



# County of Fresno

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

## EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

- APPLICANT: Selma Cemetery District
- APPLICATION NOS.: Initial Study No. 8135 and Unclassified Conditional Use Permit Application No. 3721
- DESCRIPTION: Allow the development and operation of a cemetery on a 17.70-acre parcel in the AE-20 (Exclusive Agricultural, 20-acre minimum parcel size) Zone District.
- LOCATION: The project site is located on the southwest corner of the intersection of E. Nebraska Avenue and S. Bethel Avenue approximately one mile east of the nearest city limits of the City of Selma (APN: 393-071-18T) (Sup. Dist. 4).

### I. AESTHETICS

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

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The subject property is located in a mainly rural area with the majority of land utilized for agricultural, and low-density residential uses. The subject parcel is currently utilized for agricultural production vineyards, and is also improved with a single-family dwelling and several accessory structures. There are no identified scenic vistas impacted by the project proposal. There are no identified scenic resources on the project site that would be impacted by development of the subject parcel. There were no historic buildings or scenic highways identified on the project parcel or identified as being impacted by the project. The proposed cemetery will not change the overall character of the area, which is predominately rural.

The development of the proposed cemetery will entail the construction of a new approximately 308 square-foot public restroom building, several new landscape related structures such as fountains, sculptures, and landscape planters, along with new landscape plants and trees, a perimeter fence with a main entrance gate and an emergency entrance gate. The existing dwelling will be utilized as a caretaker's

residence and existing accessory buildings also be utilized; additionally, the cemetery The addition of the landscaping with enhance the appearance of the facility and minimize its visual impact on the surrounding area, and will not substantially alter the rural character of the surrounding area.

- 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 production and rural residential uses. The project would involve the utilization of landscaping to screen the use from adjacent properties and public right-of-way. The existing visual character of the subject site would change as the prevailing agricultural character would be removed and replaced with a landscaped site; this is not considered a substantial degradation of the visual character that would negatively impact the surrounding area. Therefore, a less than significant impact to the visual character is anticipated.

- 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 Operational Statement indicates that outdoor lights will be used for security at the office and shop. To ensure that sources of light associated with the proposed operation do 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 and away from adjacent properties and the 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: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

According to the 2016 Fresno County Important Farmland Map the subject parcel contains land that is designated as Farmland of Statewide Importance and Unique Farmland. The project will result in the permanent conversion of approximately 18.0 acres of Farmland to a non-agricultural use. However, it would not constitute a substantial conversion of agricultural land. Therefore, in consideration of the conversion of Farmland, this project is not expected to have a significant impact on Farmland, or precipitate additional conversion of Farmland.

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED:

The project is limited in scope and is not anticipated to directly conflict with surrounding agricultural users or encourage future non-agricultural uses. The project would be developed in three phases over time as demand for interment space increases on the Cemetery District's existing facilities. General Plan Policy directs those agricultural operations be protected from conflicts with non agricultural uses by requiring buffers between agricultural and non-agricultural uses. The buffer requirement provides that it consist of a physical separation between the non-agricultural use and surrounding agricultural operations, although no specific distance is provided. However, General Plan Program LU-A.C provides that the appropriate width of buffers be determined on a site-by site basis, in consideration of the type of existing agricultural uses, the nature of the proposed development, the natural features of the site, and any other factors specific to the situation.

In the case of this proposal, the project site has road frontage on its north and east sides, where the road right-of-way provides approximately 60 feet between the subject property and neighboring properties. On the west and south sides, the subject property abuts the neighboring property immediately with ten to fifteen feet of separation between those surrounding agricultural uses and the project site. Based on the nature of the proposed use, it is not anticipated that there would be adverse impacts to agriculture from operation of the cemetery, however, there is potential that the operation of the cemetery would be impacted by surrounding agricultural operations.

The Fresno County Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Commissioner's office has reviewed the proposal and express concerns that the project may affect surrounding agricultural operators' ability to apply pesticides as scheduled, due to concerns that members of the public or employees of the cemetery may be exposed to airborne dust and pesticide drift. It was suggested by the Agricultural Commissioner's office, that in

order to minimize the potential for pesticide drift onto the cemetery, the perimeter should be planted with fast growing dense foliage to form a physical buffer, or a solid wall at least six (6) feet in height. To address the concerns stated by the County Agricultural Department, the following mitigation measure has been included.

\* **Mitigation Measure(s)**

1. *Prior to beginning operation of the cemetery a continuous physical buffer, as shown in the submitted landscaping plan shall be installed between the cemetery property boundaries, and surrounding properties, such that the potential for drift of agricultural chemicals and dust from agricultural operations onto the cemetery site would be minimized. Maintenance of the buffer shall be provided for by the project owner/operator in perpetuity.*

- 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 expected to be confined to the subject parcel and 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?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The project was reviewed by the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District, which did not express concern that the project would obstruct implementation of any identified air quality plans.

- 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 Air District review determined that neither construction or operation of the project was likely to result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in any criteria pollutant for which the region is in non-attainment, such as PM 10 and PM 2.5. As such, the project is anticipated to have a less than significant impact on air quality.

- 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: NO IMPACT:

The project once constructed would not result in the generation of substantial pollutant concentrations impacted sensitive receptors, or cause emissions leading to odors which would affect a substantial number of people, and project construction is not anticipated to result in the generation of substantial pollutant concentrations, or 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:

According to the California Natural Diversity Database, the project site is not located in a reported occurrence area of any special status species. A search of the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB) Bios Viewer, maintained by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW), reveals that the subject parcel is within the range and near to areas of predicted habitat of several special status species, such as the Burrowing Owl, and Tricolored Blackbird, both listed as state species of special concern, and within the range of the California Tiger Salamander (CTS) by the CDFW, although no. However, no sightings of either species have been recorded in the vicinity the subject site is located in a mainly agricultural area and no sensitive natural community or riparian habitat, or wetlands were identified on the project site, according to a review

of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife National Wetlands Mapper. The nearest wetland feature is identified as an irrigation canal, located approximately 600 feet west of the subject parcel. The subject parcel is currently utilized for agricultural production (vineyards) and residential use, thus the ground is regularly disturbed. When considering the current use of the subject parcel and surrounding area; and the absence of any reports of special status species on the site, or identified sensitive natural community, the project would not likely result in adverse impacts to biological 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:

A review of the National Wetlands Inventory (NWI) mapper and web based aerial imagery of the subject property and surrounding area, there are no wetlands located within the subject property itself, however there is an irrigation canal located approximately 600 feet west of the property. No federally protected wetlands were identified on or in the vicinity of the subject parcel. Therefore, based on the foregoing analysis, the project would not have a substantial adverse effect on any 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 subject parcel is utilized for agricultural and residential purposes. There are no wildlife corridors or wildlife nursery sites known on the project site. The project proposes to have fencing along the perimeter of the subject parcel which could deter movement of native wildlife along the site when comparing movement to existing conditions. However, the provision of 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 accessory structure. The remainder of the parcel is utilized for agricultural production. In considering the past ground disturbance and disturbance related to the agricultural operation, 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 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 Heritage 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 conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or 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?

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 will result in the loss of topsoil; however, this loss of topsoil would not result in dangerous conditions involving risk of loss, injury, or death. 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
- 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 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).

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project proposes to utilize an individual onsite wastewater treatment system (septic). 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 existing septic system or any proposed septic system.

- F. 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 are unearthed during ground disturbing activities, the following mitigation measure has been added to address that potential discovery.

\* **Mitigation Measure(s)**

1. *If a paleontological resource is found, regardless of depth or setting, the Project contractor shall cease ground-disturbing activities within 50 feet of the find and contact a qualified paleontologist. The qualified paleontologist shall oversee paleontological monitoring of all excavation at depths greater than 20 feet in*

*previously undisturbed sediments. Monitoring shall be conducted by a paleontological monitor meeting the standards of the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology (2010). The qualified paleontologist shall evaluate the significance of the resources and recommend appropriate treatment measures.*

## 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:

A Greenhouse Gas Memorandum was prepared for the project by LSA, dated December 22, 2022. It is anticipated that both project construction and operation will result in the generation of greenhouse gas emissions. Construction GHG emissions would be generated by consumption of fossil fuels during operation of construction equipment and worker and vendor vehicle traffic. The California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) was utilized to quantify project GHG emissions. The CalEEMod output for the project estimated that project construction would generate approximately 602 metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e (Carbon Dioxide Equivalent). According to the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), CO<sub>2</sub>e represents the number of metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions with the same global warming potential as one metric ton of another greenhouse gas.

Operational GHG emissions or long-term emissions would be primarily generated by mobile sources such as from vehicle trips by visitors, area sources such as from maintenance activities including landscaping, and indirect emissions from energy consumption such as from solid waste disposal and water use (supply and conveyance) treatment and distribution, and increased electricity consumption. Based on CalEEMod inputs, Operational GHG emissions were estimated to be approximately 22.2 metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e per year. Because there are no adopted any numeric GHG emissions thresholds of significance for the County, GHG emissions by evaluated for consistency with a regional GHG emissions reduction plan. In the case of this project, the project was evaluated for consistency with the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District's Climate Change Action Plan, adopted in August 2008, and the subsequent Guidance for Valley Land Use Agencies in Addressing GHG emissions Impacts for New Projects Under CEQA, when serving as the lead agency. The Guidance relies upon performance-based standards or Best Performance Standards (BPS). Projects implementing BPS would be determined to have a less than cumulatively significant impact; or with demonstration of a 29 percent reduction in GHG emissions, from business as usual (base line), levels, or consistency with, Executive Order B-30-15,/SB 32, which has a goal of a 40 percent reduction in GHG emissions below 1990 levels by 2030. The project would generate low levels of energy source emissions, and generate minimal new traffic trips. The project would also be required to comply with Title 24

California Code of Regulations (CCR), which requires reduction of waste water generation and water use, and other regulatory measures like MWEL (The Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance), therefore the project would not be in conflict with any energy use reduction measures or water conservation measures, nor result in a significant impact on the environment, or conflict with any state or local greenhouse gas emissions reduction goals, policies or plans.

## 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 school.

- G. 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 NEPAassist. There is a site located approximately three quarter-miles west of the project site, identified as a Hazardous Waste Handler under RCRA (the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act) which provides the authority and framework for the EPA to regulate the generation, transportation, treatment, storage and disposal of hazardous waste.

- H. 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.

- I. 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.

- J. 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?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The project is not anticipated to substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere in any way with groundwater recharge. The project will be supplied water from an onsite domestic well which will be utilized for domestic purposes and maintenance of landscaping, which is subject to the applicable provisions of the Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance (MWELo). The project was reviewed by the County Water and Natural Resources Division, which determined that the subject parcel was not in an area of the County identified as being water short. Additionally, the water system will be

subject to permitting and regulation by the State Water Resources Control Board, Division of Drinking Water.

- 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 may result in some additional runoff; however, it is not anticipated to be substantial. The project will not add a significant amount of new impervious surface.

- 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?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project has no features which would 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: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

Review of the project identified the potential for the project to conflict with normal agricultural operations, due to the increase in sensitive receptors during memorial services being in close proximity to the application of agricultural chemicals, and the generation of dust. The General Plan Land Use Element contains policies which seek to protect agriculture from the encroachment of non-agricultural uses which may create conflicts with surrounding agricultural operations. As such, mitigation has been included under Section II (Agricultural and Forestry Resources) above. In the case of this project, it is not anticipated that the establishment of the proposed cemetery would result in significant environmental impacts.

## 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 is not anticipated to result in generation of a substantial increase in ambient noise levels or generate excessive ground-borne vibration in the vicinity. The project will be subject to all applicable provisions of the Fresno County Noise Ordinance. There may be an occasional 21-gun salute during funeral ceremonies for veterans of military service, which may briefly result in noise levels exceeding the County Noise Ordinance standards. Additionally, the use of sound amplification equipment services may also be used on occasion, however, the noise from the discharge of firearms and sound amplification systems would be limited to the duration of such ceremonies and therefore not result in a substantial increase in ambient noise levels in the immediate vicinity.

- 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. The proposed cemetery will not require a substantial number of new employees, which would entail the construction of new 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:

The project will not require the provision for new or physical altered governmental facilities. The project will be subject to current fire code and may be required to be annexed into Community Facilities District No. 2010-01 of the Fresno County Fire Protection District.

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.

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. According to the conclusions and recommendations of the Trip Generation and Distribution Analysis prepared for the project by JLB Traffic Engineering, Inc. dated June 27, 2022, the project would generate approximately 104 daily trips, based on estimates derived from then Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) 11<sup>th</sup> edition Trip Generation Manual. The proposed trip generation was based on two employees, at a rate of 51.75 trips per employee per day, including three a.m. peak hour trips, and eight (8) p.m. peak hour trips. Based on the foregoing analysis, the project would not conflict with an applicable plans or policies addressing the County General Plan Transportation and Circulation Element, and therefore result in a less than significant impact on Transportation.

- 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 Miles Travelled, of 110 trips, established by the State Governors Office of Planning and Research (OPR). As noted the project is anticipated to be below that threshold with 104 daily trips.

- 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: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED:

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

\* **Mitigation Measure**

1. *Prior to issuance of development permits, a Traffic Management Plan, prepared by a licensed Traffic Engineer, shall be submitted to the Design Division of the Fresno County Department of Public Works and Planning (Design Division), for review and approval. Construction of the proposed new Almond Hulling/Shelling facility shall be in substantial conformance with the Traffic Management Plan, as approved by the Design Division.*
2. *Primary public access to and from the cemetery shall be taken exclusively via the Nebraska Avenue driveway. Access to the cemetery from Bethel Avenue shall be limited to employees of the Selma Cemetery District and emergency vehicles and apparatus. The Bethel Avenue access shall be gated and the gate setback a minimum of 20 feet from the ultimate right-of-way of Bethel Avenue. The gate shall be locked with a Fresno County Fire Protection District approved padlock.*

3. *An additional 12 feet of road right-of-way is required to be irrevocably offered for dedication along the parcel frontage to meet the ultimate road right-of-way for Nebraska Avenue; and an additional 33 feet of road right-of-way is required to be irrevocably offered for dedication along the parcel frontage to meet the ultimate road right-of-way for Bethel Avenue.*

D. Result in inadequate emergency access?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

No aspects of the project design would restrict emergency access, moreover, the project would be subject to the current Fire Code as it relates to access for emergency apparatus.

## 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: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The project proposes to utilize an onsite wastewater treatment system, no public sewer services are proposed.

- 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 will rely upon an onsite well for water. The project was reviewed by the County Water and Natural Resources Division, which did not express any concerns with the project's water supply. The water system will be subject to permits from and regulation by the State Water Resources Control Board, Division of Drinking Water.

- 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 wastewater treatment system (OWTS) which is subject to County development standards, permits and inspection.

- 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 solid 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?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The project is not expected to have a significant effect on the quality of the environment, or result in substantial loss of habitat for fish or wildlife, nor result in adverse impacts to historical resources.

- 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 impacts were identified.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

No environmental impacts that would cause adverse effects on human beings were identified in the analysis.

## **CONCLUSION/SUMMARY**

Based upon the Initial Study prepared for Unclassified Conditional Use Permit Application No. 3721, 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 Biological Resources, Energy, Mineral Resources, Noise, Public Services, Recreation, Utilities and Service Systems, and Wildfire.

Potential impacts related to Air Quality, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Hydrology & Water Quality, and Land Use and Planning, have been determined to be less than significant.

Potential impacts relating to Aesthetics, Agricultural and Forestry Resources, Cultural Resources, Geology and Soils, Transportation 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\3700-3799\3721\CEQA-IS\CUP 3721 IS Writeup.docx