the project is not located on a known earthquake fault zone.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

Per Figure 9-5 of the Fresno County General Plan Background Report (FCGPBR), the project site is located on land designated as having a 40%-60% chance of reaching peak horizontal ground acceleration assuming a 10% probability of a seismic hazard in 50 years. In considering the lower chance of reaching peak horizontal ground acceleration and mandatory compliance of the development with the California Building Code, there is minimal adverse risks associated with the project related to strong seismic ground shaking or seismic-related ground failure.

4. Landslides?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

Figure 9-6 of the FCGPBR indicates that the project site is not located in a moderate or high landslide hazard area.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project would result in the development of the site where impervious surface would be added, and a loss of topsoil would occur. The subject site is relatively flat with small

changes in elevation. The project would not result in a loss of topsoil or soil erosion where a significant risk of loss, injury, or death would occur.

- 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:

No geologic unit or unstable soil was identified on the project site.

- 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:

Per Figure 7-1 of the Fresno County General Plan Background Report (FCGPBR), the project site is not located on soils exhibiting moderately high to high expansion potential.

- 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; or

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project does not propose the development or use of a septic system or alternative waste water disposal system. There were no unique paleontological resource or unique geologic feature identified on the project site.

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 construction is expected to generate greenhouse gas emissions. Long-term project operation is expected to rely on existing electrical infrastructure and not produce greenhouse gas emissions that may have a significant impact on the environment.

Therefore, these instances would not result a significant generation of greenhouse gas emission where a significant impact would occur. Reviewing Agencies and Departments did not express concern with the project to indicate that a conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases exists as a result of the project.

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:

Operation of the tower does not anticipate the use of a hazardous material or production of a hazardous waste. Storage and handling of equipment related to the tower would not result in a significant hazard to the public.

- 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. For reference, McKinley Elementary is located 1.12 miles northwest of the site. As noted, the project is not anticipating using any backup generator and associated fuel and therefore there will be no hazardous emissions within one-quarter mile of a 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:

According to the NEPAAssist Database, the project site is not located on a listed hazardous materials site and the project would not result or create a significant hazard to the public or the environment.

- 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 within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. For reference, Fresno Chandler Downtown Airport is located 2.46-miles southeast of the project site.

- F. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan; or
- G. Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

Reviewing Agencies and Departments did not identify any conflict with the project and any adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. Additionally, no concerns were expressed that the project would result in a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving 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 ground water quality; or
- 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 proposes to construct an unmanned communications facility consisting of a communications tower. The use is anticipated to be unmanned and operated remotely. The project does not propose the use of water resources and would not violate water quality standards, waste discharge requirements or substantially degrade surface or ground water quality. With the project not utilizing water supplies, no impact to groundwater supplies or groundwater recharge would occur.

- 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?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project anticipates the development of a new tower and equipment shelter. The most substantial addition of impervious surface would be the equipment shelter which proposed to be a 50-foot by 50-foot structure. The proposed facility is located on relatively flat land and does not anticipate substantial erosion or siltation events occurring as a result of the project. Surface runoff is anticipated to be kept onsite per County of Fresno standards and is not expected to result in flooding on- or offsite. Reviewing Agencies and Departments did not express concern with the project to indicate that the project would result in runoff water contributions that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide additional sources of polluted runoff.

4. Impede or redirect flood flows?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

According to FEMA FIRM panel 2105H, the subject property is found to be under shaded Flood Zone X. The shaded flood zone x refers to areas of 0.2% annual chance flood, areas of 1% annual chance flood with average depths of less than 1 foot or with drainage areas less than 1 square mile, and areas protected by levees from 1% annual chance flood. For property within flood zone shaded x, any future building pad must be elevated above the existing ground to at least a minimum of twelve inches (12") and/or the finish floor elevation must be elevated above the crown of the adjacent street. Furthermore, any proposed associated electrical equipment/electrical system components (e.g., service panels, meters, switches, outlets, electrical wiring, walk-in equipment cabinets, generators, bottom of the lowest edge of the solar array, pool-associated motors and water heater, receptacles, junction boxes, inverter, transformers, etc.) in the shaded Flood Zone X must be elevated above the finish floor elevation. All future electrical wiring below the flood elevation shall be in a watertight conduit or approved direct burial cable. All sides of any future building shall be sloped 2% for a distance of 5' to provide positive drainage away from the building. The project as proposed would not impede or redirect flood flows. The project site is located within the Fresno Metropolitan Flood Control District (FMFCD) Drainage Zone and Boundary. FMFCD reviewed the project site and should did not have any comments regarding any requirements and asserted the project as proposed would not impede or redirect flood flows.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

Although the project site is located within a flood hazard area, the project will not increase the risk of release of pollutants due to project inundation. Additionally, the project site is not located near a body of water where a tsunami or seiche risk is prevalent.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project does not anticipate the use of water resources and would not contribute to a degradation of water quality. Reviewing Agencies and Departments did not express concern with the project in regard a conflict with a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan.

XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING

Would the project:

- A. Physically divide an established community?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project anticipates construction of a permanent tower. The project will not physically divide an established community.

- 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:

There were no land use plans, policies, or regulations for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect identified in the Fresno County General Plan as being in conflict with the project proposal.

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:

Figure 7-7 and 7-8 of the Fresno County General Plan Background Report (FCGPBR) depicts mineral resource locations and principal mineral producing locations within the County of Fresno. The project site is not located on or near an identified mineral resource or mineral producing site.

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 involves the construction and operation of a tower and associated communications equipment. Noise levels and vibrations associated with the project are not expected to result in significant impacts. The proposed backup generator would result in an increase noise levels and vibration, however, in consideration of the nature of use related to the backup generator, the noise level increase is not anticipated to result in significant impacts on sensitive receptors in vicinity of the project site. As noted, the backup generator is anticipated to be utilized when the main power source for the tower is interrupted. This situation is not expected to occur in regular intervals where an impact on sensitive receptors would be significant.

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

XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING

Would the project:

- A. Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?; or

- B. Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project will not induce unplanned population growth in the area. The project would not displace a substantial number of people or housing.

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:

Reviewing agencies and departments did not provide concerns regarding the project where additional governmental facilities or alteration to existing governmental facilities are needed. The Fresno County Fire Protection District provided comments referencing Fire Code requirements when a building permit is issued for the project.

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 intends to develop a communications tower. The use is intended to be unmanned with maintenance work being the only time where employees would be present. Therefore, the project is not expected to increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks and does not include the construction or expansion of 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)?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

Per the Applicant's Operational Statement, there are two employees that access the existing maintenance yard. The project does anticipate the occasional maintenance trip for the facility; however, the volume of maintenance trips is not expected to result in impacts related to vehicle miles traveled or any County-adopted program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system. Reviewing Agencies and Departments did not express concern with the project in terms of a transportation impact resulting from 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
- D. Result in inadequate emergency access?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

Reviewing Agencies and Departments did not express concern with the project design or access to indicate that a hazard due to design features or inadequate emergency access will result from the project.

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:

Participating California Native American Tribes were notified of the project proposal and given the opportunity to enter into consultation with the County of Fresno in addressing potential tribal cultural resources occurring on the project site. No notified California Native American Tribe expressed concern with the project and did not enter into consultation. The subject parcel has been previously disturbed. No reviewing Agency or Department provided comments to indicate that a listed or eligible historical resource is located on the project site. A Mitigation Measure will be implemented to establish procedure for the addressing of a tribal cultural resource, should it be identified during ground disturbing activities related to the project.

* **Mitigation Measure(s)**

1. See Section V. Cultural Resources Mitigation Measure #1

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 proposes to construct a new telecommunication facility consisting of a microwave tower and communications equipment shelter. Reviewing Agencies and Departments did not identify any significant environmental effects as a result of the project.

- 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 intends to develop an unmanned telecommunication facility. The proposed use would not utilize water resources for the operation and would not have an impact on water supplies.

- 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 does not propose the development of a wastewater treatment system and would not have employees onsite where wastewater generation would occur. Therefore, the project does not necessitate a wastewater treatment provider.

- 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:

Reviewing Agencies and Departments did not provide comments to indicate that the project would result in solid waste generation more than State or local standards, or result in a conflict with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

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:

As depicted in the 2007 Fresno County Fire Hazard Severity Zones in LRA Map, produced by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection, the project site is not located within a very high fire hazard severity zone or within a State Responsibility Area (SRA).

XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Would the project:

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The subject site has been determined to be previously disturbed and occupied with human activity. The project does not have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a wildlife species and would not cause a wildlife population 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)?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

It has been determined that the project would result in impacts to Aesthetics, Cultural Resources, and Tribal Cultural Resources. These impacts were determined to be less than significant with the implementation of mitigation measures. With the implementation of mitigation measures, the project is not anticipated to result in a cumulative considerable impact and would result in a less than significant impact regarding the identified section.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project has been determined to not result in substantial adverse effect on human beings.

CONCLUSION/SUMMARY

Based upon the Initial Study prepared for 8405 Unclassified Conditional Use Permit Application No. 3766, staff has concluded that the project will not/will have a significant effect on the environment. It has been determined that there would be no impacts to Hydrology, Land Use Planning, Mineral Resources, Population and Housing, Public Services, Recreation, Transportation, and Utilities and Service Systems.

Potential impacts related to Aesthetics, Agricultural and Forestry, Biological Resources, Energy, Geology and Soils, Green House Gas Emissions, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Noise, Wildfire, and Mandatory Findings of Significance have been determined to be less than significant.

Potential impacts relating to Cultural Resources have determined to be less than significant with mitigation.

A Mitigated Negative Declaration/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:\pacific\pwp\4360Devs&PIn\PROJSEC\PROJDOCS\CUP\3700-3799\3766\CEQA\CUP 3766 & IS 8405 Initial Study Writeup.docx