



County of Fresno

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

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

- APPLICANT: Derrel's Mini Storage
- APPLICATION NOS.: Initial Study No. 8589 and Classified Conditional Use Permit No. 3805
- DESCRIPTION: Allow a personal/recreational vehicle storage facility on a 10-acre portion of a 19.55-acre parcel in the AL-20 (Limited Agricultural, 20-acre minimum parcel size) Zone District. The facility is planned to contain approximately 202,300 square feet of enclosed storage buildings, an approximately 2,543 square feet caretaker's residence and office building including a garage for the residents totaling 204,843 square feet.
- LOCATION: The subject parcel is located north of E. Bullard Ave., 0.25-miles west of N. Highland Ave., northerly adjacent from the City of Clovis. (553-060-34S) (Section 1 Township 13s Range 21e) (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?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

No scenic vistas, or scenic resources including topographical features, trees, rock outcroppings or historical buildings were identified in the analysis; additionally, the project site is not located along a 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: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

According to the applicant's operational statement, the proposed personal storage and recreational vehicle (RV) storage facility will occupy approximately 10 acres of a 19.55-acre site, including approximately 202,300 square feet of enclosed personal storage space, within separate buildings located along the perimeter and interior of the site, and 204,843 square feet combined, enclosed and RV storage area and carport area. The exterior of the facility will be enclosed by an eight-foot-six-inch tall stucco perimeter wall. The proposed caretaker's residence/office has a peak roof height of approximately 16 feet.

The subject parcel is currently vacant and surrounded by a mix of large agricultural parcels to the west and north and rural residential development to the south and is northerly adjacent to a planned residential community. Once construction is complete, the proposed development would represent a substantial increase in urban development in the area, however, surrounding zoning and current development indicate a trend toward a future increase in residential uses. The subject parcel is located north of the nearest city limits of the City of Clovis; however, it is not within the City of Clovis Sphere of Influence.

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The project proposes the installation of approximately 11, 35-foot tall poles, each with two (2) louvered security lights mounted at 30 feet, and security cameras mounted at 35 feet, building-mounted light fixtures and one high-pressure sodium light mounted on an approximately seven-foot-six-inch tall fixture. Future development proposals on the property could result in the creation of new sources of light and glare in the area and would be subject to Section 855-I.3.d. of the Zoning Ordinance, which requires outdoor lighting to be hooded, arranged and controlled so as not to cause a nuisance either to highway traffic or the living environment.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The subject parcels are located within the AL-20 (Limited Agricultural) Zone District which is partly intended to reserve certain lands for future urban uses and also limit agricultural uses that may be incompatible with surrounding non-agricultural uses. According to the Fresno County Important Farmlands Map, the subject property is designated as Farmland of Local Importance, which indicates land that is either currently producing or has the capability of production; but does not meet the criteria for Prime farmland, farmland of Statewide Importance or Unique farmland.

In Fresno County, Local Importance includes all farmable lands that do not meet the definitions of Prime, Statewide or Unique, and land that is or has been used for irrigated pasture, dryland farming, confined livestock, dairy, poultry facilities, aqua culture and grazing land, thus the project will not convert Prime or Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance to non-agricultural use. The subject parcel are not restricted under 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?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The subject property does not contain forestland or timberland, and is not zoned for forest land, or Timberland production, thus the project will not conflict with such zoning or result in the loss of or conversion of forest land.

- 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: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The project will convert approximately 19.55-acres of farmland to non-agricultural uses, however, as noted previously, the land is designated as limited agricultural. The Limited Agricultural designation serves as a reserve area for future urban uses. The subject property, although not within the Sphere of Influence of the City of Clovis, is northerly adjacent to the Sphere of Influence boundary, and land which is designated by the City of Clovis for future residential 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?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan. A measure for determining if the project is consistent with the air quality plans is if the project would not result in an increase in the frequency or severity of existing air quality violations, cause or contribute to new violations, or delay timely attainment of air quality standards or the interim emission reductions specified in the air quality plans.

Based on the Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions Technical Analysis by Johnson, Johnson, and Miler Air Quality Consulting Services, dated February 11, 2025, the project's construction regional emissions would not exceed SJVAPCD's regional criteria pollutant emissions quantitative thresholds. Similarly, emissions of ROG, NOX, CO, SOX, PM10 or PM2.5 during operations would not exceed any applicable threshold of significance in either buildout scenario analyzed. Additionally, it is noted in the analysis that the project complies with all applicable rules and regulations from the applicable air quality plans; therefore, the project is consistent with and would not obstruct implementation of the Air Quality Plan. Therefore, the project would be considered less than significant.

- 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: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment status under applicable federal or state ambient air quality standards.

- C. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

Based on comments from the Air District, this proposal is not expected to produce substantial pollutant concentrations, affecting sensitive receptors or result in other emissions which would adversely affect a substantial number of people. The project does not contain sources that would produce substantial quantities of SO2 emissions during construction and operation. Modeling conducted for the project shows that SO2 emissions are below the Air District's (GAMAQI) thresholds. Emissions from all phases

of construction in each year are below the significance thresholds. The project may potentially expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. The nearest sensitive receptor is a residence located approximately 280 feet south of the project site.

Based on the Traffic Impact Study completed by Peters Engineering Group in November of 2024, project construction would result in minor increases in traffic for the surrounding roads. Once the project becomes operational, vehicles accessing the site would also result in a minor increase in overall daily traffic trips on the surrounding roads but would not substantially reduce the Level of Service (LOS). Therefore, the project would not significantly exceed state or federal CO standards.

The proposed personal storage and recreational vehicle storage facility is not a use that would generate substantial toxic air contaminant emissions. Traffic generation from proposed the mini storage is minimal and the volume of truck traffic is low. The proposed facility includes a caretaker's residence.

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

Odor impacts on residential areas and other sensitive receptors, such as hospitals, day-care centers, schools, warrant consideration, however, consideration should also be given to other land uses where people may congregate, such as recreational facilities, worksites, and commercial areas. The proposed project is located near residences; however, it is also in an area of agricultural uses where emissions may generate odors.

According to the screening table for land use types that are potential odor generators. available on the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District's website, the proposed mini storage facility would not be a source of odors. Construction activities will involve various diesel-powered vehicles and equipment which would create localized emissions and odors. However, emission would be temporary and not likely be noticeable for extended periods, beyond the project boundaries. Therefore, the potential for odor impacts, including those generated by diesel emissions, would be less than significant.

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?

- 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: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

There were no State or Federally protected wetlands on or in the vicinity of the project site. The memorandum also included a review of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS), Wetland Mapper tool, which indicated that there are no FWS mapped wetlands on the subject parcel.

- 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:

No native or migratory fish or wildlife species, or migratory wildlife corridors were observed on the project site, nor are there any wildlife nurseries or fisheries were identified on or in the vicinity of the project site.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project will not conflict with local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources. No such policies or ordinances, applicable to the subject property were identified in the analysis. The project site consists of open cultivated farmland, which is currently fallow, no trees were observed on the site.

- 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 is located within the PG&E San Joaquin Valley Operation and Maintenance Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP), which is limited to PG&E maintenance activities. The project will not conflict with this HCP or any other adopted or approved HCP or Natural Community Conservation Plan.

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: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

With adherence to standard construction practices, energy usage during all three construction phases is not anticipated to be wasteful, inefficient or unnecessary, nor conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency.

The project will be subject to Title 24, California Code of Regulations (CCR) of the California Building Standards Code, and Part 11 of Title 24, California Green Building Standards (CAL Green) Code; which contains regulations on energy production, fuels, and motor vehicles that apply to both new and existing development.

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: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT 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.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The proposed project will entail grading of a majority of the 19.55-acre site and the addition of a substantial amount of impervious surface area, consisting of buildings and paved parking and access drives. Any grading proposed with this project will require a grading permit or grading voucher, which will be reviewed to ensure that substantial erosion does not result.

- C. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of project development, 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 the County that is subject to on or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse.

- 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 parcel is not located in an area of expansive soils as identified by Figure 7-1 of the Fresno County General Plan Background Report (FCGPBR), which is a generalized location.

- 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:

The project proposes the installation of an onsite wastewater treatment system to serve the caretakers residence. The system will require permitting from the County of Fresno to ensure that the soils are capable of supporting the septic tank.

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED:

The subject property is not located in an area of moderate or high sensitivity for archaeological resources. A cultural resources assessment completed for the project, found no unique paleontological or geological resources on the subject property. However, in the unlikely event that such resource is discovered during excavation, the project will be required to follow mitigation procedures.

* **Mitigation Measure(s)**

1. *See Mitigation Measure 1, Section V, above.*

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?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

An Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions Technical Analysis was done by Johnson Johnson and Miler Air Quality Consulting Services for this project and have concluded the project would generate direct and indirect greenhouse gas (GHG)

emissions; however, these emissions would not result in a significant impact on the environment. In the Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Analysis prepared for this project, GHG emissions were estimated using the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) 2016.3.2. Emissions generated for all phases of construction were based on a 30-year project lifespan assumption.

- 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:

The proposed mini storage facility is a low energy consumption use and is not subject to state energy efficiency standards; however, the caretaker's residence and office will be required to comply with state energy efficiency standards. The proposed facility is also subject to the California Green Building Standards Code.

The project complies with applicable regulations adopted to achieve the AB 32, 2020 target and would not interfere or conflict with the State's ability to implement regulations and programs to reduce GHG emissions. Additionally, considering the proposed project's emissions, consistency with the SB 32 Scoping Plan measures, and the progress being made by the state in achieving emissions reduction goals, the project would be consistent with the State's AB 32 and SB 32 goals, and not impact the attainment of those goal.

IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Would the project:

- A. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials; or
- B. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment; or
- 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 does not involve the handling of hazardous materials as part of the operation of the proposed personal storage and recreational vehicle storage facility. Additionally, this project will be subject to the provisions of the California Health and Safety Code (HSC), which requires that any business that handles a hazardous material or hazardous waste may be required to submit a Hazardous Materials Business Plan online, through the Cal EPA, California Environmental Reporting System (CERS). All hazardous waste shall be handled in accordance with the California HSC, Title 22,

Division 4.5. The nearest school to the project site is Red Bank Elementary School, located approximately 1.25 miles southwest from the subject 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 a search of the Environmental Protection Agency's NEPAAssist tool, and the California Environmental Protection Agency's (Cal EPA), Department of Toxic Substances Control, EnviroStor mapping tool, the proposed project is not located on or near a known hazardous material 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?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, the closest airport is Fresno Yosemite International Airport which is 5.15- miles from the project: therefore will not result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing of working in the project area.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The subject property is not located within an area subject to an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan; therefore, the project will not impair implementation of or physically interfere with any such 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 subject property is not within a wildland fire area or State Responsibility Area (SRA).

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?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project is not expected to violate any water quality standards.

- 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 project is not anticipated to impact groundwater supplies or recharge. The proposed facility is projected to use approximately 150 gallons per day for operation, and domestic use associated with the on-site caretaker's residence and public restroom.

- 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:

- i. Result in substantial erosion or siltation on, or off-site?
- ii. Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite?
- iii. 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
- iv. Impede or redirect flood flows?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The project is not anticipated to result in substantial off-site erosion or siltation, increase the rate of surface runoff, resulting in offsite flooding, create or contribute storm water runoff that would exceed existing or planned drainage capacity, or create substantial sources of polluted runoff. The project does entail the addition of impervious surfaces; however, an on-site drainage basin is proposed to manage increased run off from the proposed facility.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

Portions of the project site are subject to flooding from the two-percent chance (50 year) storm event; however the subject property is not located with a flood hazard, tsunami or

seiche zone. To handle additional storm runoff created by the increase in impervious surfaces the project proposes an on-site drainage basin, to be located at the southwest corner of the facility.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project will not conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan. The project was reviewed by the Fresno County Department of Public Works and Planning, Water and Natural Resources Division 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.

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: NO IMPACT:

The project will not physically divide an established community; the immediate area, within one-quarter mile of the project site contains a mix of farmland to the north and west, rural residential development to the south, southwest and southeast, and higher density residential development. The project will not conflict with any land use plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect; the proposed use is allowed with discretionary approval in unincorporated areas of the County which are within one-half mile of the sphere of influence of the City of Clovis. In the case of this application, the project site is easterly adjacent to the City of Clovis sphere of influence boundary.

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:

The project site is not located within any known mineral resource zones as identified by Figures 7-7 through 7-11 of the Fresno County General Plan Background Report (FCGPBR).

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

There will be minor increases in the ambient noise level due to construction and operation of the facility. The new use will not cause excessive ground-borne vibration or exceed the County's noise ordinance.

- 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?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan, or within two miles of a public airport, and therefore will not expose people in the project area to excessive noise levels.

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 population growth, as no new infrastructure, residential or commercial development, other than the proposed mini storage facility, is proposed with

this project. The project will not displace any people or a substantial amount of housing in the area. The subject property is agriculturally zoned which prohibits residential subdivisions.

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:

The project will not require the provision of or create the need for 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: NO IMPACT:

The project will not require the construction of new or expansion of existing recreational facilities, nor increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks.

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?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION
INCORPORATED:

A Traffic Impact Study (TIS) dated November 20, 2024, was prepared for this project by Peters Engineering Group, per the recommendation from the Fresno County Department of Public Works and Planning, Transportation Division. The TIS evaluated three surrounding street intersections as well as the proposed site entrance off of Bullard Avenue, during weekday (7:00-9:00) A.M. and (4:00-6:00) P.M. peak hours, to determine the existing traffic conditions and anticipated conditions from the project.

Data from the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual are typically used to estimate the number of traffic trips anticipated to be generated by the project, the trip generation calculations utilize ITE Land Use 151, Mini-Warehouse. Rates are reported in trips per 1,000 square feet of net rentable area.

The Traffic Impact Analysis evaluated the project traffic impacts based on the Level of Service (LOS) model, which is a quantification of performance measures that relate to quality of service from the drivers perspective, measured using an A-F scale, representing the best (LOS A) to worst (LOS F) operating conditions for a particular segment of roadway, as defined by the Transportation Research Board, Highway Capacity Manual, 2010 (HCM 2010). LOS A, B and C are considered acceptable within the County areas that are not within a city sphere of influence (SOI), and LOS D for those areas that are.

In this case, the project site is located easterly adjacent to the boundary of the City of Clovis SOI. A project is considered to have a significant impact, if the traffic increase attributed to the project, when combined with the existing conditions, would cause the current Level of Service (LOS) on a roadway segment, or a signalized or unsignalized intersection, to deteriorate below an acceptable LOS for the given area.

The conclusions of the TIS found that the project would not cause a significant change in the current LOS conditions or after implementation of the project at the studied intersections and will continue to operate at acceptable LOS with acceptable calculated 95th-percentile queues during the studied time periods.

However, it is noted in the analysis, the conditions after the construction of the project, reflect the intersection of Bullard Avenue and DeWolf Avenue is expected to operate worse than the target LOS during both peak hours. The other studied intersections are expected to continue to operate at acceptable LOS. The analysis state the intersection of Bullard and DeWolf Avenues would operate at acceptable LOS with signalization, protected left-turn phasing, with the below lane configurations:

Eastbound: one left-turn lane and one through lane with a shared right turn;
Westbound: one left-turn lane and one through lane with a shared right turn;

Northbound: one left-turn lane and one through lane with a shared right turn;
Southbound: one left-turn lane and one through lane with a shared right turn.

The project is anticipated to contribute a low number of trips to each cumulative significant impact. To mitigate its share of the significant impacts, the following mitigation measure has been included.

* **Mitigation Measure(s)**

1. *The project shall be required to pay a fair share of the cost of the future construction to the improvements called for in the Traffic Impact Study for the intersection of DeWolf and Bullard Avenues for its share of the cumulative traffic issues. Evidence of payment to the City of Clovis shall be provided prior to the issuance of any development permits.*

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

Regarding Vehicle Miles Travelled (VMT), the Traffic Impact Study referenced the State of California Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR) guidance in evaluating a projects VMT impacts in under CEQA, which indicates that residential, office and retail projects typically have the greatest influence on VMT.

The CEQA guidelines defines vehicle miles travelled as the "amount and distance of automobile travel attributable to a project. OPR guidance provides that, absent substantial evidence supporting the conclusion that a project would generate a potentially significant level of VM, or is inconsistent with a Sustainable Communities Strategy or General Plan; projects generate or attract fewer than 110 trips per day generally may be considered to result in a less than significant transportation impact. CEQA guidelines also state that, projects that decrease vehicle miles travelled, in the project area compared to existing conditions, should be presumed to have a less than significant transportation impact.

The TIS concludes that mini-warehouse facilities are typically located strategically near areas in need of such facilities. By adding mini-warehousing opportunities into the existing and developing residential fabric and thereby improving destination proximity, local-serving Mini warehousing development tends to shorten trips and reduce VMT. Additionally as there are only two employees living on site, the office component of the this facility is ancillary to the use and does not generate additional office-type trips, as such, office and employee trips will be substantially less than the threshold of 110 trips per day which is presumed to result in a less than significant transportation impact.

C. Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The proposed facility will have a gated entrance, accessible from Bullard Avenue located approximately 600 feet of its intersection with Leonard Avenue. A Traffic Impact Study (TIS) prepared for the project concluded that the project as proposed will not create a significant impact on traffic, nor increase hazards to traffic due to design features.

Based on a review of the applicant's site plan, the entrance to the proposed facility consists of a 35-foot-wide driveway off Bullard Avenue, leading to a small parking area with an electronically controlled gate just beyond. The trip generation analysis portion of the TIS indicate that a left-turn lane at the site access driveway from eastbound Bullard Avenue is not warranted.

D. Result in inadequate emergency access?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

Gate access will be subject to current Fresno County Fire Protection District requirements pertaining to emergency access and the current Fire Code. The Fresno County Fire Protection District reviewed this proposal and did not identify any concerns.

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: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED:

Under the provisions of Assembly Bill (AB) 52, the County was required to provide notice of the preparation of this Initial Study to Native American Tribes who had previously indicated interest

in reviewing CEQA projects. Notices were sent on April 22, 2015 to representatives of the Dumna Wo Wah, Table Mountain Rancheria, Santa Rosa Rancheria Tachi-Yokut Tribe and the Picayune Rancheria of the Chukchansi Indians. None of the Tribal Governments responded.

The project site is not located in an area of archaeological sensitivity and no cultural resources inventory was recommended by any reviewing agency.; however, the potential exists for undiscovered subsurface, cultural resources to be discovered during ground disturbance. Therefore, the following mitigation measure is proposed to reduce impacts to yet unknown tribal cultural resources to a less than significant level.

* **Mitigation Measure(s)**

2. See Mitigation Measure 1, Section V, above.

XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Would the project:

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

No wastewater facilities are planned. The project will entail the construction of a new drainage basin to be in the northeast portion of the facility, to handle the increase water runoff generated by addition of impervious surfaces, parking areas, access roads and buildings, associated with construction of the facility. There are no major electrical, gas or telecommunications distribution facilities proposed with this application.

- 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:

Per the applicant's operational statement, the project is anticipated to use approximately 150 gallons of water per day during operation of the facility, which will be supplied by an onsite well. The subject property is not located in an area of the County designated as water-short, and no concerns related to water supply were raised by any reviewing agencies or County departments.

- 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:

Wastewater generated by the project will be handled by a proposed on-site septic system. Septic system placement, expansion areas and capacity will be subject to the provisions of California Plumbing Code, and the Fresno County Local Area Management Program (LAMP), which regulates the design, installation, and operation of on-site wastewater treatment systems (OWTS).

- 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 proposed facility is not anticipated to exceed State or local standards, or the capacity of local infrastructure, or impair attainment of solid waste reduction goals. The project will be required to comply with federal, state and local solid waste reduction statutes, and Chapter 8.20.060 of the Fresno County Ordinance Code, which relates to solid waste removal.

XX. WILDFIRE

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

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The subject property is not located in a State Responsibility Area, or in an area of increased wildfire risk; as such the project will not impair any adopted emergency

response or evacuation plans, nor impair telecommunications facilities, or the construction or relocation thereof. The subject parcel is located in area of relatively flat terrain with, a combination of open irrigated farmland, orchards, and some residential subdivisions, and no substantial slopes. The project will not require the installation or maintenance of infrastructure that would exacerbate fire risk or expose people or structures to post-fire slope instability or flooding.

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 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)?

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.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

No environmental effects which would result in adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly were identified in the analysis.

CONCLUSION/SUMMARY

Based upon the Initial Study prepared for Unclassified Conditional Use Permit Application No. 3805, staff has concluded that the project will not/will have a significant effect on the environment. It has been determined that there would be no impacts to Land Use and Planning, Mineral Resources, Population and Housing, Public Services, Recreation and Wildfire.

Potential impacts related to Aesthetics, Agriculture and Forestry, Noise, Air Quality, Energy, Geology and Soils, Greenhouse Gases, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Hydrology and Water Quality have been determined to be less than significant.

Potential impacts relating to Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, and Tribal Cultural Resources, and Transportation have been determined to be less than significant with compliance with the included 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" Street, Fresno, California.

AA

G:\4360Devs&Pln\PROJSEC\PROJDOCS\CUP\3800-3899\3805\CEQA\CUP 3805 IS WU.docx