EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

APPLICANT: Nick Sahota

APPLICATION NOS.: Initial Study No. 8383, Amendment Application No. 3855, and General Plan Amendment No. 569

DESCRIPTION: Rezone an existing 7.76-acre parcel from the AE-20 (Exclusive Agricultural, 20-acre minimum parcel size) Zone District to the C-4 (c) (Central Trading, Conditional) (Limited) Zone District. It is the applicant's primary intent to operate a museum for cultural and agricultural preservation. Additional allowed uses include: Antique shops, Exhibit halls, Institutions of a philanthropic nature, Meeting hall, Museums, and Signs subject to the provisions of Section 836.5.

LOCATION: The subject parcel is located on the northeast corner of S. Leonard Ave. and San Joaquin Valley, approximately 1.16-miles east of the City of Fresno. (APN 313-410-09) (910 S. Leonard Ave.) (Sup. Dist. 5).

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

Images of the subject site depict views of agricultural surrounding the subject site. Underlying development standards established by the Zone District do not regulate construction to any maximum height of 35. In considering the project will be following development standards of the underlying zone district and that no scenic vista would be negatively impacted by the project, a less than significant impact can be seen.

B. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

Per Figure OS-2 of the Fresno County General Plan, Leonard Ave. and San Joaquin Valley are not designated as scenic roads. The project site is not located in any points

of interest. As there were no scenic resources identified on the project site, the project is not expected to have a significant impact 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: NO IMPACT:

Overall, the visual character of the Project site is an agricultural building. In addition, there are no significant trees, rock outcroppings, or historical buildings on the Project site that would be affected by the Project, and the Project would not alter long-distance scenic views of mountains, valleys, or other natural features. For these reasons, the Project would cause no impact on scenic resources viewed from a state scenic highway.

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:

Such uses may utilize outdoor lighting which has the potential to generate new sources of light and glare in the area. As such, any future outdoor lighting shall be required to be hooded and directed as to not shine towards adjacent properties and public streets. This requirement will be included in the following Mitigation Measure:

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

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

II. AGRICULTURAL AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

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

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

Per the 2018 Fresno County Important Farmland Map, the subject property is not designated Farmland of Local Importance. 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; or

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGIFICANT IMPACT:

The subject parcel is not subject to a Williamson Act Contract. The project will potentially conflict with the existing zoning for agricultural uses as the parcel is currently zoned for agricultural use.

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; or

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The subject parcel is not zoned for forest land or timberland, and therefore will not result in the loss of forest land or the conversion of forest land or farmland to incompatible uses.

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 property is within an agricultural area. No concerns from all applicable agencies related to the requested rezone or potential subdivision were provided. Therefore, this proposal will have a less than significant impact on agricultural resources.

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

This proposal will have a less than significant impact on air quality. Further, this proposal was reviewed by the San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District (Air District), which did not express any concerns related to the requested rezone or potential subdivision.

B. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard; or

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:

Considering the limited number of additional parcels and relatively low population density of the potential subdivision, this proposal will have a less than significant impact on air quality. Further, this proposal was reviewed by the San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District (Air District), which did not express any concerns related to the requested rezone or potential subdivision.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

A. Has 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:

According to the California Department of Fish and Wildlife, California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB) BIOS web mapping application, no candidate, sensitive or special-status species have occurred on or near the project site. including California Tiger Salamander and Vernal Pool Fairy Shrimp. Therefore, any potential special-status species impacts resulting in disturbing these habitats are determined to be less than significant.

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

According to the National Wetlands Inventory mapper web application, the project site is not substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community. Therefore, impacts resulting in disturbing these habitats can be mitigated to less than significant.

C. Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally-protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means; or

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The proposed project is not located within a state or federally-protected wetland. No substantial adverse effect on state or federally-protected wetlands is affected.

D. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites; or

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The proposed project is not likely to affect nor interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species.

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

This project does not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project site is improved with no vegetation located in a predominantly urbanized area. The project is not within any Conservation Plan area. The project will not conflict with local policies or ordinances regarding a tree preservation policy or ordinance.

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:

Additional mitigation measures including proper procedure for identification of cultural resources should they be identified during project construction and the requirement of an archeological monitor being present during ground-disturbing activity will further ensure that the project would result in a less than significant impact. Further discussion can be found in Section XVIII. Tribal Cultural Resources.

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

1. *See Section XVIII. Tribal Cultural Resources*

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

Development of by-right uses allowed in the proposed Zone District, including a proposed uses on the subject property would result in less than significant consumption of energy (gas, electricity, gasoline, and diesel) during construction. Construction activities and corresponding fuel energy consumption would be temporary and localized. There are no unusual project characteristics that would cause the use of construction equipment to be less energy efficient compared with other similar construction sites in the County. Therefore, construction-related fuel consumption by the project would not result in inefficient, wasteful, or unnecessary energy use compared with other construction sites in the area.

The project will also be subject to meeting California Green Building Standards Code (CCR, Title 24, Part 11-CALGreen), effective January 1, 2020, to meet the goals of Assembly Bill (AB) 32 which established a comprehensive program of cost-effective reductions of greenhouse gases to 1990 levels by 2020.

B. Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

Energy resource consumption is expected to occur during project construction and operation. Subsequent potential construction shall be subject to current building code

standards which would consider state and local energy efficiency standards and renewable energy goals. The project would result in a less than significant impact.

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:

Per the California Department of Conservation's Earthquake Hazard Zone Web Application, the project is not located within or near an Earthquake Fault Zone or known earthquake fault.

2. Strong seismic ground shaking?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

According to Figure 9-5 of the Fresno County General Plan Background Report, the project site is located on land that has a 0-20% chance of reaching peak horizontal ground acceleration assuming a probabilistic seismic hazard with 10% probability in 50 years. In consideration of Figure 9-5, the project site has a low chance of reaching peak horizontal ground acceleration and would have a low chance of being subject to strong seismic ground shaking.

3. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

4. Landslides?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

As depicted in Figure 9-6 of the Fresno County General Plan Background Report, the project site is not located within an area with landslide hazard or subsidence hazard. In addition, as noted above, the project site is not expected to be subject to strong seismic shaking which if prolonged would result in liquefaction of the site.

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

Project construction will result in the loss of topsoil due to the addition of impervious surface. The existing terrain of the project site contains small hills and a seasonally

flooded stream. The project would be subject to local and state standards for development of the site. Development of the site would be further reviewed and permitted and would ensure that the development would not result in substantial soil erosion where increased risk would occur.

C. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable because of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

No adverse geologic unit or unstable soil has been 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:

According to Figure 7-1 of the Fresno County General Plan Background Report, 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 wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

According to the Fresno County Department of Public Health, Environmental Health Division, the subject parcel is located in an area that requires engineered septic systems for on-site wastewater disposal. As such, prior to the issuance of Building Permits, the developer shall submit an engineered sewage disposal system design proposal to the Fresno County Department of Public Health, Environmental Health Division for review and approval.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

No unique paleontological resource or unique geologic feature was 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:

Considering the proposed use, this proposal will have a less than significant impact on greenhouse gas emissions. Further, this proposal was reviewed by the San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District (Air District), which did not express any concerns related to greenhouse gas emissions.

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?

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:

There are no existing schools within a one-quarter mile of the project site nor any indication of any designated sites for a school within the area. The closest school Francher Creek Elementary is located 3.00-miles northwest of the project site.

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 NEPAssist database, there are no listed hazardous materials sites located on the project site, nor in proximity of the subject 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, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area; or

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

Per the Fresno County *Airport Land Use Compatibility* Plan Update adopted by the Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) on December 3, *2018,* the nearest public airport, Fresno Yosemite International Airport, is approximately 4.60-miles northwest of the project site.

Given the distance between airport and the project site, the safety and noise impacts resulting from flying operations on people residing or working in the project area would be less than significant.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project will not impair the implementation of, or physically interfere with, the implementation of an adopted Emergency Response Plan or Emergency Evacuation Plan.

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

Per Figure 9-9 of the Fresno County General Plan Background Report, the project site is not within the State Responsibility area for wildland fire. Potential exposure to wildland fires is deemed less than significant as the area is away from sensitive receptors whom may be negatively affected from potential risk of wildfires.

X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Would the project:

A. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality; or

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The subject property is not located in a designated water short area.

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

C. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on or off site?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

According to the Development Engineering Section of the Fresno County Department of Public Works and Planning, no existing drainage patterns nor alterations of streams nor rivers would result in flooding on or offsite.

1. Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site.

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

Any site grading and drainage associated with the construction of fire station will adhere to the Grading and Drainage Sections of the County Ordinance Code.

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?

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The project is not located within a flood zone.

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The subject proposal would not conflict with any Water Quality Control Plan or sustainable groundwater management plan. The project was reviewed by the Regional Water Quality Control Board, who indicated the project will be required to submit a Notice of Intent and Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan to comply with statewide General Permit requirements for construction activities and for industrial facilities.

XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING

Would the project:

A. Physically divide an established community; or

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

This rezone proposal will not physically divide a community. The subject property is located approximately 1.50-miles east from the City of Fresno.

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:

This proposal will not conflict with any land use plans nor policies as stated within the Policies set forth by Fresno County. Fresno County Policies require the County to consider the current inventory of undeveloped parcels when reviewing rezoning. The proposal can accommodate a sustainable water supply for the requested rezone and potential subdivision.

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:

Per Figure 7-8 of the Fresno County General Plan Background Report, the project site is not located within a mineral-producing area of the County.

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 more than standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies; or
B. Generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels; or

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The project shall be in compliance with the Fresno County Noise Ordinance, provided daily operating activities occur between the hours of 6:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m. Monday through Friday and 7:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. 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 be residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels; or

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project site is not near an airport to be subject to airport noise. The nearest public airport, Fresno Yosemite International Airport, is approximately 4.60-miles northwest of the project site.

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The project will not construct or displace housing and will not otherwise induce population growth.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The site is will not displace any exiting people or houses necessitating housing replacement elsewhere.

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, 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 result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities. In addition, no impacts on the provision of other services were identified in the analysis of the proposal.

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:

No significant such impacts were identified in the analysis of the proposal.

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

This proposal was reviewed by the Transportation Planning Unit Design Division of the Fresno County Department of Public Works and Planning, which did not express any concerns regarding the carrying capacities of the adjacent roadways and did not require a Traffic Impact Study (TIS).

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The project will not conflict nor be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b).

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:

According to the Road Maintenance and Operations Division of the Fresno County Department of Public Works and Planning, the project will not increase traffic hazards due to design features nor result in inadequate emergency access.

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:

The project site is not in an area determined to be highly or moderately sensitive to archeological resources. Pursuant to Assembly Bill (AB) 52, project information was routed to the Picayune Rancheria of the Chukchansi Indians, Dumna Wo Wah Tribal Government, Table Mountain Rancheria and Santa Rosa Rancheria Tachi Yokut Tribe offering them an opportunity to consult under Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 21080.3(b) with a 30-day window to formally respond to the County letter. No requests for consultation were presented to County Staff.

However, in the unlikely event that cultural resources are identified on the property, the Mitigation Measure included in the CULTURAL ANALYSIS section of this report will reduce impact to tribal cultural resources to less than significant.

XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Would the project:

A. Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects; or

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

See discussion in Section VII. E. GEOLOGY AND SOILS and Section X. B. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY above. The construction of any new or expanded electric power, or natural gas to provide for the proposed residential development.

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

See discussion in Section X. B. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY above.

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: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

See discussion in Section VII. E. GEOLOGY AND SOILS above.

D. Generate solid waste more than State or local standards, or more than 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: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The project does not anticipate on generating solid waste exceeding State or local standards. As such, the impact would be a less than significant impact.

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, because of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The project is not located within the State Responsibility Area (SRA). The project will not impair any emergency response/evacuation plan, exacerbate wildfire risks due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors to require installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure, or create risks related to downstream flooding due to drainage changes or landslides.

XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Would the project:

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED:

Future development projects may impact cultural resources. The included Mitigation Measure in Section V (Cultural Resources) will minimize such impacts to less than significant.

B. Have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects); or

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

No cumulatively considerable impacts were identified in the analysis of the proposal.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

No substantial adverse impacts on human beings were identified in the analysis of the proposal.

CONCLUSION/SUMMARY

Based upon Initial Study No. 8383 prepared for Amendment Application No. 3855, staff has concluded that the project will not have a significant effect on the environment.

No potential impacts were identified related to agricultural and forestry resources, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, mineral resources, geology and soils, public services, recreation, and.

Impacts related to air quality, biological resources, energy, greenhouse gas emissions, land use and planning, noise, population and housing, transportation, utilities and service systems, wildfire, have been determined to be less than significant.

Impacts related to aesthetics, tribal cultural resources, and mandatory findings of significance have been determined to be less than significant with adherence to the proposed 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, Ste. “A”, Fresno, CA.

A Mitigated Negative Declaration is recommended and is subject to approval by the decision-making body. The Initial Study is available for review at 2220 Tulare Street, Suite A, street level, located on the southwest corner of Tulare and “M” Streets, Fresno, California.

ER
G:\4360Devs&Pln\PROJSEC\PROJDOCS\AA\3800-3899\3855- See GPA 569\CEQA\AA 3855 IS 8383 Writeup.docx