



County of Fresno

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

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

- APPLICANT: Mark Christie
- APPLICATION NOS.: Initial Study No. 8489 and Unclassified Conditional Use Permit No. 3774
- DESCRIPTION: Allow a Solid Waste Processing Facility along with a (by right) Ready-Mix Concrete Plant on an existing 12.01-acre Parcel. The subject property is located within the M-3 (Heavy Industrial) Zone District. and is designated as Limited Industrial Reserve in the Edison Community Plan.
- LOCATION: The subject parcel is located on the west side of Golden State Boulevard 0.4 miles north of Chestnut Avenue, approximately 0.33-miles east from the City of Fresno. (APN: 330-090-52) (3525 Golden State Boulevard) (Sup. Dist. 3).

I. AESTHETICS

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

- A. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista; or

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The subject site is in a predominantly limited industrial area throughout the region. Underlying development standards are established by the Zone District and the site is designated as Limited Industrial Reserve in the Edison Community Plan. In considering the project will be following development standards of the underlying zone district and that no scenic vista would be negatively impacted by the project, a less than significant impact can be seen.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The subject parcels are located on the north side of Kings Canyon/State Route 180 and is not designated as a scenic road. Although the project site is located near some of the points of interest, these areas are not observed from the project site where an impact to a scenic vista could potentially occur. As there were no scenic resources identified on

the project site, the project is not expected to have a significant impact on a scenic vista or scenic resource.

- C. In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings. (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The subject parcel is M-3 (Heavy Industrial) Zone District. There are no identifiable public views within the area. Therefore, with the project's mandatory compliance of the development standards, any planned visual character of the site follows all development.

- 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:

Per the Applicant's Operational Statement, the project will utilize outdoor site lighting and pole mounted parking lot lights to provide security for the development. To ensure that new sources of lights and glare do not adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area and not substantially impact adjacent properties or public right-of-way, the project shall be subject to Section 834.4.025.B(1)(a). of the Zoning Ordinance, which requires outdoor lighting to be hooded, arranged and controlled so not to be directly visible from an abutting property or public street right-of-way.

II. AGRICULTURAL AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

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

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

Per the 2018 Fresno County Important Farmland Map, the subject property is not designated Farmland of Local Importance. Therefore, the project would not convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The subject parcel is designated as limited Industrial, is located in the M-3 (Heavy Industrial) Zone District, and is not subject to a 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; or

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

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

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The subject parcel is designated as Limited Industrial in the Edison Community Plan and will not result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use.

III. AIR QUALITY

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

- A. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable Air Quality Plan; or

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The applicant provided an Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Impact Analysis, completed by Lilburn Corporation dated May 6th, 2024, concluded the operational GHG emissions associated with the project were estimated to be 1,668.20 MTCO₂e per year. However, the prior use (Fresno Foreign Wrecking) generated more than 500 MTCO₂e per year

which is greater than 29% State reduction requirements. The Analysis was provided to the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD) along with the project information for review and comments. No concerns were expressed by Air District.

The Long-Term Operational Emissions are associated with mobile source emissions that would result from vehicle trips associated with the proposed project. Area sources, such as landscape equipment would also result in pollutant emissions. Based on the air quality impact analysis, emission estimates for operation of the project calculated using CalEEMod shows that the total project emission resulting from the project would not exceed San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District thresholds for annual ROG, NOx, CO, SOx, PM10, or PM2.5 emissions; therefore, the proposed project would have a less than significant effect on regional air quality, and thus, operation of the proposed project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment under applicable federal or State ambient air quality standards.

- 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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The project area is located within the San Joaquin Valley Air Basin (SJVAB), which is included among the eight counties that comprise the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District. Under the provisions of the U.S. Clean Air Act, the attainment status of the SJVAB with respect to national and state ambient air quality standards has been classified as non-attainment/extreme, non-attainment/severe, non-attainment, attainment/unclassified, or attainment for various criteria pollutants which includes O₃, PM₁₀, PM_{2.5}, CO, NO₂, SO₂, lead and others.

Per the Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Impact Analysis by Lilburn Corporation dated May 6th, 2024, the project does not pose a substantial increase to basin emissions. As the project would generate less than significant project-related operational impacts to criteria air pollutants, the project's contribution to cumulative air quality impacts would not be cumulatively considerable.

- C. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations; or

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

While it is expected that there will be some dust and particulate matter released into the air during construction activities, the overall area of ground disturbance would be limited to the proposed lease areas.

Given its limited scope, 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 ambient air-quality standard.

The proposal will be subject to General Plan Policy OS-G.14, which requires that all access roads, driveways, and parking areas serving new commercial and industrial development to be constructed with materials that minimize particulate emissions and are appropriate to the scale and intensity of the use.

- C. Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?

According to the operational statement for the proposed project, the project would incorporate the use of Tier 4 engines in all on-site mobile equipment used for material handling. The proposed project would only operate a single plant a maximum of 25-days a year. The ready-mix ICE engine and the recycling plant could operate simultaneously for a maximum of 125-days per year. The operational use of the plants would not exceed a combination of 250-days a year.

Daily production will be limited to 3,500 tons per day for the recycling plant and 3,000 cubic yards per day for the ready-mix when operating exclusively. The production of the ready-mix plant will be limited to a maximum of 1,650 cubic yards per day and the recycling plant will be limited to a maximum of 1,925 tons per day when operating simultaneously.

With adherence to the operational statement, the proposed project would limit the emissions to a level that would no longer exceed the SJVAPCD Acute Hazard Exposure Index. Therefore the proposed project would have a less than significant impact on the resulting emissions that could adversely affect a substantial number of people.

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The proposed project is not located within an area identified as a habitat for California Tiger Salamander and Vernal Pool Fairy Shrimp. Therefore, any potential special-status species impacts resulting in disturbing these habitats are determined to be less than significant.

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

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

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

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

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

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

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

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

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project site is unimproved with no vegetation. The project will not conflict with local policies or ordinances regarding a tree preservation policy or ordinance.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

- A. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to Section 15064.5; or

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED:

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

* **Mitigation Measure(s)**

1. See Section XVIII. Tribal Cultural Resources

VI. ENERGY

Would the project:

- A. Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation; or

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

There are no unusual project characteristics that would cause the use of construction equipment to be less energy efficient compared with other similar construction sites in the County. Therefore, construction-related fuel consumption by the project would not result in inefficient, wasteful, or unnecessary energy use compared with other construction sites in the area.

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

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

Energy resource consumption is expected to occur during project construction and operation. The proposed development is subject to current building code standards which would consider state and local energy efficiency standards and renewable energy goals. The project would result in a less than significant impact.

VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Would the project:

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

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

2. Strong seismic ground shaking?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

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

3. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

4. Landslides?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

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

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

Project construction will not result in the loss of topsoil due to the addition of impervious surface. The existing terrain of the project site consists of impervious surfaces and flat compacted topsoil. The proposed project is utilizing existing structures and surfaces. If future development is proposed the project would be subject to local and state standards. Development of the site would be further reviewed and permitted and would

ensure that the development would not result in substantial soil erosion where increased risk would occur.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

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

- 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:

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

- 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: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The proposed project will utilize existing septic tanks on the subject property. The Fresno County Environmental Health Department reviewed the proposed project and determined that existing septic systems are sufficient for the proposed use.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

No unique paleontological resource or unique geologic feature was identified on the project site.

VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Would the project:

- A. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment; or

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

Greenhouse gas emissions associated with the project would occur over the short-term

from construction activities, as stated in the Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas by Lilburn Corporation dated May 6th, 2024. Review of this application by the Air District indicated that this project, with adherence to the mitigation measure proposed by the Air District, would follow their policies and regulations adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases. These requirements provide oversight for the project to ensure that standards continue to be met. As they do not address any specific impacts, they will be included as conditions of approval to the Conditional Use Permit associated with this Initial Study. The purpose of District Rule 9510 (Indirect Source Review) is to reduce the growth in both NOx and PM10 emissions associated with development and transportation projects from mobile and area sources associated with construction and operation of development projects. The rule encourages clean air design elements to be incorporated into the development project. In case the proposed project clean air design elements are insufficient to meet the targeted emission reductions, the rule requires developers to pay a fee used to fund projects to achieve off-site emissions reductions. Adherence to the Air District's regulations will ensure less than significant impacts on the release of greenhouse gases.

- 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:

Per the *Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Analysis Report*, conducted by Lilburn Corporation dated May 6th, 2024, a threshold of significance is defined by the SJVAPCD in its GAMAQI1 as an identifiable quantitative, qualitative, or performance level of a particular environmental effect. Non-compliance with a threshold of significance means the effect will normally be determined to be significant. Compliance with a threshold of significance means the effect normally will be determined to be less than significant. The study concludes the operational GHG emissions associated with the project were estimated to be 1,668.20 MTCO_{2e} per year. However, the prior use (Fresno Foreign Wrecking) generated more than 500 MTCO_{2eq} per year which is greater than 29% State reduction requirements.

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: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The Department of Public Health, Environmental Health Division has reviewed the project and provided comments. There comments include compliance of the project with

State and local regulations for the use and/or storage of hazardous materials and wastes should they be utilized. Regulations include compliance with the California Health and Safety Code and preparation of submittal of a Hazardous Materials Business Plan. The project does not propose the storage of hazardous materials in amounts where a significant hazard to the public or environment could occur. With the project's compliance with applicable State and local handling and reporting requirements, the project is not likely to result in a significant hazard or result in a significant hazard due to accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

There are no existing schools within a one-quarter mile of the project site nor any indication of any designated sites for a school within the Specific Plan area. For reference, the closest school, Malaga Elementary School, is located 0.50-miles southeast of the project site.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

According to the NEPAassist database, there are no listed hazardous materials sites located on the project site, nor in proximity of the subject site.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

Per the Fresno County *Airport Land Use Compatibility* Plan Update adopted by the Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) on December 3, 2018, the nearest public airport, Fresno Chandler Executive Airport, located five miles northwest of the project site will not be detrimentally affected by the proposed project.

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

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

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

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

Per Figure 8-10 of the Fresno County General Plan Background Report, the project site is not within the State Responsibility area for wildland fire. Potential exposure to wildland fires is deemed less than significant as the area is away from sensitive receptors who may be negatively affected from potential risk of wildfires.

X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Would the project:

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

This proposal was routed to the California Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), who did not express any concerns related to the project. Based on the information provided, the water that will be served at the site will likely not require new infrastructure that will trigger a Division of Drinking Water permit for an existing public water system or create a new water system that meets the definition of a public water system and so will not likely need a Division of Drinking Water permit. Additionally, if construction associated with the proposal disturbs more than one acre, compliance with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Permit for Discharges of Storm Water Associated with Construction Activity shall be required. Before construction begins, the applicant shall submit to the State Water Resources Control Board a Notice of Intent to comply with said permit, a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), a site plan, and appropriate fees. The SWPPP shall contain all items listed in Section A of the General Permit, including descriptions of measures taken to prevent or eliminate unauthorized non-storm water discharges, and best management practices (BMP) implemented to prevent pollutants from discharging with storm water into waters of the United States. These requirements will be included as project notes.

- 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: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The recycling facility would process and recycle its own water. All remaining water would be provided back to the client for mixing new drilling mud and filling hydro excavation tanks. Other than potable water used for onsite restrooms and breakrooms, the recycling facility does not plan to use large quantities of potable water. Based on typical employee potable water usage for bathrooms and breakrooms, it is estimated that the recycling facility will use between 15-20 gallons of potable water per day per worker. This totals to between 75 and 200 gallons per day. The water would be provided by a municipal water supply provider. Therefore, there were no negative impacts identified regarding the local groundwater table.

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The project site is not expected to alter any existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river.

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

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

2. Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite?
3. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or
4. Impede or redirect flood flows?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The project development may cause changes in absorption rates, drainage patterns, and an increase in the rate and amount of surface runoff. This potential impact would result from construction and paving activities, which would compact and over cover the soil, thereby reducing the area available for infiltration of storm water.

According to the Development Engineering Section of the Fresno County Department of Public Works and Planning, the project shall require: 1) an engineered grading and drainage plan to show how the additional storm water runoff generated by the proposed development will be handled without adversely impacting adjacent properties; 2) filing of a Notice of Intent (NOI) and Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) with State

Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) before the commencement of any construction activities disturbing 1.0 acre or more of area; and 3) providing copies of completed NOI and SWPPP to Development Engineering prior to any grading work. These requirements will be included as Project Notes.

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

According to FEMA FIRM Panel 2140H, the parcel is not subject to flooding from the 100-year storm. Most of the project site is not located within a floodplain. However, the western portion of the area of the subject property is within the Special Flood Hazard Area, subject to flooding from the 100-year storm. Any development within the Special Flood Hazard Area shall conform to provisions established in Fresno County Ordinance Code Title 15, Chapter 15.48 Flood Hazard Areas. With these provisions in place, the project is not anticipated to expose persons to flood or inundation hazards.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The subject proposal would not conflict with any Water Quality Control Plan or sustainable groundwater management plan. The recycling facility would process and recycle its own water. All remaining water would be provided back to the client for mixing new drilling mud and filling hydro excavation tanks. Other than potable water used for onsite restrooms and breakrooms, the recycling facility does not plan to use large quantities of potable water. Based on typical employee potable water usage for bathrooms and breakrooms, it is estimated that the recycling facility will use between 15-20 gallons of potable water per day per worker. This totals to between 75 and 200 gallons per day. The water would be provided by a municipal water supply provider.

XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING

Would the project:

- A. Physically divide an established community; or

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project will not physically divide an established community. The project site is designated as Limited Industrial Reserve in the Edison Community Plan and compatible with the community designations within and therefore 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: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The project is not in conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation of any agency with jurisdiction over the project and complies with the Edison Community Plan designating the subject parcels as Limited Industrial Reserve.

XII. MINERAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

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

XIII. NOISE

Would the project result in:

- A. Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project more than standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies; or

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

Noise from increased vehicular traffic on and around the project site during construction of the project site would be less than significant. Construction-related noises are expected to be short term and exempt from compliance with the Fresno County Noise Ordinance, provided construction activities occur between the hours of 6:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m. Monday through Friday and 7:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Saturday and Sunday.

- B. Generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels; or

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The project site is located within an industrial area. Noise related to generating excess ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels could potentially be problematic. A Project Note would require that the construction of the project shall comply with the

County Noise Ordinance regulations to reduce the likelihood of excess noise to less than significant impact.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project site is not near an airport to be subject to airport noise. the nearest public airport, Fresno Chandler Executive Airport, located five miles northwest of the project site.

XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING

Would the project:

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The proposed project facility will not result in any unplanned population growth.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

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

XV. PUBLIC SERVICES

Would the project:

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

1. Fire protection.
2. Police protection.
3. Schools.
4. Parks; or

5. Other public facilities?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The project will not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities.

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: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The proposed facility will not increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities nor include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment.

XVI. TRANSPORTATION

Would the project:

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The Design Division of the Fresno County Department of Public Works and Planning reviewed the proposal. As the anticipated daily traffic generated, is expected to be minimal, the project does not warrant the need for a Traffic Impact Study to be provided. A traffic management plan to determine the project's impacts to County roads and intersections. According to the traffic management and Vehicles Miles Traveled report, project construction is anticipated to occur over a six-month construction period with an average of five employees a day. In addition to employee trips, an estimated 30 delivery truck trips associated with equipment and materials will provide an increase in overall trip generation, however, would have a minimal impact on the average daily trip for construction related traffic and would not exceed the 110 trips per day threshold.

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

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

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

This proposal will not impair the implementation of, or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan.

XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED:

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

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

* **Mitigation Measure(s)**

3. *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.*

XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Would the project:

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

See discussion in Section VII. E. GEOLOGY AND SOILS and Section X. B. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY above. The project will not require new or expanded water facilities.

- 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:

The recycling facility would process and recycle its own water. All remaining water would be provided back to the client for mixing new drilling mud and filling hydro excavation tanks. Other than potable water used for onsite restrooms and breakrooms, the recycling facility does not plan to use large quantities of potable water. Based on typical employee potable water usage for bathrooms and breakrooms, it is estimated that the recycling facility will use between 15-20 gallons of potable water per day per worker. This totals to between 75 and 200 gallons per day. The water would be provided by a municipal water supply provider.

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

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

- D. Generate solid waste more than State or local standards, or more than the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals; or
- E. Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

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

XX. WILDFIRE

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

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

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

XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Would the project:

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project site is not located within an area of wildlife and wetlands.

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

Each of the projects located within Fresno County has been or would be analyzed for potential impacts, and appropriate project-specific Mitigation Measures are developed to reduce that project’s impacts to less than significant levels. Projects are required to comply with applicable County policies and ordinances. The incremental contribution by the proposed project to overall development in the area is less than significant.

The project will adhere to the permitting requirements and rules and regulations set forth by the Fresno County Grading and Drainage Ordinance, San Joaquin Air Pollution Control District, and California Code of Regulations Fire Code at the time development occurs on the property. No cumulatively considerable impacts relating to Agricultural and Forestry Resources, Air quality or Transportation were identified in the project analysis. Impacts identified for Aesthetics, Cultural Resources, and Transportation will be mitigated by compliance with the Mitigation Measures listed in Sections I., V., and XVII of this report.

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The project was analyzed for potential impacts, and appropriate project-specific Mitigation Measures have been developed to reduce project impacts to less than significant levels. The project is required to comply with applicable County policies and ordinances. The incremental contribution by the proposed project to overall development in the area is less than significant.

The project will adhere to the permitting requirements and rules and regulations set forth by the Fresno County Grading and Drainage Ordinance, the San Joaquin Air Pollution Control District, and the California Code of Regulations Fire Code. No cumulatively considerable impacts relating to Agricultural, and Forestry Resources, Air Quality, or Transportation were identified in the project analysis. Impacts identified for Aesthetics, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, and Energy will be addressed with the Mitigation Measures discussed above in Section I, Section IV, Section V and Section VI.

CONCLUSION/SUMMARY

Based upon Initial Study No. 8489 prepared for Unclassified Conditional Use Permit No. 3774, staff has concluded that the project will not have a significant effect on the environment.

No potential impacts were identified related to agricultural and forestry resources, population and housing, public services, land use and planning, and mineral resources.

Impacts related to aesthetics, air quality, geology and soils, greenhouse gas emissions, biological resources, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, noise, energy, transportation, recreation, utilities and service systems, and wildfire have been determined to be less than significant.

Impacts related to tribal cultural resources have been determined to be less than significant with adherence to the proposed Mitigation Measures.

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

AP

G:\4360Devs&Pln\PROJSEC\PROJDOCS\CUP\3700-3799\3774\CEQA\CUP 3774 IS Writeup.docx