



County of Fresno

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

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

- CONSULTANT: Harry Babujyan
- APPLICATION NOS.: Initial Study Application No. 8521 and Unclassified Conditional Use Permit Application No. 3779
- DESCRIPTION: To allow the conversion of an existing Single-Family Residence to an 18-bed residential care facility on a 2.16-acre parcel in the AE-20 (Exclusive Agricultural 20-acre minimum parcel size) Zone District.
- LOCATION: The subject parcel is located on the east side of N. De Wolf Ave, approximately 332 feet south from the intersection with E. Bullard Ave, northerly adjacent from the city limits of the City of Clovis. (APN: 554-030-02) (ADDRESS: 5820 N. De Wolf Ave) (Sup. Dist. 5).

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?
- 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:

The subject 2.16-acre property is currently developed with a 3,974 square feet single family residence, and a 2,800 square feet barn with attached shed. The remainder of the property is vacant and undeveloped. The surrounding land uses consist of mostly single-family residences. The nearest residence is approximately 209 feet southeast of the subject property.

The project will not impact visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings in that it involves no new construction and the existing residence and related improvements match with similar improvements in the area. Further, no known scenic vistas or scenic resources exist on or in the immediate vicinity of the property and De Wolf Avenue which fronts the property is not designated as scenic highway in the County General Plan. Therefore, the project will not have an impact on a scenic vista or scenic resource.

- 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:

Any outdoor lighting that might have the potential of generating glare in the area is limited by Zoning Ordinance section 820.3.020 which requires it to be “directed downward and shielded so that all direct light and glare is confined within the boundaries of the subject parcel, thereby minimizing off-site glare” and that “light sources shall be shielded to direct light rays onto the subject parcel only. The light source, whether bulb or tube, shall not be directly visible from an abutting property or public street rights-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 Fresno County Important Farmland Map, the subject parcel is designated as Rural Residential Land. Therefore, the project would not convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The subject parcel is zoned AE-20 (Exclusive Agricultural, 20-acre minimum parcel size) Zone District and is not subject to a Williamson Act Contract. The project will not conflict with the existing zoning for agricultural use and would not conflict with the Williamson Act Contract.

- C. Conflict with existing zoning for forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production; or
- D. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?
- E. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project site is not located on land zoned for forest land, timberland or timberland zoned Timberland Production. The project will utilize existing improvements on the property thereby causing no physical or visual changes on or near the property, and as such will not result in the loss of forest land or conversion of land for non-forest use.

III. AIR QUALITY

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

- A. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable Air Quality Plan; or
- B. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

According to the Greenhouse Gas Analysis prepared by JK Consulting LLC for the proposal, the quantification of criteria pollutant emissions for CEQA purposes is not required based upon the SJVAPCD's Small Project Analysis Levels (SPAL) guidance. Congregate Care Assisted Living facilities that are less than 536 dwelling units AND generate less than 800 Average Daily One-Way trips (except HHDT) or 15 Average Daily One-Way HHDT Trips are deemed to have a less than significant impact on air quality. Additionally, reviewing Agencies and Departments did not express concern with the project to indicate that the project would result in a conflict with an applicable Air Quality Plan or result in cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant. The project proposal does not include any new construction, only conversion of existing structures on site.

- 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 project will not create objectionable odors to affect people in the area. No concerns related to odor were expressed by reviewing Agencies and Departments.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

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

The California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) did not express concern with the project to indicate impacts to special-status species. Additionally, the project does not involve new construction, as such, is not expected to negatively impact through habitat modification as the site is not occupied or has not significant habitat for special-status species.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

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

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project does not involve new construction and as such does not cut off movement of the site for any wildlife resident.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

Reviewing Agencies and Departments did not identify a local policy or ordinance adopted for the protection of a biological resource that would be in conflict with the project proposal. No Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan or other approved local, regional, or state Habitat Conservation Plans were identified as being in conflict with the project proposal.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

- A. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to Section 15064.5; or
- B. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5; or
- C. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED:

No reviewing Agencies and Departments express concern with the project to indicate that a cultural or historical resource is present on the site and would be affected by the project proposal. Also, the project is not located in an area sensitive to historical, archeological or paleontological resources. However, a mitigation measure will be implemented in the event that a cultural resource is identified during ground-disturbing activities related to project development.

Mitigation Measure(s)

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

activities, no further disturbance is to occur until the Fresno County Sheriff-Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition. All normal evidence procedures should be followed by photos, reports, video, etc. If such remains are determined to be Native American, the Sheriff-Coroner must notify the Native American Commission within 24 hours.

VI. ENERGY

Would the project:

- A. Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation; or
- B. Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project will be built to current building code standards which would take into consideration applicable energy efficiency standards. The project construction and operation would not result in a potentially significant impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources. No state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency was identified during Agency and Department review.

VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Would the project:

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

According to the California Department of Conservation Earthquake Hazard Zone Application (EQ Zapp), the project is not located on a known earthquake fault zone. In considering the lower chance of reaching peak horizontal ground acceleration and mandatory compliance of the development with the California Building Code, there is minimal adverse risks associated with the project related to strong seismic ground shaking or seismic-related ground failure.

4. Landslides?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

Figure HS-8 of the Fresno County General Plan indicates that the project site is not located in a moderate or high landslide hazard area.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project would result in the development of the site where impervious surface would be added, and a loss of topsoil would occur. The subject site is relatively flat with small changes in elevation. The project would not result in a loss of topsoil or soil erosion where a significant risk of loss, injury, or death would occur.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

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

C. Be located on expansive soil as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

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

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

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The existing single family residence is currently served by an on-site sewage disposal system. Reviewing Agencies and Departments did not express concern or identify any unique paleontological resource or unique geologic feature identified on the project site.

VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Would the project:

- A. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment; or
- B. Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

According to the Greenhouse Gas Analysis prepared by JK Consulting Group, LLC for the proposal dated October 22, 2024, the projected GHG emissions generated by the project reflect between 0.1% and 1.5% of the various thresholds identified by other lead agencies. As a result, the project will not generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment. Therefore, mitigation is not warranted since there is a less than significant impact from project operational emissions.

Additionally,

The proposal does not include any new construction, only conversion of existing structures. Additionally, reviewing Agencies and Departments did not express concern with the project to indicate that a conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases exists as a result of the project.

VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Would the project:

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

According to the Fresno County Department of Public Health, the proposed care facility has been identified to use and/or store hazardous materials and/or hazardous wastes. As such, the project 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 and will be required to submit a Hazardous Materials Business Plan pursuant to the HSC, Division 20, Chapter 6.95 and will be required to obtain a Medical Waste Permit from the California Department of Health Services, Medical Waste Management Program. This will be added as Project Notes.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project site is located within half a mile northeast of an existing school (Red Bank Elementary School). As noted, the project is not anticipating using any backup generator and associated fuel and therefore there will be no hazardous emissions within one-quarter mile of a school.

- D. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

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

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

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

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

Reviewing Agencies and Departments did not identify any conflict with the project and any adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. Additionally, no concerns were expressed that the project would result in a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires.

X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Would the project:

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

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The existing single-family residence which will house the proposed eighteen-bed residential care facility has a sewage disposal system and a water well on the property.

The Fresno County Department Water and Natural Resources Division reviewed the project and determined that the proposal will have a less than significant impact on the existing water supply in the area. Additionally, the subject parcel is not located within an area of the county defined as being a water short area.

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

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project anticipates the conversion of an existing single-family residence to an eighteen-bed care facility. The proposed facility is located on relatively flat land and does not anticipate substantial erosion or siltation events occurring as a result of the project. Surface runoff is anticipated to be kept onsite per County of Fresno and Fresno Metropolitan Flood Control District's standards and is not expected to result in flooding on- or offsite. Reviewing Agencies and Departments did not express concern with the project to indicate that the project would result in runoff water contributions that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide additional sources of polluted runoff.

4. Impede or redirect flood flows?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project site is not located within a flood hazard area. Applicable agencies reviewed the project site and did not have any comments regarding any requirements and asserted the project as proposed would not impede or redirect flood flows.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project site is not located within a flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche areas. Applicable agencies reviewed the project site and did not have any comments regarding any requirements and asserted the project as proposed would not risk release of pollutants due to project inundation.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project does not propose new development, rather conversion of an already existing residence on site. The water and Natural Resources Division of Fresno County determined that the proposal will have a less than significant impact on the existing water supply in the area. Additionally, the subject parcel is not located within an area of the county defined as being a water short area. Reviewing Agencies and Departments did not express concern with the project in regard a conflict with a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan.

XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING

Would the project:

- A. Physically divide an established community?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project will not physically divide an established community.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

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

XII. MINERAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

- A. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state; or
- B. Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local General Plan, Specific Plan or other land use plan?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

Figure 7-12 of the Fresno County General Plan Background Report (FCGPBR) depicts mineral resource locations and principal mineral producing locations within the County of Fresno. The project site is not located on or near an identified mineral resource or mineral producing site.

XIII. NOISE

Would the project result in:

- A. Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies; or
- B. Generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

Being the proposed use is residential care facility, the project will have no noise-related impacts in the area. No concerns related to noise were expressed by reviewing Agencies and Departments.

- C. For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels; or

D.

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

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

XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING

Would the project:

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

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

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

XV. PUBLIC SERVICES

Would the project:

- A. Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically-altered governmental facilities, or the need for new or physically-altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services?

1. Fire protection;

2. Police protection;

3. Schools;

4. Parks; or

5. Other public facilities?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

Reviewing agencies and departments did not provide concerns regarding the project where additional governmental facilities or alteration to existing governmental facilities are needed. The City of Clovis provided comments referencing governmental facilities requirements as well as The Fresno County Fire Protection District provided comments referencing Fire Code requirements when a building permit is issued for the project. All will be placed as Project Notes.

XVI. RECREATION

Would the project:

- A. Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated; or
- B. Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project intends to convert an existing residence into a residential care facility with limited number of visitors per day (one visitor per patient, per day maximum). Therefore, the project is not expected to increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks and does not include the construction or expansion of recreational facilities.

XVI. TRANSPORTATION

Would the project:

- A. Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities; or
- B. Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

According to the Applicant's Operational Statement, the number of visitors a day would be one per patient, per day (maximum 18 total per day) and four employees per shift (3 shifts per day). Additionally, deliveries are expected to be once a week, and removal of medical waste will be done on a bi-weekly basis. As such, the volume of trips is not expected to result in impacts related to vehicle miles traveled or any County-adopted program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system. Reviewing Agencies and Departments did not express concern with the project in terms of a transportation impact resulting from the project.

- C. Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?; or
- D. Result in inadequate emergency access?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

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

XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

- A. Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:

1. Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or
2. A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED:

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

* **Mitigation Measure(s)**

1. *See Section V. Cultural Resources Mitigation Measure No. 1*

XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Would the project:

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

Reviewing Agencies and Departments did not identify any significant environmental effects as a result of the project. Per the Applicant's Operational Statement, the estimated volume of water usage is between 400-500 gallons per day. The Fresno County Water and Natural Resources Division confirmed the proposal will have less than significant impact of water in the area and the subject parcel is not in an area designated as low water.

- C. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

Reviewing Agencies and Departments did not identify any significant environmental effects or changes to wastewater treatment as a result of the project.

- 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:

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

XX. WILDFIRE

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

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

As depicted in the 2007 Fresno County Fire Hazard Severity Zones in LRA Map, produced by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection, the project site

is not located within a very high fire hazard severity zone or within a State Responsibility Area (SRA).

XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Would the project:

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

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

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

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

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

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

CONCLUSION/SUMMARY

Based upon the Initial Study No. 8521 prepared for Unclassified Conditional Use Permit Application No. 3779, 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 Hydrology, Land

Use Planning, Mineral Resources, Population and Housing, Public Services, Geology and Soils, Recreation, Transportation, Green House Gas Emissions, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Noise, Wildfire, Agricultural and Forestry, and Biological Resources.

Potential impacts related to Aesthetics, Cultural Resources, Utilities and Service Systems and Tribal Cultural Resources, and Mandatory Findings of Significance have been determined to be less than significant.

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

A Mitigated Negative Declaration 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.

AA
GG:\4360Devs&PIn\PROJSEC\PROJDOCS\CUP\3700-3799\3779\CEQA\CUP 3779 Initial Study Writeup.docx