



County of Fresno

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

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

- APPLICANT: James Heisdorf
- APPLICATION NOS.: Initial Study No. 8329 and Variance No. 4142
- DESCRIPTION: Allow the creation of three 20-acre parcels and a remaining 63-acre parcel from an existing 123-acre parcel within the AE-40 (Exclusive Agricultural, 40-acre minimum parcel size) Zone District.
- LOCATION: The subject parcel is located on the north side of Millerton Rd. 1.21-miles east of Auberry Rd., approximately 6.8-miles east from the community of Friant (APN 138-061-16) (10836 Millerton Rd.) (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
- 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: NO IMPACT:

The subject parcel is located in a foothill area characterized by open space and low density single-family residential development. No scenic vistas, other scenic resources, or historic buildings were identified during analysis of this proposal, nor is the project site located near a scenic highway.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

According to the applicant's submitted plans, no lighting has been proposed as this simply creates additional parcels.

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: NO IMPACT:

The subject parcels are designated as Eastside Rangeland in the County Adopted Sierra North Regional Plan, which allows for grazing and other agricultural operations, and limited non-agricultural uses, and are also classified as Grazing land per the 2020 Fresno County Important Farmlands Map. The subject parcel contains approximately 123 acres combined, adjacent parcels to the northeast range in size from approximately 10 to 40 acres and contain some sparse residential development. There are larger parcels located to the west, southwest, south and southeast which range in size from 160 to 640 acres.

There is no forestland in the vicinity, that would be impacted by this proposal. The project was reviewed by the Fresno County Agricultural Commissioner's Office, which did not express any concerns related to the project resulting in the conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural uses. Because the subject parcel is designated as grazing land in the 2020 Fresno County Important Farmlands Map, the project would not convert any Prime, Unique or Farmland of Statewide Importance to non-agricultural uses, nor interfere with any existing agricultural operations in the vicinity.

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The 123-acre parcel is enrolled in the Williamson Act Program under Contract No. 162. According to comments from the Fresno County Department of Public Works and Planning, Policy Planning Unit, the three 20-acre proposed parcels will be removed from agricultural use because of the parcellation. Accordingly, the submission of a Statement of Intended Use was required for this proposal, to determine its consistency with the provisions of the Williamson Act. The applicant's submitted Statement of Intended Use

was evaluated by the Policy Planning Unit, which made the determination that the proposed use would not conflict with the provisions of the Williamson Act.

- 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
- 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 subject parcels are 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.

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?
- 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: NO IMPACT:

The parcels created will only be reflected on a map; no construction has been proposed. This proposed project is not expected to conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable Air Quality Plan or violate any air quality standard or result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in any criteria pollutant for which the project region is designated a non-attainment area, under any ambient air-quality standard.

No construction has been proposed at this time. As the area has sparse residential development, and with no current construction proposed, as indicated by the applicant, the project is therefore unlikely to either generate substantial pollutant concentrations, other emissions or odors, that would adversely affect a substantial number of people, and would be a less than significant impact.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

This project proposal was reviewed by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS). Comments from FWS indicate that based on information obtained from the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB), the project is within 4.5 miles of a recorded occurrence of the federally threatened California Tiger Salamander (CTS), and that wetlands and ponds in the vicinity may provide suitable breeding habitat for the CTS.

A search of the Information Planning and Consultation system (IPaC) resource list by County staff produced a list of threatened or endangered species that may be affected by development activities in the area. Of those species listed, none were associated with critical habitat located on or near the project site, however, the list indicated the project site is within the range of the endangered Blunt Nosed Leopard Lizard and endangered Vernal Pool Tadpole Shrimp, however no occurrences have been recorded in proximity to the project site. With regard to migratory birds, the IPaC list indicated no particular species in the area that may be affected by the project but indicated that several breeds of migratory birds have a probability of being present during certain times of the year.

No construction has been proposed at this time. As the project entails the creation of parcels that will be reflected only on a map there will be no substantial effect on any species identified in the IPaC list.

- B. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service; or
- C. Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally-protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

No riparian habitat or state or federally-protected wetlands were identified in the analysis. The habitat assessment did note that one linear water feature was identified off site. However the project does not propose any construction that would have a negative impact on the identified water feature.

- 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:

See discussion under Section IV.A above.

- E. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?
- F. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state Habitat Conservation Plan?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

No conflicts with any existing local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources were identified, nor were any conflicts with any adopted Habitat Conservation, Natural Community Conservation, or other approved plans identified, in the analysis of this 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: NO IMPACT:

The parcels created will only be reflected on a map; no construction has been proposed. As such there will be no substantial impact to any historical or archaeological 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
- B. Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The project is not anticipated to have a significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources during construction or operation as according to the applicant's submitted plans, no construction has been proposed as this simply creates additional parcels.

VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Would the project:

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project scope is to allow for the creation of four parcels from an existing 123-acre parcel within the AE-40 (Exclusive Agricultural, 40-acre minimum parcel size) Zone District. No adverse effects nor foreseeable conditions would be created by division of the parcel into four separate lots.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project parcel is in the foothills of the Sierra Nevada, and in an area of relatively steep slopes as identified in Figure 7-2 of the Fresno County General Plan Background Report (FCGPBR) and in an area of Generalized Erosion Hazard, per Figure 7-3 of the (FCGPBR). Policy OS-F.6 states that, the County shall require that development on hillsides be limited to maintain valuable natural vegetation, especially forests and open grassland, and to control erosion. Policy OS-F.7 states that, the County shall require developers to consider a site's natural topography with respect to the design and siting of all physical improvements to minimize grading.

None of the reviewing agencies or departments expressed concerns related to the potential for erosion or landslide because of the proposed project.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project site is not located in an area of lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse as identified in 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?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The subject property is not located in an area of expansive soils, as identified by Figure 7-1 of the Fresno County General Plan Background Report.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

There are no septic systems proposed with this application.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

No paleontological resources were identified by any reviewing agencies. Nor would the division of the land cause any impact.

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:

No construction has been proposed at this time. However, any future potential greenhouse gas emissions generated from the operation of construction equipment and vehicles would be temporary and not anticipated to result in significant impacts on the

environment. Additionally, the project would not conflict with any plans, policies or regulations adopted for the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions.

IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Would the project:

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project scope is to allow for the creation of four parcels from an existing 123-acre parcel within the AE-40 (Exclusive Agricultural, 40-acre minimum parcel size) Zone District. No hazards nor foreseeable conditions are readily present currently.

- 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 schools located within one-quarter mile of the subject property. For reference, the closest school, Solid Truth Academy is located 0.79-miles north 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; or
- E. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

Per review of the project area using the United States Environmental Protection Agency's NEPAssist, no hazardous materials sites are located within the boundaries of the subject parcel. The project site is not located within an Airport Land Use Plan nor in the vicinity of a private airstrip.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

No adopted emergency response plans in the area of the project site, were identified in the analysis. The project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan. No comment was received from either the Fresno County Fire Protection District or CALFIRE relating to conflict with any emergency response 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 was reviewed by the Fresno County Fire Protection District/CALFIRE and will be required to comply with all applicable Fire Code and County Ordinance pertaining to State Responsibility Area Fire Safe Regulations. The project does not include the construction of an structures or any increase of people at the site.

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?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The proposed parcel creations currently proposed will not generate any waste discharge that would otherwise degrade surface water quality or violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. The project will not affect groundwater supplies or recharge as no use of groundwater is proposed. A hydrogeological survey was conducted in December of 2023, which determined there was sufficient water to support the creation of four parcels.

- 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?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project will not alter drainage patterns or alter any existing watercourse. No additional storm water runoff will be generated.

The proposed project will not increase the impervious surface area or result in erosion, on or off site, or increased rate of surface runoff, impede or redirect flood flows. The subject property is not located in an area subject to flooding from the 100-year (one percent chance) storm event per FEMA, FIRM Panel 1060H.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project site is not located in an area subject to flood hazard, tsunami, or in seiche zone, and therefore there would not be a risk of release of pollutants due to inundation.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project, once constructed, does not propose any water use. No conflicts with the implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan were identified in the analysis.

XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING

Would the project:

A. Physically divide an established community; or

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The project will not divide an established community however could potentially create higher levels of residential homes of which may conflict with the agricultural land use plan and policies to prevent agricultural and residential conflicts.

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 impacts to known mineral resources were identified in the analysis, the project does not propose to utilize or disturb any known mineral resources and will not result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site.

XIII. NOISE

Would the project result in:

- A. Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project 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?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

Temporary ambient noise level increases may occur if by-right residential homes are to be constructed because of the parcel creation (up to eight homes permitted via by-right and via discretionary permits), however due to the rural area and lack of homes in the vicinity, no current concerns regarding excess noise or ground-borne vibration were identified by any reviewing agencies. Additionally, the project will be subject to the provisions of the Fresno County Ordinance Code, Title 8, Chapter 8.40 – Noise Control.

- 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 located within the vicinity of a private air strip or within an airport land use plan, or within two miles of a public airport, and would not expose people living or working in the project area to excessive noise levels. The nearest airport is located approximately 8.5-miles north 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
- B. Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

No housing is proposed to be added or displaced with this application.

XV. PUBLIC SERVICES

Would the project:

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

No new or physically altered governmental facilities are proposed with this application.

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 any existing parks or other recreational facilities or involve the construction or expansion 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; or

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project will not conflict with programs or plans addressing transit facilities.

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

No significant impact to vehicle miles traveled can be seen.

- 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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project will not change the existing road geometry.

- D. Result in inadequate emergency access?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

Millerton Road is Classified as an Arterial Road in the Fresno County General Plan, requiring an ultimate right-of-way of 106 feet. The project will not conflict with any program, plan, ordinance or policy the pertains to the circulation system, or be inconsistent with provisions of CEQA regarding significance of transportation impacts. The project will not create any hazards to traffic due to design features.

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:

Under the provisions of Assembly Bill (AB) 52, the County was required to provide notice of preparation of this Initial Study to Native American tribes who had previously indicated interest in reviewing CEQA projects. Notices were sent in January of 2024 to the appropriate Tribal government representatives. No consultation was established, and Table Mountain Rancheria expressed no interest in this project.

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
- B. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years; or
- 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; or
- 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: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The project will not require wastewater treatment, utilize any local water source, generate any solid waste, except that which would be incidental to construction, and would be required to be removed and disposed of at an appropriate landfill, or other facility

authorized to handle such construction waste. Additionally, the project will be required to comply with all applicable regulations pertaining to the reduction of solid waste.

XX. WILDFIRE

If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:

- A. Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects; or
- B. Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire; or
- C. Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment; or
- D. Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The project site is in a State Responsibility Area (SRA), and given the topography and seasonally dry conditions, is also prone to wildfire risk. Accordingly, the applicant had preliminary discussions with the Fresno County Fire Protection District and the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CALFIRE) prior to submitting this application.

The Fire District and Calfire did not express any concerns with the proposal. The project will be subject to the requirements of the current California Fire Code including all applicable State Responsibility Area - Fire Safe Regulations, per Fresno County Ordinance Code Title 15.

XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Would the project:

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The proposed parcel creations are not deemed to cause a significant impact towards the habitat of a fish or wildlife species.

- 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: NO IMPACT:

No cumulatively considerable impacts were identified, which would result from the project.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

No environmental effects resulting in any adverse effects on human beings were identified in the analysis.

CONCLUSION/SUMMARY

Based upon the Initial Study prepared for Variance No. 4142, 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 Aesthetics, Agriculture, Air Quality, Energy, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Geology and Soils, Hydrology and Water Quality, Noise, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Transportation, and Wildfire, Mineral Resources, Population and Housing, Public Services, Recreation, Utilities and Service Systems.

Potential impacts related to Land Use and Planning have been determined to be less than significant.

Potential impacts relating to Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, and Tribal Cultural Resources have determined to be less than significant.

A 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.

AP

G:\4360Devs&Pln\PROJSEC\PROJDOCS\VA\4100-4199\4142\IS CEQA\VA 4142 Initial Study Writeup.docx