



County of Fresno

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

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

- APPLICANT: Sikandar Singh
- APPLICATION NOS.: Initial Study No. 8410 & Director Review and Approval Application No. 4743
- DESCRIPTION: Allow the maintenance and storage of trucks and trailers to be utilized exclusively for the transportation of agricultural products, supplies and equipment, to be located on 0.7-acre portion of an approximately 23.94-acre parcel within the AE-20 (Exclusive Agricultural, 20-acre minimum parcel size) Zone District.
- LOCATION: The subject parcel is located on the southeast corner of S. Peach Avenue and E. Nebraska Avenue, approximately four and one half-miles west of the city limits of the City of Selma. (APN:385-052-31) (4133 E. Nebraska Avenue) (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; or
- C. In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage points.) If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The site of the proposed project is located in an area of agricultural uses and low-density residential development. No scenic vistas or other scenic resources were identified in the analysis. The project does not have any features, that would degrade the existing visual character or quality of the views of the site and its surrounding area.

The only publicly accessible vantage points in the vicinity would be the public road right of way on the north and west sides of the property. The views experienced by passing vehicles would not be substantially altered.

- 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:

The project proposes to utilize motion activated security lights attached to the existing single-family dwelling. No pole mounted light fixtures or other building mounted light fixtures are proposed. There for the project is not anticipated to create a new source of substantial light and glare in the vicinity. However, the following Mitigation Measure will be included to ensure that any new lighting will not adversely affect nighttime views in the vicinity.

* **Mitigation Measure(s)**

1. *All outdoor lighting shall be hooded and directed away from neighboring property and the public right 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 Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The subject parcel is located on land zoned for agricultural use, and contains land designated as Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, Unique Farmland and Farmland of Local Importance. The proposed project, the storage, maintenance and repair of trucks and trailers devoted exclusively to the transportation of agriculturally related products, supplies and equipment, is a use allowed in the AE Zone District, with discretionary review and approval, and subject to applicable conditions of approval; additionally, the project would convert approximately 0.7-acre of the 23.94-acre parcel,

therefore, the conversion of Farmland that will occur as a result of the project is less than significant.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The subject parcel is not enrolled in the Williamson Act program.

- 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 parcel on which the proposed does not contain any land designated as forest or timberland.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

According to the 2016 Fresno County Important Farmland Map, the parcel on which the proposed project will be located does not contain any forest land, timberland, or land zoned for Timberland Production, it does however contain some Prime, Farmland of Statewide Importance and Unique, the subject parcel is not enrolled in the Williamson Act program. Therefore, the proposed project will not result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or forest land to non-forest land.

III. AIR QUALITY

Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management district or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:

- A. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable Air Quality Plan; or
- B. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard; or
- C. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations; or
- D. Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

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

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project proposes the use of approximately 0.7-acre of land on an existing 23.94-acre parcel, for the storage of trucks and trailers. The balance of the property consists of vineyards. The project would not disturb a substantial amount of land and is therefore unlikely to result in substantial adverse effects due to habitat modification.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project will not have a substantial adverse effect on any sensitive natural community. No riparian habitat was identified on or near the project site.

- 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:

No state or federally-protected wetlands were identified on or in the vicinity of 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:

There are no features of the proposed project which would interfere 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
- 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 not located within the boundaries of an adopted habitat conservation plan, natural community conservation plan, other local, state, or regional habitat conservation plan, and therefore the project would not conflict with any identified local policy related to the protection of biological resources, or conflict with the provisions of an adopted, local, state or regional plan, protecting biological resources.

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 parcel on which the proposed project will be sited is not located within proximity of any area designated to be moderately or highly sensitive for archeological resources. No historical or paleontological resources, unique geological features, or evidence of possible human remains were identified in this analysis. However, in the unlikely event that cultural resources are inadvertently discovered during ground disturbance, the following mitigation measure has been included.

* **Mitigation Measure(s)**

1. *In the event that cultural resources are unearthed during ground-disturbing activities, all work shall be halted in the area of the find. An Archeologist shall be called to evaluate the findings and make any necessary mitigation recommendations. If human remains are unearthed during ground disturbing*

activities, no further disturbance is to occur until the Fresno County Sheriff-Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition. All normal evidence procedures shall be followed by photos, reports, video, and etc. If such remains are determined to be Native American, the Sheriff-Coroner must notify the Native American 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: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The project site will utilize existing buildings which are subject to local and state standards for building and energy efficiency. The project will involve the use of some nonrenewable fossil fuels; however, it is not anticipated to be wasteful, inefficient or unnecessary, and is expected to have a less than significant impact on energy resources. The project will not 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?
 - 2. Strong seismic ground shaking?
 - 3. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?
 - 4. Landslides?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

According to Figures 9-4(California Building Code Seismic Zones) & 9-5(Probabilistic Seismic Hazards) of the Fresno County General Plan Background Report (FCGPBR) and the California Department of Conservation, Earthquake Hazard Zone Application (EQ Zapp), the project site is not located on or near identified earthquake hazard zone

areas. The area of the proposed project is not identified as an area which by nature is subject to these types of seismic effects. No agencies expressed any concerns related to ground shaking, ground failure, liquefaction, or landslides. Construction of the proposed project will be subject to seismic design standards.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

No areas of unstable soil were identified on the project site. The proposed parking will be gravel surfaced or paved, which will minimize the potential for erosion or loss of topsoil.

- 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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

Landslides and other forms of slope failure form in response to long-term uplift, mass wasting, and disturbance of slopes. The project site contains naturally flat relief (slopes of no more than three percent), which precludes the possibility of land sliding on-site.

The potential for seismic-related ground failure (lateral spreading and liquefaction) occurring on the project site is minimal because of the absence of high groundwater levels and saturated loose granular soil. The project site is not in an area identified by Fresno County as being susceptible to liquefaction. In addition, the intensity of ground shaking from a large, distant earthquake is expected to be relatively low on the project site and, therefore, would not be severe enough to induce liquefaction on-site.

The San Joaquin Valley in which Fresno County is located is known to experience subsidence in certain areas. However, the subject parcel is not located in an area of the County identified as having a low likelihood for the occurrence of subsidence, or landslide according to Figure 9-6 (Landslide Hazards and Areas of Subsidence), of the Fresno County General Plan Background Report (FCGPBR).

- 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; or

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

Per Figure 7-1(Expansive Soils) of the FCGPBR, the project site is not located within an area of known risk of expansive soils, and no new construction is proposed with this application.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project will utilize an on-site sewage disposal system. No concerns related to the soil's capability to support the septic system were expressed by the Fresno County Department of Public Health, Environmental Health Division.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The parcel on which the proposed project will be sited is not located within proximity of any area designated to be moderately or highly sensitive for archeological resources. No historical or paleontological resources, unique geological features, or evidence of possible human remains were identified in this analysis. As such, no impact on historical, archeological, or paleontological resources would result from this proposal.

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 (GHG) Analysis was prepared for the project by JK Consulting Group, LLC, dated October 31, 2023. The GHG analysis determined that the project would generate approximately 9.57 metric tons of CO₂ equivalent per year, based on California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) projections, which accounts for both construction and operation. The San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD) does not have established thresholds for GHG emissions, however the SJVAPCD does have published guidance for land use agencies in determining the significance of GHG impacts, and there are thresholds developed by other agencies, such as the Air Resources Board California Air Pollution Control Officers Association, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District, the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District, and the South Coast Air Quality Management District, which are based upon AB 32 goals, that can be used for comparative purposes. The emissions thresholds for each of the referenced agencies are listed in Table 1 of the GHG memorandum. The project's operational GHG emissions estimates were determined to fall below any established thresholds for GHG emissions of the aforementioned agencies. Furthermore, the project would not conflict with identified local or state air quality plan, policy or regulation for aimed at reducing GHG emissions. Therefore, no mitigation is required.

IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Would the project:

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

According to the applicant's operational statement, the project does not propose to store hazardous materials; however, the project must comply with the applicable provisions of the California Health and Safety Code, pertaining to the use and storage of hazardous materials. Facilities proposing to use and/or store hazardous materials and/or hazardous wastes shall meet the requirements set forth in the California Health and Safety Code (HSC), Division 20, Chapter 6.95, and the California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 22, Division 4.5. Any business that handles a hazardous material or hazardous waste may be required to submit a Hazardous Materials Business Plan electronically pursuant to the HSC, Division 20, Chapter 6.95

- C. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school; or
- 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; or

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The subject parcel is not located within one-quarter mile of a school, nor is the proposed project site listed on the Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List (Cortese List) which is maintained by the California Department of Toxic Substances Control. According to the U.S. EPA, NEPAAssist tool, there are no listed sites located within a half-mile radius of the proposed project site.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

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

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

Per the Fresno County General Plan, Nebraska Avenue is a County maintained road classified as a Local Road with an existing 50 foot of road right-of-way and an ultimate right-of-way of 60 feet.

In addition, the Fresno County Department of Public Health, Environmental Health Division which administers the Office of Emergency Services to coordinate planning and preparedness, response and recovery efforts for disasters did not express any concerns regarding emergency response or evacuation plans.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project site is located in an area of irrigated agricultural land uses and is not in a wildland fire area, precluding the site from impacts caused by wildland fires.

X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Would the project:

- A. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality; or
- B. Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin; or

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project does not propose to use a substantial amount of water, approximately 60-80 gallons per day for domestic use. Additionally, a condition of approval will be included that no onsite truck washing will be permitted.

- 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:
 - 1. Result in substantial erosion or siltation on or off site?
 - 2. Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on or off site?
 - 3. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or

4. Impede or redirect flood flows?

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

According to FEMA FIRM Panel 2650H, the southern portion of the property is located within Flood Zone A. No development is proposed in this area, however, any development in a Special Flood Hazard Zone is required to conform to the applicable provisions of County Ordinance Code Title 15.48 Flood Hazard Areas.

- 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 Water and Natural Resources Division which commented that the project site is not located in an area of the County identifies as being water short. The project does not propose to use a substantial amount of water, approximately 60-80 gallons per day for domestic use, provided by an on-site well.

XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING

Would the project:

- A. Physically divide an established community?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The proposed project will not physically divide an established community nor

- B. Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The proposed project will not cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation. The proposed use is allowed in agricultural areas with review and approval of a discretionary application. The use, which is intended to support agricultural operations, is considered compatible with surrounding agricultural uses.

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:

No mineral resource impacts were identified in the analysis. According to Figures 7-7 (Mineral Resource Locations), 7-8 (Principal Mineral Producing Locations (1997-1998)) and 7-9 (Generalized Mineral Resource Zone Classifications) of the General Plan, the site is not located in a mineral resource area identified in Policy OS-C.2 of the General Plan.

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 operation of the proposed agriculturally related truck and trailer maintenance and storage facility will generate some ambient noise during operations primarily from idling trucks and moving trucks, however, in consideration of the limited scope of the proposed operation, which will be limited to 12 trucks, and given the substantial distance between the proposed parking area and the nearest receptor, which is approximately 300 feet, no adverse impacts to sensitive receptors or substantial or permanent increase in ambient noise is anticipated to occur as a result of project operation; additionally, the proposed truck parking and maintenance facility will be subject to the applicable provisions of the Fresno County noise ordinance, Chapter 8.40 of the Fresno County Ordinance Code.

- 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 who reside or work in the project area to excessive noise levels?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project site is not located within the vicinity of a private air strip, within the boundaries of an airport land use plan area, or within two miles of an airport.

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 proposed project will not induce population growth, nor will it displace housing or people. The project consists of utilizing an existing location for the purpose of storing trucks and trailers for the exclusive transportation of agriculturally related products, supplies and equipment. It will not induce substantial unplanned population growth or displace any housing in the area directly nor indirectly.

XV. PUBLIC SERVICES

Would the project:

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project will not require the provision of any new or physically altered government facilities. None of the reviewing agencies cited any concerns with the proposed operation.

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 is not located near any neighborhood or regional parks or recreational centers and does not propose any new recreational facilities or require the construction of such facilities.

XVII. TRANSPORTATION

Would the project:

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project was reviewed by the Transportation Planning Unit, and the Road Maintenance and Operations Division of County Department of Public Works and Planning. Neither department identified any conflicts with programs, plans, ordinances or policies applicable to the transportation and circulation system.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b) provides that projects within one-half mile of an existing major transit stop can be presumed to cause less than significant transportation impact” The subject parcel meets the criteria specified.

- 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:

The project does not have any design or operational features which would substantially increase transportation hazards. The proposed vehicle turning radius movements entering and exiting the site onto Nebraska Avenue were demonstrated to be adequate to accommodate the proposed truck traffic. The project was reviewed by the County Road Maintenance and Operations Division, which indicated that Nebraska Avenue could accommodate the truck turning movements.

D. Result in inadequate emergency access?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The proposed project meets all set back requirements and does not have any major construction that would affect emergency access. Any new development will be subject to the existing Fire Code and Building Code.

XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

- A. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:
1. Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k); or
 2. A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1? (In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.)

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

No ground disturbing activities are proposed with this application other than minor grading and paving of a an approximately one half-acre portion of the site for the proposed parking area.

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 proposed project will not require the construction, expansion or relocation any public facilities.

- 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 proposed project will not use a substantial amount of water in its operation. The submitted operational statement estimates that the project would use approximately 60-80 gallons per day.

- 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 proposed project will utilize an existing on-site septic system, with an estimate liquid waste volume of approximately 60 gallons per day for domestic use.

- 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 proposal was routed to the Fresno County Department of Public Works and Planning, Resources Division reviewed the project and did not express concern that the proposed operation would result in exceedance of any state or local 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 subject parcel is not located in an area prone to downslope flooding or landslides according to Figures 9-6 (Landslide Areas and Areas of Subsidence and 9-7 (100 Year Flood Inundation Areas). There is no grading proposed with the project which would result in site drainage changes.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The subject site is not within an identified area of fish or wildlife species that would cause a decrease in the wildlife population. The project will not substantially degrade the quality of the environment nor substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species. No responses from County departments or Responsible agencies and departments indicated that any substantial adverse impacts on human beings would occur as a result of this project.

CONCLUSION/SUMMARY

Based upon the Initial Study prepared for Director Review and Approval Application No. 4743, 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, Cultural Resources, Geology and Soils, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Hydrology and Water Quality, Land Use and Planning, Mineral Resources, Population and Housing, Public Services, Recreation, Utilities and Service Systems, and Wildfire.

Potential impacts related to Agricultural and Forestry Resources, Air Quality, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Energy, Noise, and Transportation, have been determined to be less than significant.

Potential impacts relating to Aesthetics, have been determined to be less than significant with adherence to the recommended mitigation measure(s).

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 B, Plaza level, located on the southwest corner of Tulare and "M" Street, Fresno, California.

JS

G:\4360Devs&Pln\PROJSEC\PROJDOCS\DRA\4700-4799\4743\CEQA\DRA 4743 IS 8410 Write Up.docx