E201910000438

County of Fresno

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

FILED
DEC 16 2019 TIME 11:12 AM
FRESNO COUNTY CLERK
By _____ DEPUTY

For County Clerk's Stamp

NOTICE OF INTENT TO ADOPT A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

Notice is hereby given that the County of Fresno has prepared Initial Study Application (IS) No. 7326 pursuant to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act for the following proposed project:

INITIAL STUDY APPLICATION NO. 7326, proposing the replacement of two structurally deficient bridges on Manning Avenue: the James Bypass Overflow Bridge Nos. 42C0066 and 42C0067. The scope of work includes placing an asphalt concrete overlay on approximately 790 feet of Manning Avenue to match the approach work associated with the proposed new bridges and complete the previously placed asphalt concrete overlay outside the current project limits, excavation for new abutments and wingwalls, and PG&E improvements to a section of gas main. The proposed project would increase public safety by replacing the existing structurally deficient bridges with bridges built to current design standards. The project site is located on West Manning Avenue approximately 2.60 miles east of the nearest city limits of the City of San Joaquin and approximately 3.50-miles west of State Route 145 (South Madera Avenue).

(hereafter, the "Proposed Project").

The County of Fresno has determined that it is appropriate to adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Proposed Project. The purpose of this Notice is to (1) provide notice of the availability of IS Application No. 7326 and the draft Mitigated Negative Declaration, and request written comments thereon; and (2) provide notice of the public hearing regarding the Proposed Project.

Public Comment Period

The County of Fresno will receive written comments on the Proposed Project and Mitigated Negative Declaration from December 18, 2019 through January 17, 2020.

Email written comments to jshaw@fresnocountyca.gov, or mail comments to:

Fresno County Department of Public Works and Planning
Development Services and Capital Projects Division
Attn: Jeremy Shaw
2220 Tulare Street, Suite A
Fresno, CA 93721

IS Application No. 7326 and the draft Mitigated Negative Declaration may be viewed at the above address Monday through Thursday, 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., and Friday, 8:30 a.m. to

12:30 p.m. (except holidays), or at http://www.co.fresno.ca.us/InitialStudies. An electronic copy of the draft Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Proposed Project may be obtained from Jeremy Shaw at the addresses above.

Public Hearing

The Board of Supervisors will hold a public hearing to consider approving the Proposed Project and the Mitigated Negative Declaration on January 21, 2020 at 9:00 a.m., or as soon thereafter as possible, in Room 301, Hall of Records, 2281 Tulare Street, Fresno, California 93721. Interested persons are invited to appear at the hearing and comment on the Proposed Project and draft Mitigated Negative Declaration.

For questions please call Jeremy Shaw (559) 600-4207.

Published: December 18, 2019

Print Form

Appendix C

Notice of Completion & Environmental Document Transmittal

Mail to: State Clearinghouse, P.O. Box 3044, Sacramento, CA 95812-3044 (916) 445-0613
For Hand Delivery/Street Address: 1400 Tenth Street, Sacramento, CA 95814

SCH #

Project Title: Initial Study No. 7326, James Bypass Bridge Replacement Project

Lead Agency: Fresno County | Contact Person: Jeremy Shaw
Mailing Address: 2220 Tulare Street. 6th Floor | Phone: 559-600-4207
City: Fresno | Zip: 93721 | County: Fresno

Project Location: County: Fresno | City/Nearest Community: San Joaquin
Cross Streets: West Manning Avenue and West Adams Avenue | Zip Code: 93630
Longitude/Latitude (degrees, minutes and seconds): 36 ° 38 ′ 51 ″ N / 119 ° 26 ′ 10 ″ W | Total Acres:
Assessor's Parcel No.: Public Right of Way/ No APN | Section: 28 | Twp.: 15 S | Range: 17 E | Base: MDBM
Within 2 Miles: State Hwy #: N/A | Waterways: James Bypass and Overflow Channel
Airports: N/A | Railways: N/A | Schools: N/A

Document Type:

CEQA: ☐ NOP ☐ Early Cons ☐ Neg Dec ☒ Mit Neg Dec ☐ Draft EIR ☐ Supplement/Subsequent EIR (Prior SCH No.) ☐ Other:
NEPA: ☐ NOI ☐ EA ☐ Draft EIS ☐ FONSI
Other: ☐ Joint Document ☐ Final Document ☐ Other:

Local Action Type:

☐ General Plan Update ☐ General Plan Amendment ☐ General Plan Element ☐ Community Plan
☐ Specific Plan ☐ Master Plan ☐ Planned Unit Development ☐ Site Plan
☐ Rezone ☐ Prezone ☐ Use Permit ☐ Land Division (Subdivision, etc.)
☐ Annexation ☐ Redevelopment ☐ Coastal Permit ☒ Other: Bridge Replacem

Development Type:

☐ Residential: Units ____ Acres ____
☐ Office: Sq.ft. ____ Acres ____ Employees ____
☐ Commercial: Sq.ft. ____ Acres ____ Employees ____
☐ Industrial: Sq.ft. ____ Acres ____ Employees ____
☐ Educational: ____
☐ Recreational: ____
☐ Water Facilities: Type ____ MGD ____
☐ Transportation: Type ____
☐ Mining: Mineral ____
☐ Power: Type ____ MW ____
☐ Waste Treatment: Type ____ MGD ____
☐ Hazardous Waste: Type ____
☐ Other: ____

Project Issues Discussed in Document:

☒ Aesthetic/Visual ☒ Agricultural Land ☒ Air Quality ☒ Archeological/Historical ☒ Biological Resources ☐ Coastal Zone ☒ Drainage/Absorption ☐ Economic/Jobs
☐ Fiscal ☒ Flood Plain/Flooding ☒ Forest Land/Fire Hazard ☒ Geologic/Seismic ☒ Minerals ☒ Noise ☒ Population/Housing Balance ☒ Public Services/Facilities
☒ Recreation/Parks ☒ Schools/Universities ☒ Septic Systems ☒ Sewer Capacity ☒ Soil Erosion/Compaction/Grading ☒ Solid Waste ☒ Toxic/Hazardous ☒ Traffic/Circulation
☒ Vegetation ☒ Water Quality ☒ Water Supply/Groundwater ☒ Wetland/Riparian ☒ Growth Inducement ☒ Land Use ☒ Cumulative Effects ☒ Other: Greenhouse Gases

Present Land Use/Zoning/General Plan Designation:

AE-20 (Exclusive Agricultural, 20-acre minimum parcel size)/Agriculture

Project Description: *(please use a separate page if necessary)*

The project proposes the replacement of two structurally deficient bridges on Manning Avenue: the James Bypass Overflow Bridge Nos. 42C0066 and 42C0067. The scope of work includes placing an asphalt concrete overlay on approximately 790 feet of Manning Avenue to match the approach work associated with the proposed new bridges and complete the previously placed asphalt concrete overlay previously placed and lying outside the current project limits. The propose project would increase public safety by replacing the existing structurally deficient bridges with bridges built to current design standards.

Note: The State Clearinghouse will assign identification numbers for all new projects. If a SCH number already exists for a project (e.g. Notice of Preparation or previous draft document) please fill in.

Reviewing Agencies Checklist

Lead Agencies may recommend State Clearinghouse distribution by marking agencies below with and "X".
If you have already sent your document to the agency please denote that with an "S".

X	Air Resources Board		Office of Historic Preservation
X	Boating & Waterways, Department of		Office of Public School Construction
	California Emergency Management Agency		Parks & Recreation, Department of
	California Highway Patrol		Pesticide Regulation, Department of
X	Caltrans District #6		Public Utilities Commission
	Caltrans Division of Aeronautics	X	Regional WQCB #
	Caltrans Planning		Resources Agency
	Central Valley Flood Protection Board		Resources Recycling and Recovery, Department of
	Coachella Valley Mtns. Conservancy		S.F. Bay Conservation & Development Comm.
	Coastal Commission		San Gabriel & Lower L.A. Rivers & Mtns. Conservancy
	Colorado River Board		San Joaquin River Conservancy
X	Conservation, Department of		Santa Monica Mtns. Conservancy
	Corrections, Department of		State Lands Commission
	Delta Protection Commission	X	SWRCB: Clean Water Grants
	Education, Department of	X	SWRCB: Water Quality
	Energy Commission		SWRCB: Water Rights
	Fish & Game Region #		Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
X	Food & Agriculture, Department of		Toxic Substances Control, Department of
	Forestry and Fire Protection, Department of		Water Resources, Department of
	General Services, Department of		
	Health Services, Department of		Other:
	Housing & Community Development		Other:
	Native American Heritage Commission		

Local Public Review Period (to be filled in by lead agency)

Starting Date December 18, 2019 Ending Date January 17, 2020

Lead Agency (Complete if applicable):

Consulting Firm: Fresno County
Address: 2220 Tulare Street, 6th Floor
City/State/Zip: Fresno, CA 93721
Contact: Jeremy Shaw
Phone: 559-600-4207

Applicant: Fresno County Design Division
Address: 2220 Tulare Street, 6th Floor
City/State/Zip: Fresno, CA 93721
Phone: 559-600-4530

Signature of Lead Agency Representative: Jeremy Shaw **Date:** 12-16-19

Authority cited: Section 21083, Public Resources Code. Reference: Section 21161, Public Resources Code.

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

INITIAL STUDY
ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

1. **Project title:**
   James Bypass Bridge Replacement Project, Initial Study No. 7326
   Federal Project No. BRLO-5942[212]
   State Bridge No. 42C-0066 and 42C-0067
   County No. FRE-040501

2. **Lead agency name and address:**
   Fresno County Department of Public Works and Planning
   Development Services Division
   2220 Tulare Street, 6th Floor, Fresno CA 93721-2104

3. **Contact person and phone number:**
   Jeremy Shaw, (559) 600-4207

4. **Project location:**
   The project site is located on Manning Avenue, approximately 2.60-miles east of the nearest city limits of the City of San Joaquin and approximately 3.60-miles west of State Route 145 (South Madera Avenue).

5. **Project sponsor's name and address:**
   Fresno County Design Division

6. **General Plan designation:**
   Agriculture

7. **Zoning:**
   AE-20 (Exclusive Agricultural, 20-acre minimum parcel size) Zone District

8. **Description of project: (Describe the whole action involved, including, but not limited to, later phases of the project, and any secondary, support, or off-site features necessary for its implementation. Attach additional sheets if necessary.)**

   The project proposes the replacement of two structurally deficient bridges on Manning Avenue: the James Bypass Overflow Bridge Nos. 42C0066 and 42C0067. The scope of work includes placing an asphalt concrete overlay on approximately 790 feet of Manning Avenue to match the approach work associated with the proposed new bridges and complete the previously placed asphalt concrete overlay outside the current project limits, excavation for new abutments and wingwalls, and PG&E improvements to a section of gas main. The proposed project would increase public safety by replacing the existing structurally deficient bridges with bridges built to current design standards.

9. **Surrounding land uses and setting: Briefly describe the project's surroundings:**
   Adjacent land uses active agricultural production fields and very low-density single-family residential development.

10. **Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement.)**
    None

11. Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1? If so, is there a plan for consultation that includes, for example, the determination of significance of impacts to tribal cultural resources, procedures regarding confidentiality, etc.?

NOTE: Conducting consultation early in the CEQA process allows tribal governments, lead agencies, and project proponents to discuss the level of environmental review, identify and address potential adverse impacts to tribal cultural resources, and reduce the potential for delay and conflict in the environmental review process. (See Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.2.) Information may also be available from the California Native American Heritage Commission's Sacred Lands File per Public Resources Code Section 5097.96 and the California Historical Resources Information System administered by the California Office of Historic Preservation. Please also note that Public Resources Code Section 21082.3(c) contains provisions specific to confidentiality.

Per Assembly Bill 52 (AB52), participating California Native American Tribes, which had previously requested notification of land use projects were notified of the project and given the opportunity to enter consultation with the County regarding the proposal pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1; Of the four tribes that were notified, (Dumna Wo Wah, Picayune Rancheria of the Chuckchansi Indians, Santa Rosa Rancheria Tachi Yokut Tribe, and Table Mountain Rancheria).

On September 7, 2017, County Staff received a request for consultation on this project from the Dumna Wo Wah Tribal Government. On September 19, 2017 County Staff provided a written response to the request and subsequently, however, no further correspondence relating to this project was received by County Staff. On November 29, 2018, an email was sent to Dumna Wo Wah Tribal representatives requesting that the Tribe provide evidence establishing the existence of Tribal Cultural Resources on the project site which satisfy the criteria of Public Resources Code section 21074(a)(2). The requested due date for Tribal representatives to provide such evidence was December 13, 2018. To date no response has been received by County Staff.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- ☐ Aesthetics
- ☐ Agriculture and Forestry Resources
- ☐ Air Quality
- ☐ Biological Resources
- ☐ Cultural Resources
- ☐ Energy
- ☐ Geology/Soils
- ☐ Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- ☐ Hazards & Hazardous Materials
- ☐ Hydrology/Water Quality
- ☐ Land Use/Planning
- ☐ Mineral Resources
- ☐ Noise
- ☐ Population/Housing
- ☐ Public Services
- ☐ Recreation
- ☐ Transportation
- ☐ Tribal Cultural Resources
- ☐ Utilities/Service Systems
- ☐ Wildfire
- ☐ Mandatory Findings of Significance

DETERMINATION OF REQUIRED ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT:

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

☐ I find that the proposed project **COULD NOT** have a significant effect on the environment. **A NEGATIVE DECLARATION WILL BE PREPARED**.

☒ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because the Mitigation Measures described on the attached sheet have been added to the project. **A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION WILL BE PREPARED.**

☐ I find the proposed project **MAY** have a significant effect on the environment, and an **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required

☐ I find that as a result of the proposed project, no new effects could occur, or new Mitigation Measures would be required that have not been addressed within the scope of a previous Environmental Impact Report.

PERFORMED BY:

Jeremy Shaw, Planner

Date: 12-16-19

REVIEWED BY:

M Mollring

Marianne Mollring, Senior Planner

Date: 12-16-19

INITIAL STUDY
ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM
Initial Study Application No. 7326

The following checklist is used to determine if the proposed project could potentially have a significant effect on the environment. Explanations and information regarding each question follow the checklist.

1 = No Impact

2 = Less Than Significant Impact

3 = Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated

4 = Potentially Significant Impact

I. AESTHETICS

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

1 a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

2 b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?

2 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 a 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?

1 d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

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:

1 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?

1 b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act Contract?

1 c) Conflict with existing zoning for forest land, timberland or timberland zoned Timberland Production?

1 d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

1 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?

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:

2 a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable Air Quality Plan?

2 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?

2 c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

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

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

3 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?

2 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?

1 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?

1 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?

1 e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?

1 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?

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

3 a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?

3 b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?

3 c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

VI. ENERGY

Would the project:

2 a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources during project construction or operation?

1 b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?

VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Would the project:

a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

1 i) 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?

1 ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?

1 iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

1 iv) Landslides?

2 b) Result in substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil?

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

2 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?

1 e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?

1 f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Would the project:

2 a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?

2 b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Would the project:

3 a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?

3 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?

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

1 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, create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

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

1 f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

1 g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?

X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Would the project:

3 a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality?

1 b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?

2 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?

2 i) Result in substantial erosion or siltation on or off site;

2 ii) Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on or off site;

2 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

2 iv) Impede or redirect flood flows?

2 d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?

1 e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?

XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING

Would the project:

1 a) Physically divide an established community?

1 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?

XII. MINERAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

1 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?

1 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?

XIII. NOISE

Would the project result in:

1 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?

1 b) Generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels?

1 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, exposing people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING

Would the project:

1 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)?

1 b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

XV. PUBLIC SERVICES

Would the project:

1 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 i) Fire protection?

1 ii) Police protection?

1 iii) Schools?

1 iv) Parks?

1 v) Other public facilities?

XVI. RECREATION

Would the project:

1 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?

1 b) Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

XVII. TRANSPORTATION

Would the project:

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

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

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

2 d) Result in inadequate emergency access?

XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

3 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:

3 i) 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

3 ii) 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.)

XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Would the project:

2 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?

1 b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?

1 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?

1 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?

1 e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

XX. WILDFIRE

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

1 a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

2 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?

1 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?

1 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?

XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Would the project:

3 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?

2 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.)

2 c) Have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

Documents Referenced:

This Initial Study is referenced by the documents listed below. These documents are available for public review at the County of Fresno, Department of Public Works and Planning, Development Services and Capital Projects Division, 2220 Tulare Street, Suite A, Fresno, California (corner of M & Tulare Streets).

Fresno County General Plan, Policy Document and Final EIR
Fresno County Zoning Ordinance
Important Farmland 2016 Map, State Department of Conservation

JS
G:\4360Devs&Pln\PROJSEC\PROJDOCS\Environmental\Initial Studies - Environmental Assessments\7000-7999\IS 7326 James Bypass Bridge Replacement\IS CEQA\CEQA 2019\IS 7326 IS Cklst.docx

County of Fresno

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

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

APPLICANT: Fresno County Department of Public Works and Planning, Design Division

APPLICATION NO. Initial Study Application No. 7326

DESCRIPTION: The project proposes the replacement of two structurally deficient bridges on Manning Avenue: the James Bypass Overflow Bridge Nos. 42C0066 and 42C0067. The scope of work includes placing an asphalt concrete overlay on approximately 790 feet of Manning Avenue to match the approach work associated with the proposed new bridges and complete the previously placed asphalt concrete overlay outside the current project limits, excavation for new abutments and wingwalls, and PG&E improvements to a section of gas main. The proposed project would increase public safety by replacing the existing structurally deficient bridges with bridges built to current design standards.

LOCATION: The project site is located on Manning Avenue, approximately 2.60-miles east of the nearest city limits of the City of San Joaquin, and approximately 3.50-miles west of State Route 145 (South Madera Avenue).

I. AESTHETICS

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

A. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The Fresno County General Plan has not identified any scenic vistas within the project area, nor have any of the reviewing agencies/departments. The land surrounding the project limits includes agricultural land, aquatic habitat (James Bypass) rural habitat, and rural/developed areas/roadways. The surrounding agricultural land in the region includes irrigated pastures, vineyards, orchards, and row crops.

This project will replace the two existing bridges; the western Bridge No. 42C0066, is a concrete channel beam structure with six spans and a concrete precast panel deck and is approximately 184 feet long and 37 feet wide. The eastern Bridge No. 42C0067 is a concrete channel beam structure with three spans and concrete precast panel deck and

is approximately 74 feet long, by 37 feet wide. The replacement for the western bridge is a 44-foot-wide, by 180-foot-long three-span precast and pre-stressed voided slab bridge with outrigger type, pile-foundations and type 736 barrier rails.

The replacement for the eastern bridge is a 44-foot-wide, by 70-foot-long single-span precast pre-stressed voided slab bridge with outrigger pile foundations and type 736 barrier rails. The two proposed bridges would be constructed concurrently and will be raised approximately 1 foot above the height of the existing bridges. This increase in height will not obstruct any existing sight lines in this area, and therefore have no impact on any scenic vistas.

Up to 25 feet of soil would need to be excavated for the construction of the new abutments and wingwalls near the top of the channel embankments. Pile excavation is anticipated to require up to 120 feet of excavation.

Pacific Gas and Electric Co. (PG&E) is proposing to retire and replace a section of 4" Gas Transmission Line 111A-1 in place and remove two main line valves - Valve 3.79 and Valve 3.88. As part of the pipeline retirement activities, PG&E will remove sections of existing gas line attached to the James Irrigation Canal, Bridge No. 42C0065 and the James Bypass West Channel Bridge (Bridge No. 42C0066) on Manning Avenue as requested by the County of Fresno for the James Bypass Overflow Bridge Replacement Project.

PG&E will install a new 4" replacement line, approximately 1,200 feet in length via Horizontal Direction Drill (HDD) north of the existing gas line within the County Right of Way. Installation of the new line will require excavation of a drill entry pit on the east side James Bypass West Channel bridge (Bridge No. 42C0066) within the upland area of the Bypass. The entry pit will measure approximately 15 feet wide, by 15 feet long, by 6 feet deep, and will require a temporary construction and staging area approximately 70 feet wide, by 180 feet long. An approximate 6-foot-wide, by 6-foot-long, by 6-foot-deep, sniff hole will be excavated approximately 100 feet east of the entry pit to check for migration of gas during tie-in. An approximate 10-foot-wide, by 10-foot-long, by 6-foot-deep isolation bell hole will be excavated approximately 1000 feet east of the drill entry pit outside of the Bypass during tie-in of the new line.

A drill exit pit will be located approximately 500 feet west of James Irrigation Canal, Bridge No. 42C0065 and will measure approximately 15 feet wide by 15 feet long by 6 feet deep. An approximate 6-foot-wide by 6-foot-long by 6-foot-deep sniff hole will be excavated approximately 100 feet west of the exit pit to check for migration of gas during tie-in. A temporary staging and construction area measuring approximately 45 feet wide by 2350 feet long will be required along the edge of Manning Avenue to stage, weld, test, and string the new segment of pipe.

Once the new pipeline segment is installed and tied in, two approximately 6-foot-wide, by 6-foot-long, by 6-foot-deep bell holes will also be excavated to segment the retired pipeline on either side of both bridges so the pipe can then be removed from the bridges. PG&E will then excavate two approximately 8-foot-wide by 8-foot-long by 6-foot-deep bell holes to cut out existing main line valves. A temporary staging and

construction area measuring approximately 53 feet wide by 120 feet long will be required between the two bridges noted above. The remaining underground pipe segments will be abandoned in place after they are purged of gas and cleaned, and then filled with either a concrete slurry, grout, or inert gas from each bell hole.

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

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The James Main Canal and the James Bypass and Flood Channel within the proposed APE are both historic water conveyances. A review of historical aerial images shows that the bridges were existing in 1957. Although there has been some recent development in the vicinity, the project area has remained undeveloped and rural in character. Because the project involves the replacement of two existing bridges, with two bridges of similar design and size, any potential impacts to identified scenic resources would be less than significant. Additionally, once the project is complete the area will look substantially the same as it was prior to the replacement of the existing bridges.

This determination was reviewed by the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), who concurred with Staff's determination of no historic resources in a letter dated March 8, 2016.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

No new lighting is proposed as part of the bridge replacement project and the bridge will not create a new source of glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views.

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; or

C. Conflict with existing zoning for forest land, timberland or timberland zoned Timberland Production; or

D. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use; or

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The bridge replacement project will not convert any farmland to non agricultural use, nor conflict with existing zoning. The project proposes to replace two bridges within the County right-of-way; following construction activities, the two replacement bridges will serve the same purpose as the existing bridges and will not interfere with the adjacent farming operations. Most of the parcels adjacent to the project site are restricted under Williamson Act Contract; however, potential impacts to farmland are limited to the staging of construction materials. Following construction activities, there will be no impact to the land under Contract.

III. AIR QUALITY

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

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

B. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard; or

C. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations; or

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

Construction has the potential to create short-term emissions which may affect the local area; however, the project will not change the alignment or increase the number of through lanes, therefore, would not increase the level of criteria pollutants in the area. The project will not increase capacity, or cause or contribute to any new localized Carbon Monoxide (CO) or Particulate Matter (PM-10) violations or increase the frequency or severity of any existing CO or PM-10 non-attainment.

The nearest potential sensitive receptors (residences) are located more than one-mile from the project site; the project is not anticipated to result in substantial pollutant concentrations or emissions which would adversely affect a substantial number of people.

The project specifications would require actions during construction to reduce PM-10 in accordance with the San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District's Regulation VIII, reducing the impact of construction to less than significant. The replacement of the bridges is not expected to release any objectionable odors that would affect a substantial number of people as the nearest residences are located approximately three and one-quarter miles west of the project site within the unincorporated community of San Joaquin.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED:

For the evaluation of the proposed projects potential impacts to Biological Resources, the following three studies were consulted for recommended mitigation: (1) The Biological Assessment (BA) Caltrans June 2016 (2) The Natural Environmental Study (NES) Caltrans, June 2016, (3) The United States Fish and Wildlife Service, Biological Opinion, date stamped April 6, 2017.

The Biological Study Area (BSA), consists of 544,500 square feet (12.5-acres) of land within and adjacent to the James Bypass Overflow area, immediately north and south of where the James Bypass Overflow channel flows under West Manning Avenue. The BSA encompasses the Project Impact Area (PIA), which includes a 0.6-mile segment of West Manning Avenue between South Yuba Avenue and South Lassen Avenue.

The final Natural Environmental Study (NES) conducted by Caltrans in June 2016, identified two special status animal species with the potential to be impacted by the project, including the Blunt- Nosed Leopard Lizard and the Coast Horned Lizard, as well as several Species of Special Concern including the San Joaquin Whip Snake, the Crotch Bumble Bee and the Burrowing Owl. Additionally, the Mountain Plover, Swainson's Hawk, the Fresno Kangaroo Rat, Nelsons Antelope Squirrel, San Joaquin Kit Fox, San Joaquin Pocket Mouse, Western Mastiff Bat, and Yuma Myotis.

Additionally, four of the nine Federally Listed wildlife species were determined to have the potential to occur in the BSA; the Blunt- Nosed Leopard Lizard, Fresno Kangaroo Rat, Giant Kangaroo Rat, and the San Joaquin Kit Fox. Due to the presence of potentially suitable habitat, the possibility exists that one or more of these species could enter the Project Impact Area during construction. No federally listed species were observed during biological surveys or protocol level surveys of the BSA.

The vegetation within the study area mainly consists of non-native Cheatgrass, grassland. The BSA also includes the Project Impact Area (PIA), including the proposed construction and demolition, equipment staging area, and temporary access roads into the James Bypass Overflow Area, required for the project. The project is not anticipated to result in permanent impacts to non-native grassland.

According to the Biological Assessment (BA), the California Natural Diversity Database records and site conditions of the Biological Study Area (BSA), two federally-listed plant species, the Palmate-bracted Salty Bird's-Beak, and (San Joaquin Woolly-Threads), and nine federally-protected wildlife species; Vernal Pool Fair Shrimp, Delta Smelt, California Red-Legged Frog, Giant Garter Snake, Longhorn Fairy Shrimp, Blunt-Nosed Leopard Lizard, Fresno Kangaroo Rat, Giant Kangaroo Rat and San Joaquin Kit Fox, were evaluated for potential to occur within the BSA.

Based on evaluation of site conditions, San Joaquin Woolly-Threads was the only Federally Listed plant species with the potential to occur within the BSA. However, the BA determined that 15 special status plant species have the potential to occur in the project vicinity, and that the BSA supports marginally suitable conditions for four of the 15 special-status plant species; the four plant species are California Alkali Grass, Hoovers Eriastrum, Recurved Larkspur, and San Joaquin Woolly-Threads.

Avoidance and minimization efforts have been incorporated to minimize potential impacts to special-status plant and animal species. Based on evaluation of the site conditions, San Joaquin Woolly-Threads was the only federally listed plant species determined to have the potential to occur within the BSA. In addition to the federally listed San Joaquin Woolly-Threads, three other special-status plant species with the potential to be impacted by the project were identified including: California Alkali Grass, Hoover's Eriastrum and Recurved Larkspur. In order to minimize potential impacts to special status plant and animal species, if present in the Project Impact Area (PIA), the following measures shall be implemented:

* ***Mitigation Measures***

1. Prior to construction, up to one-year in advance, plant surveys shall be conducted at the appropriate times and methods according to the following or most current guidelines: Guidelines for Conducting and Reporting Botanical Inventories for Federally Listed, Proposed and Candidate Plants (United States Fish and Wildlife Service 1996); Supplemental Survey Methods for San Joaquin Woolly-Threads (California State University Stanislaus 2002); and Protocols for Surveying and Evaluating Impacts to Special Status Native Plant Populations and Natural Communities (California Department of Fish and Wildlife 2009). Extant populations of San Joaquin Woolly-Threads shall be avoided to the greatest extent practicable. The locations of listed plants shall be avoided and temporarily fenced or prominently flagged to prevent inadvertent encroachment by vehicles and equipment during project-related activities. Information regarding the location of listed plant populations shall be provided to the California Department of Fish and Wildlife's California Natural Diversity Database according to their reporting protocols. A completed copy of the reporting form and a topographic quadrangle map with the population location precisely marked shall be submitted to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service. If extant populations cannot be avoided, the California Department of Transportation will contact the United States Fish and Wildlife Service to discuss ways to proceed with the project and avoid take to the maximum extent practicable.

   To avoid and minimize potential adverse impacts to the federally listed Blunt-Nosed Leopard Lizard, the following Mitigation Measure shall be implemented: Prior to initiation of any site preparation and/or construction activities, the County of Fresno Department of Public Works and Planning will retain a United States Fish and Wildlife Service approved on-call biologist to provide oversight over ground-disturbing activities and implementation of avoidance and minimization efforts. The monitor will coordinate with the County Resident Engineer and California Department of Transportation Local Assistance regarding any special-status species detections or requests to stop construction activities.

2. Prior to and during any site preparation and/or construction activities associated with the proposed project, the County of Fresno Department of Public Works and Planning will implement the following conservation measures.

   a. Project employees will be directed to exercise caution when commuting within the James Bypass Overflow area. A 20 mile per hour speed limit will be enforced on all unpaved roads.

   b. Project employees will be provided with written guidance governing vehicle use, speed limits on unpaved roads, fire prevention, and other hazards.

   c. Prior to initiation of any site preparation/construction activities, the County of Fresno, Department of Public Works and Planning will prepare and supply a PowerPoint presentation and sign-in sheets

for all construction personnel. All individuals who will be involved in the site preparation or construction, including the project representative(s) responsible for reporting take to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service and the California Department of Fish and Wildlife, will be required to review the PowerPoint presentation and acknowledge such review via the sign-in sheets. At a minimum, the presentation will include a description of the natural history of the species with the potential to be affected by the proposed project, the penalties for non-compliance, and the boundaries of the work area within which the project must be accomplished. To ensure that employees and contractors understand their roles and responsibilities, training may have to be conducted in languages other than English. The sign-in sheet will be returned to the County of Fresno Department of Public Works and Planning.

d. A litter control program shall be instituted at the project site. All workers shall ensure their food scraps, paper wrappers, food containers, cans, bottles, and other trash from the project area are deposited in covered or closed trash containers. The trash containers shall be removed from the project area at the end of each working day.

e. No canine or feline pets or firearms (except for federal, state, or local law enforcement officers and security personnel) shall be permitted on construction sites to avoid harassment, killing, or injuring of listed species.

f. Maintenance and construction excavations greater than two feet deep shall be inspected for Blunt-Nosed Leopard Lizard prior to implementation of the following measure:

    i. At the end of each working day, maintenance and construction excavations shall be covered, filled in, or equipped with earthen escape ramps no greater than 200 feet apart to prevent entrapment of listed species.

g. All construction activities shall be confined within the project construction area, which may include temporary access roads, haul roads, and staging areas specifically designated and marked for these purposes. At no time shall equipment or personnel be allowed outside the project area without authorization from the United States Fish and Wildlife Service.

h. All grindings and asphaltic-concrete waste shall be stored within previously disturbed areas absent of habitat and at a minimum of 150 feet from any jurisdictional feature.

i. Environmentally Sensitive Areas within the Project Impact Area, such as active burrows and trees to be preserved, shall be delineated with high visibility temporary fencing at least four feet in height, flagging, or other barrier to prevent encroachment of construction personnel and equipment onto any sensitive areas during project work activities. Such fencing shall be inspected and maintained daily until completion of the project. The fencing will be removed only when all construction equipment is removed from the site.

j. Within 30 days prior to any ground disturbance, pre-construction surveys shall be conducted for federally-protected species with the potential to occur within the BSA, including Blunt-Nosed Leopard Lizard, Fresno Kangaroo Rat, Giant Kangaroo Rat, San Joaquin Kit Fox , and San Joaquin Pocket Mouse. These surveys will consist of walking surveys of the project limits and adjacent areas accessible to the public to determine presence of the species. A letter report documenting the results of the pre-construction surveys shall be prepared and submitted to the County of Fresno Department of Public Works and Planning for review and approval.

k. Tightly woven fiber netting or similar material shall be used for erosion control or other purposes at the project site to prevent special status species from becoming trapped. This limitation will be communicated to the contractor through use of Special Provisions included in the bid solicitation package.

l. Use of rodenticides and herbicides at the project site shall be avoided to the maximum extent feasible to prevent primary or secondary poisoning of special status species and depletion of prey populations on which they depend. In the event that the use of herbicides is necessary for invasive species control, all uses of such compounds shall observe labels and other restrictions mandated by the United States Environmental Protection Agency, California Department of Fish and Wildlife.

3. Prior to any site preparation and/or construction activities associated with the proposed project, the County of Fresno Department of Public Works and Planning shall implement the following avoidance measures for Blunt-Nosed Leopard Lizard:

   a. The United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)-approved biological monitor shall conduct a pre-construction survey within the Project Impact Area no more than 30 calendar days prior to the start of construction. If Blunt- Nosed Leopard Lizards are located within the action area, the biological monitor will notify the County of Fresno Department of Public Works and Planning, who will contact the California Department of Transportation who, in turn, will contact the USFWS to discuss ways to

proceed with the project and avoid take to the maximum extent practicable.

b. All exiting pipes and culverts shall be searched for Blunt- Nosed Leopard Lizard prior to being moved or sealed to ensure that an animal has not been trapped.

4. To mitigate potential impacts to the Coast Horned Lizard and California Whipsnake Mitigation Measure Nos. 2, 3 and 4 above may be implemented. If Coast Horned Lizard or San Joaquin Whipsnake are observed within the work area, the USFWS approved biologist may relocate these species to an area with suitable habitat outside the work area.

5. Implementation of Mitigation Measure Nos. 2 and 3 above will be sufficient to mitigate potential impacts to Crotch Bumble Bee and its associated habitat.

6. To minimize potential impacts to Burrowing Owl, the following Mitigation Measures shall be implemented:

    a. A pre-construction survey will be conducted by a qualified biologist to determine the presence of Burrowing Owl nesting sites within the Biological Study Area. The survey shall be conducted no more than 30 days prior to any construction activities for each construction area. This will ensure that the Burrowing Owl has not moved onto and is not inhabiting the project site. All potential burrows located within the construction and work areas will be monitored for three (3) consecutive nights using tracking medium at the burrow entrance to determine the current use. If no owl activity is observed during this period, the burrow will be destroyed immediately to preclude subsequent use.

    b. If active Burrowing Owl nest sites are found within the Biological Study Area, the County of Fresno Department of Public Works and Planning shall comply with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife's 1994 Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation Guidelines.

7. To avoid and minimize potential impacts to Swainson's Hawk, Mountain Plover and other Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) protected species, the following Mitigation Measures shall be implemented:

    a. If active nests sites of MBTA and California Fish and Game Code protected bird species are observed within the project site, then the project will be modified and/or delayed as necessary to avoid direct take of the identified nests, eggs, and/or young;

    b. If active nests of raptors and/or bird species of special concern are observed within the vicinity of the project site, then the appropriate buffer around the nest site (typically 250 feet for passerines and 300 feet for raptors, not including Swainson's Hawk) will be established. Construction

activities in the buffer zone will be prohibited until the qualified biological monitor has determined that the young have fledged the nest and achieved independence;

c. Active nests shall be documented by a qualified biologist, and a letter report will be submitted to the County of Fresno Department of Public Works and Planning, documenting project compliance with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and California Fish and Game Code.

8. If any active Swainson's Hawk nests are discovered within one quarter-mile of the Biological Study Area, the biologist will determine appropriate construction setback distances based on applicable California Department of Fish and Wildlife guidelines, at a minimum of 600 feet of the active nest site. Construction free buffers will be identified on the ground with flagging, fencing, or by other easily visible means, and will be maintained until the biologist has determined that the young have fledged.

9. To avoid and minimize potential impacts to the Fresno Kangaroo Rat ,Giant Kangaroo Rat, Nelson's Antelope Squirrel and San Joaquin Pocket Mouse and associated habitat, the following Mitigation Measure shall be implemented; Prior to construction, a qualified biologist will conduct a survey to determine the presence or sign (e.g., dens, scat, and tracks) of Fresno Kangaroo Rats, Giant Kangaroo Rats and other special-status rodents within the project area, not later than 30 days before the start of construction. If any active dens or precincts are identified or, if sensitive species are observed within the Biological Study Area, the biologist will notify the County of Fresno Department of Public Works and Planning and the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) of the findings, and Caltrans will contact the USFWS to discuss ways to proceed with the project and avoid take to the maximum extent possible.

10. Within 30 days prior to initiation of site disturbance and/or construction, a USFWS approved biologist will conduct a pre-construction survey for known or potentially sensitive species, including the San Joaquin Kit Fox dens, and submit a letter to the Fresno County Department of Public Works and Planning, reporting the date the survey was conducted, the survey methodology, results and what measures were necessary (and completed), as applicable, to address any San Joaquin Kit Fox activity within the project limits.

11. Prior to or during project activities, if any observations are made of San Joaquin Kit Fox, or any known or potential Kit Fox dens are discovered within the project limits, the qualified biologist will notify the Fresno County Department of Public Works and Planning, who will in turn contact Caltrans, who will contact the USFWS to discuss ways to proceed with the project and avoid take to the maximum extent practicable. All work will stop until such time that Caltrans determines that it is appropriate to resume work.

12. To avoid and minimize potential impacts to Roosting Bat species, the following Mitigation Measure shall be implemented: Prior to construction, a survey shall be conducted at dawn and at dusk by a qualified biologist to identify potential

Roosting Bat activity. This survey shall be conducted between two (2) to four (4) weeks prior to any proposed bridge and or tree removal activities. If Roosting Bat activity is identified during the pre-construction survey process, the Fresno County Department of Public Works and Planning shall coordinate with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) regarding the biological significance of the bat population and appropriate measures that could be used to exclude bats from roosting under the bridge. Measures may include, but not necessarily include, exclusionary devices installed by a qualified biologist.

13. If it is determined that a substantial impact to Western Mastiff Bat, Yuma Myotis, or a maternity roost is present, the Fresno County Department of Public Works and Planning shall coordinate with CDFW to determine the need for mitigation planning.

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED:

According to the Natural Environmental Study approved July 22, 2017, by the California Department of Transportation, the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB) documents three sensitive habitats occurring within the region; coastal and valley freshwater marsh, northern clay pan vernal pool, and, and Valley Sink Scrub. However, none of these sensitive habitats were identified within the Biological Study Area (BSA). The Great Valley Willow Scrub which is recognized by the CNDDB as a natural community of special concern, and Gooding's Black Willow specifically, is recognized by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers as a Facultative Wetland Plant, according to the USACE Arid West 2014 Regional Plant List. Additionally, potentially jurisdictional non-wetland waters of the United States, were identified within the BSA. No designated critical habitat was found within the BSA.

Permits will be required from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) and the Regional Water Quality Control Board for the project. A streambed alteration agreement will also be required from the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) for construction work within the banks of the James Bypass Channels. The proposed project will require minimal removal of riparian vegetation. Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA) fencing will be installed to designate where construction activities may occur and to protect sensitive resources. ESA fencing will be approved by the Caltrans Environmental Division.

Great Valley Willow Scrub habitat was found to occur along the west bank of the western (main) James Bypass Overflow Channel and is dominated by Gooding's Black Willow and Fremont's Cottonwood. The project is anticipated to temporarily impact approximately 0.81-acre of this habitat within the Biological Study Area (BSA).

In accordance with Executive Order (EO) No. 13112, aimed at preventing the introduction and spread of invasive species as a result of federal agency actions. The EO requires federal agencies to work cooperatively to prevent and control the spread of invasive plants and animals, and that NEPA analysis include an assessment of the probability of the project or action to cause or promote the introduction or spread of invasive species, and that all feasible and prudent measures be taken to minimize the likelihood, if analysis supports the likelihood of occurrence. According to the Natural Environmental Study completed for this project, a total of 16 invasive plant species, as identified by the California Invasive Plant Council (Cal-IPC) Inventory, were observed within the Biological Study Area.

In order to avoid and minimize impacts to the Great Valley Willow Scrub natural community of special concern, address potential impacts to federal and State jurisdictional aquatic features within the Project Impact Area, and to address the occurrence of invasive species in compliance with Executive Order 13112, the following Mitigation Measures shall be implemented:

* ***Mitigation Measures***

14. *Prior to construction, the Fresno County Department of Public Works and Planning shall obtain all necessary regulatory permits. Prior to and during construction, the County shall comply with all regulatory permits, Best Management Practices, and Caltrans Specifications, applicable to the project.*

15. *During construction, the contractor shall make a deliberate effort to limit the use of imported soils for fill. Soils currently existing on–site shall be used for fill material. If the use of imported fill material is necessary, the imported material shall be obtained from a source that is known to be free of invasive plant species, or the material must consist of purchased clean material such as crushed aggregate, sorted rock, or similar material. To avoid the spread of invasive species, the contractor shall:*

    a. *Remove any invasive plant species within the Biological Study Area during construction activities and ensure that they are not replanted.*

    b. *Stockpile topsoil and redeposit the stockpiled soil on the slopes after construction of the new bridge is complete; or*

    c. *Transport the topsoil to a certified landfill for disposal.*

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT

According to the Natural Environmental Study (NES) conducted by Caltrans and published in June 2016, no wetlands were identified within the Biological Study Area.

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

This project proposal was reviewed by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife, a responsible agency who's jurisdiction includes native resident and migratory fish and wildlife species within the project are. The CDFW did not express any concerns with respect to the potential for the project to interfere substantially with the movement of any fish or wildlife species.

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

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

As discussed above, the project site is generally clear of vegetation. The main canal is concrete-lined and has been treated to abate the growth of weeds. The waterway does not provide a riparian habitat, nor is it used as a migratory wildlife corridor. There are no federally protected wetlands at the project site, and it is not located within an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other 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:

The project is located in an area considered to be moderately sensitive with regard to the existence of historical or archaeological resources. Accordingly, the project was routed to the Southern San Joaquin Information Center, which recommended that an archaeological inventory be undertaken to determine if any such resources were present at the site.

The Extended Phase One Archaeological Survey conducted by Applied Earthworks, Inc., identified the projects Area of Potential Effects (APE) as a 30.75-acre area surrounding the two bridges and the immediate area north and south of Manning Avenue, within the James Bypass Overflow Channel itself. Review of historical aerial images shows that the three existing bridges, including the two proposed to be replaced, were present in 1957.

The Caltrans Historic Bridge Inventory indicates that the two bridges to be replaced along with a third bridge which will not be replaced, were constructed in 1957 and have been evaluated as Category 5, which is not eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). Additionally, the James Main Canal and the James Bypass and Flood Channel are considered historic water conveyances, however they are also not eligible for the NRHP.

A historic record search using the California Historical Resources Information System, by the Southern San Joaquin Information Center identified no cultural material within the APE. According to the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC), no sacred sites or Native American resources were identified within or adjacent to the project location, however according to the NAHC, the Sacred Lands Inventory is not exhaustive, and the absence of recorded sites does not preclude the discovery of cultural resources during ground disturbing activities.

An Archaeological Survey Report/ Extended Phase 1 Report was conducted by Applied Earthworks, Inc. on September 24, 2015. The conclusions of the survey were that no cultural materials were identified within the APE.

Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21082 and CEQA guidelines, if previously unidentified historical or unique archaeological resources are unearthed during construction, all work should be halted in the area until a qualified archaeologist can assess the significance of the find.

Additionally, once a qualified archaeologist is notified and makes a determination as to the historical or cultural significance of the find, the County may, in accordance with the recommendations of the qualified archaeologist, establish an appropriate buffer around the area of the find, outside of which, construction work may continue while the mitigation measures are implemented.

If the find is determined to be human remains, all work will shall be halted in the area of the find or any adjacent area suspected to contain additional remains the Fresno County Sheriff-Coroner shall be notified, pursuant to Public Resources Code 5097.98, and the Sheriff-Coroner shall notify the Native American Heritage Commission within 24 hours.

* ***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 should 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, and 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?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The project proposes the replacement of two existing bridges along Manning Avenue spanning the James Bypass channel. The demolition and construction timeline is anticipated to be eight months. Construction and grading activities will involve the use of diesel-powered off-road equipment and other vehicles and equipment like generators which will utilize combustible fuels. However, the use of fuels is not anticipated to be wasteful, inefficient or unnecessary and the construction window is short in duration.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project will not conflict with, obstruct or otherwise impact a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency.

VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Would the project:

A. Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

1. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault?

2. Strong seismic ground shaking?

3. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

4. Landslides?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project site is not located along a fault-line according to the California Department of Conservation's Fault Activity Map (2016). Additionally, according to Figure 9-5 of the Fresno County General Plan Background Report (FCGPBR), the project site is not located in an area of probable seismic hazards. According to Figure 9-6 (FCGPBR), the project site is not located in an area of moderate or high landslide hazards. The nearest active fault to the project sites is the Nunez Fault located more than 50 miles southwest and is not expected to result in significant impacts to the project area.

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

Grading activities would have the potential to increase runoff from the project site during construction of the proposed bridges, however as this project proposes to replace two existing bridges along a paved roadway, grading activities will be limited. The construction of the two bridges is to take place concurrently and be completed within an approximate five-month period. It is anticipated that up to 25 feet of soil would be excavated for construction of the new abutments and wing walls near the top of the channel embankments. The new proposed piles are anticipated to require up to 120 feet of excavated soil. However, because the excavation is to take place in an existing channel, no significant loss of topsoil or substantial erosion is expected.

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

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: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

According to the Fresno County General Plan Background Report (FCGPBR), the project sites are not located in an area of lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse, nor are the project sites are also not located in an area of expansive soils. However, there is an area of Deep Subsidence as identified in figure 9-6 (FCGPBR) located approximately one and one-half miles west of the project area. None of the reviewing agencies expressed any concerns regarding an increased risk of subsidence in the project area.

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 replacement of two structurally deficient bridges and will not involve the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

No unique paleontological resources or unique geologic features were identified in the analysis.

VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Would the project:

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

B. Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

This proposal involves the replacement of two structurally deficient bridges along Manning Avenue western Fresno County. Project related emissions will be primarily associated with construction of the new bridges, the road will be widened as the new bridges will be slightly wider, approximately seven feet, than the existing, however no new travel lanes will be added, thus, no increase in traffic trips is anticipated, as a result. Project construction would contribute Greenhouse Gas with the use of construction equipment, delivery of materials to the site and traffic trips generated by workers traveling to and from the site.

To evaluate the impacts of Greenhouse Gas GHG emissions resulting from this project, a GHG/ Air Quality Analysis was provided by LSA consulting dated November 5, 2019. The analysis considered both construction and operational GHG emissions. Construction emissions from mobile sources such as diesel-powered off-road construction equipment, delivery trucks and passenger vehicles traveling to and from the site during construction were evaluated based on a projected eight-month construction timeline.

The analysis utilized The Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Road Construction Emissions Model, Version 9.0.0 (Road Mod), which is has been approved by the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SSJVIC) for linear projects. The emissions modeling estimated that project construction would generate approximately 774.60 metric tons of CO2e or Carbon Dioxide equivalent.

There would be no long-term increase in operational emissions once project construction is complete, as emissions from vehicle traffic are anticipated to return to pre-project levels. Neither the SSJVIC or Fresno County have adopted specific thresholds of significance for GHG's, however the Air District has adopted a Climate Change Action Plan (CCAP). As part of the CCAP, the Air Pollution District has developed and published its Guidance for Valley Land Use Agencies in Addressing GHG Emission Impacts for New Projects under CEQA. The guidance recommends the use of performance-based standards or Best Performance Standards (BPS) as a means of assessing significance of project specific greenhouse gases.

To demonstrate that a project would have a less than significant impact, it must show a 29 percent reduction in GHG emissions from business as usual (BAU) which is a measurement of total baseline emissions for the development type, in this case the baseline for commercial or industrial is a three year average of GHG emissions from all commercial or industrial units within the San Joaquin Valley Air District, expressed as annual GHG emissions per commercial or industrial unit. If the project can be shown to achieve the 29 percent reduction or mitigation of GHG emissions consistent with AB32 reduction goals, project specific quantification of GHG emissions would not be required.

Fresno Council of Governments (FCOG) adopted a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS), as part of its Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) which has the goal of quantifying and educing GHG emissions from land use and transportation projects. This proposal involves the replacement of two structurally deficient bridges along the County roadway and will not result in an increase in traffic capacity or widening of the road or the addition of travel lanes. Therefore, no increase over baseline GHG emissions is anticipated to result from replacement of the two bridges.

This project proposal was reviewed by the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District, which determined that, based upon available information, project specific annual emissions of criteria pollutants are not expected to exceed any of the following Air District significance thresholds: 100 tons annually of carbon monoxide, 10 tons annually of oxides of nitrogen, 10 tons annually of reactive organic gases, 27 tons annually of oxides of sulfur, 15 tons annually of particulate matter of 10 microns or less (PM 10), or 15 tons annually of particulate matter of 2.5 microns or less in size (PM 2.5).

Therefore, any project related increase in GHG emissions, will be entirely the result of construction and construction related activities. Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) was not utilized as a metric for evaluation of this projects impacts. The project will not generate a significant quantity of greenhouse gas emissions, nor conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the reduction of GHG emissions.

IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Would the project:

A. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials; or

B. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED:

According to an Initial Site Assessment (ISA) performed by Haro Environmental, Inc., as for all projects proposing excavation, grading or pile driving, the potential exists for unknown hazardous materials contamination to be encountered during construction of the proposed project, and as such, the potential impact to the overall project scope, cost and schedule from hazardous materials is expected to be low. The ISA was performed in a manner consistent with the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) Environmental Guidance Handbook, Volume 1, Chapter 10 Hazardous Materials, Hazardous Waste, and Contamination, Initial Site Assessment (Caltrans, 2014b), and the American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) Practice E-1527-13, *Standard Practice for Environmental Site Assessment Process* (ASTM Standard). Additionally, Haro Environmental, Inc. conducted a site visit of the project area on August 25, 2015. No hazardous materials and/ or petroleum products under conditions indicative of a release into the environment; or under conditions that pose a material threat of a failure release into the environment. Additionally, no hazardous materials or petroleum products were observed off site. However, in order to minimize potential impacts created by the release of asbestos or other hazardous materials into the environment, from demolition of the existing bridges or construction of the new bridges the following Mitigation Measures shall be implemented.

* ***Mitigation Measure(s)***

1. *The concrete used to construct the James Bypass Bridges may contain asbestos. An asbestos survey should be performed to determine whether or not the concrete will require special handling and disposal.*

2. *Testing and removal requirements for yellow traffic striping and pavement marking materials shall be performed in accordance with Caltrans Construction Policy Bulletin 99-2(Caltrans Construction Manual Chapter 7-107E; Caltrans, 2014a).*

3. *As for all projects proposing excavation, grading, or pile driving, the potential exists for unknown hazardous materials contamination to be encountered during construction of the proposed project. Therefore, for any previously unknown hazardous waste material encountered as part of construction of the proposed project, the procedures outlined in Appendix E (Caltrans Unknown hazards Procedures) shall be followed (Caltrans 2002).*

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:

While the potential for the creation of hazardous emissions during construction activities does exist, the project does not propose to utilize any hazardous materials, substances or waste within one-quarter mile of a school. Additionally, the nearest school to the project site is San Joaquin Elementary, located approximately three and one-quarter mile to the northwest.

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 Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) NEPAssist mapping web tool, there is a hazardous waste generator located approximately two and one half-miles west of the proposed project site, additionally, the project site is not included on the California Department of Toxic Substances Control, Hazardous Waste and Substances Site (Cortese) List.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The nearest airport or private airstrip to the proposed project site is the privately-owned San Joaquin airport located approximately 4.8 miles to the west of project site.

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

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

Once construction is complete, the new bridges will serve the same function as the currently existing bridges and as such would not impair implementation of or interfere with an adopted Emergency Response Plan or Emergency Evacuation Plan, nor would it expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires as the project site and surrounding area not located within a wildland fire area.

X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Would the project:

A. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED:

The existing and proposed replacement bridges traverse and drain to the James Bypass Overflow Channel. The James Bypass Overflow channel is a 1,200-foot wide, constructed bypass for the Kings River drainage. James Bypass, its levees and main channel are part of a (1913-1914) flood control project to alleviate high flows from the Kings River into the Fresno Slough. The segment of James Bypass that extends through the project area consists of dry, non-native annual grassland habitat which receives periodic high flows from the Kings River. Two secondary channels run along each side the James Bypass Overflow main channel and convey all but the highest flows, where their capacity is exceeded.

Up to 25 feet of soil would need to be excavated for the construction of the new abutments and wingwalls near the top of the channel embankments. Pile excavation is anticipated to require up to 120 feet of excavation. The contractor may install temporary driven steel falsework piles during the dry summer months to allow limited work to continue above the channel when the Central Valley Flood Protection Board limits work in the channel.

It is anticipated that construction equipment (concrete trucks, concrete pumps, cranes, excavators, etc.) will operate within the channel during the window allowed by regulatory agencies.

The California State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) *Final 2010 Integrated Report,* determined that Fresno Slough, from Graham Road to the James Bypass is considered a Clean Water Act Section 303(d) listed Impaired Water Body (SWRCB 2001). James Bypass is listed as impaired due to the existence of concentrations of agricultural runoff of unknown toxicity.

According to the September 2015 Water Quality Assessment Memorandum prepared for this application, the proposed project is located within the Fresno Sole Source Aquifer recharge area as designated under the authority of Section 142(e) of the Safe Drinking Water Act (U.S. EPA 2012) however, the project does not involve a well or sewage disposal, and therefore would not result in an increased risk of aquifer contamination or create a public health hazard.

The proposed project would affect the streambeds, banks and channels of the James Bypass Overflow due to removal and replacement of the existing bridges, piers, abutments and access ramps. Potential effects related to water quality would be limited to construction-related impact such as erosion, sedimentation, and the potential release of hazardous materials; for example, grading activities could result in sedimentation of the James Bypass Overflow if water is present. If water is present within the channel, proposed construction activities have the potential to result in direct impacts to water quality and hydrology depending on whether construction takes place during the wet or dry season. Ground disturbing activities could potentially introduce sediment and

potential sources of pollution from the improper use of fuels, oils and other construction related hazardous waste material, and therefore affect surface or ground water quality. To minimize this potential, the County would employ erosion control standards and hazardous materials spill pollution and prevention standards.

The proposed new bridges would be approximately six feet wider than the existing 34-foot wide structures resulting in an approximately 2,820-square-foot increase in impervious surface, which could result in long-term impacts to water quality from pollutants entering the water from increase storm runoff. Additionally, increased concentrations of pollutant discharge from the roadway into the James Bypass during storm events could potentially impact local water bodies, if they are transmitted by the James Bypass Channel. Additionally, increased storm water runoff from the roadway could potentially cause erosion, altering stream geomorphology.

However, based on the project design, permitting requirements, site-specific conditions, and implementation of proposed mitigation, potential long-term impacts to water quality would be less than significant. The proposed project is required to comply with a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Construction Permit to discharge storm water associated with construction activities. Additionally, the proposed project is required to prepare a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) to address storm water runoff generated on-site during construction and operation of the project, which also incorporates temporary Best Management Practices (BMPs) into the project. Construction activities associated with the proposed project, such as trenching, and excavation could disturb the groundwater table and expose groundwater to potential contamination. Implementation of the BMPs would minimize potential impacts to water quality from project construction, thereby reducing potential impacts to water quality and hydrology to a less than significant level.

* ***Mitigation Measure***

1. *Prior to the start of construction activities, the contractor shall prepare a hazardous material spill prevention control and countermeasure plan, which will minimize the potential for, and the effects of, the release of hazardous or toxic materials during construction of the proposed project. The plan shall include storage and containment procedures to prevent and respond to spills and shall identify the appropriate parties responsible for monitoring the spill response. During construction of the proposed project, any spills shall be remedied immediately according to the guidance provided in the spill prevention control and countermeasure plan. The County and Caltrans shall review and approve the spill prevention control and countermeasure plan prior to allowing construction to commence.*

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:

As there is no use of water proposed as part of this application, the bridge replacement will not result in a decrease in groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge.

C. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:

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

2. Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on or off site?

3. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or

4. Impede or redirect flood flows?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED:

The project does not propose the alteration of drainage patterns or the course of a stream or river, however it is located within FEMA Flood Zone A, and as such the County would obtain a Stream Alteration Agreement from California Department of Fish and Wildlife and a Section 401 Water Quality Certification from the Regional Water Quality Control Board, as well as submit a Pre-construction Notification to the Army Corps of Engineers prior to construction activities.

Discharges of dredged or fill material to waters of the State not subject to the Clean Water Act Section 404 are regulated by the RWQCB under the Porter-Cologne Act Article 4 Individual or General Waste Discharge Requirement Permits (WDR). WDR permit requirements require that permitted activities comply with State water quality standards and are consistent with the requirements of CEQA. As the James Bypass channel may be considered jurisdictional waters of the State by the RWQQCB, WDR permits will be required.

* ***Mitigation Measure***

2. *Once construction activities are complete, disturbed areas shall be re-vegetated with similar plant vegetation, pre-approved by the County, to stabilize soils and establish a natural system for erosion control. In addition, a five-foot vegetated buffer consisting of native upland plant species shall be planted to treat roadway runoff before it enters the channel below. Sediment controls, potentially consisting of fiber rolls, shall also be implemented.*

D. In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?
FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

According to FEMA, FIRM Panels 2550H and 2575H, the project site is located in Flood Zone A, which is subject to flooding from the 100-year or one-percent chance storm and is at risk of inundation due to levee or dam failure.

Discharges of dredged or fill material to waters of the State not subject to the Clean Water Act Section 404 are regulated by the RWQCB under the Porter-Cologne Act Article 4 Individual or General Waste Discharge Requirement Permits (WDR). WDR permit requirements require that permitted activities comply with State water quality standards and are consistent with the requirements of CEQA. As the James Bypass channel may be considered jurisdictional waters of the State by the RWQQCB, WDR permits will be required.

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.

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 proposes to replace two functionally obsolete bridges with two new bridges. The project site is located approximately three and one-half miles east of the unincorporated community of San Joaquin. The project involves the replacement of two existing bridges which traverse the James Bypass overflow area also known as the Fresno Slough Bypass along Manning Avenue. The replacement bridges would serve the same purpose as the existing bridges which is to allow vehicle traffic to cross the bypass area travelling east or west, although the road would be closed to vehicle traffic temporarily during construction operations, the proposed project will not physically divide an established community. Temporary road closures would divert vehicle channel crossings to the bridge located at South Placer Avenue, approximately four and one quarter-miles to the northwest and Mc Mullen Grade (State Route 145), approximately three and three quarter-miles southeast.

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 will be limited in scope to the replacement of two existing bridges. No mineral resources were identified by any of the reviewing agencies, and the project site is not located in an area of known mineral resources per Figure 7-7 (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; or

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

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:

Project construction is expected to result in a temporary increase in ambient noise levels and ground borne vibration; however, the project site is in a relatively remote area with sparse residential development. Review of available aerial imagery indicates that the nearest residential dwelling is at least one mile from the project site. The nearest airstrip is located approximately four and three quarter-miles west of the project site

XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING

Would the project:

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

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project involves a relatively short-term construction timeline and is not anticipated to induce any population growth, nor does it entail the extension of any roads, new residential or commercial construction.

XV. PUBLIC SERVICES

Would the project:

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

1. Fire protection;

2. Police protection;

3. Schools;

4. Parks; or

5. Other public facilities?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The road is to remain open to traffic during construction, therefore no impacts to the provision of any public services is anticipated.

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 result in increased use of parks or recreational facilities, nor require the construction of such facilities.

XVII. TRANSPORTATION

Would the project:

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project proposes the replacement/maintenance of existing transportation/ circulation system infrastructure and does not conflict with any plan, program or ordinance which addresses the transportation circulation system.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project involves the replacement of two structurally deficient bridges, and once construction is complete, the project will not result in an increase in vehicle miles traveled, as no there is no roadway capacity increase proposed with this project.

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

D. Result in inadequate emergency access?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The bridges are anticipated to remain open to traffic during most of the construction period; however, approximately three, 3 to 4-day weekend road closures are anticipated, as well as some night time construction, in order to minimize disruptions to vehicle traffic on the roadway.

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 52, the County of Fresno was required to provide notice that this Initial Study was being prepared to Native American Tribes who had previously indicated interest in reviewing CEQA projects. Notices were sent on April 30, 2019, to Robert Ledger of the Dumna Wo Wah, Robert Pennell of Table Mountain Rancheria, Ruben Barrios of Santa Rosa Rancheria, and to Tara Estes-Harter of the Picayune Rancheria of Chukchansi Indians. None of the Tribal Governments responded to the notice.

The project site is in an area of moderate archeological sensitivity, therefore, the following mitigation measure is proposed to ensure that impacts to previously unknown tribal cultural resources can be reduced to less than significant.

* ***Mitigation Measure(s)***

1. See Mitigation Measure 1 under 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:

The project will not result in the construction or relocation of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment, or stormwater drainage facilities. Pacific Gas and Electric Co. (PG&E) is proposing to retire and replace a section of 4" Gas Transmission Line 111A-1 in place and remove two main line valves - Valve 3.79 and Valve 3.88. As part of the pipeline retirement activities, PG&E will remove sections of existing gas line attached to the James Irrigation Canal, Bridge No. 42C0065 and the James Bypass West Channel Bridge (Bridge No. 42C0066) on Manning Avenue as requested by the County of Fresno for the James Bypass Overflow Bridge Replacement Project.

PG&E will install a new 4" replacement line, approximately 1,200 feet in length via Horizontal Direction Drill (HDD) north of the existing gas line within the County Right of Way. Installation of the new line will require excavation of a drill entry pit on the east

side James Bypass West Channel bridge (Bridge No. 42C0066) within the upland area of the Bypass. The entry pit will measure approximately 15 feet wide, by 15 feet long, by 6 feet deep, and will require a temporary construction and staging area approximately 70 feet wide, by 180 feet long. An approximate 6-foot-wide, by 6-foot-long, by 6-foot-deep sniff hole will be excavated approximately 100 feet east of the entry pit to check for migration of gas during tie-in. An approximate 10-foot-wide, by 10-foot-long, by 6-foot-deep isolation bell hole will be excavated approximately 1000 feet east of the drill entry pit outside of the Bypass during tie-in of the new line.

A drill exit pit will be located approximately 500 feet west of James Irrigation Canal, Bridge No. 42C0065 and will measure approximately 15 feet wide, by 15 feet long, by 6 feet deep. An approximate 6-foot-wide, by 6-foot-long, by 6-foot-deep sniff hole will be excavated approximately 100 feet west of the exit pit to check for migration of gas during tie-in. A temporary staging and construction area measuring approximately 45 feet wide, by 2350 feet long, will be required along the edge of Manning Avenue to stage, weld, test, and string the new segment of pipe.

Once the new pipeline segment is installed and tied in, two approximately 6-foot-wide, by 6-foot-long, by 6-foot-deep bell holes will also be excavated to segment the retired pipeline on either side of both bridges so the pipe can then be removed from the bridges. PG&E will then excavate two approximately 8-foot-wide, by 8-foot-long, by 6-foot-deep bell holes to cut out existing main line valves. A temporary staging and construction area measuring approximately 53 feet wide, by 120 feet long, will be required between the two bridges noted above. The remaining underground pipe segments will be abandoned in place after they are purged of gas and cleaned, and then filled with either a concrete slurry, grout, or inert gas from each bell hole.

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

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The proposed bridge replacement will require water supplies and wastewater treatment services during construction only, therefore there would be no impacts to such service systems or a determination of inadequate capacity to serve the project during normal operation/use of the bridges.

D. Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals; or

E. Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

Construction related solid waste will be required to be disposed of at an appropriate landfill site, and handled in accordance with federal, state and local statutes regulating the handling and disposal of solid waste.

XX. WILDFIRE

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

A. Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects; or

B. Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project site is not in an area of increased risk of wildfire, or near a State Responsibility Area (SRA), or in an area classified as a high fire hazard severity zone. The area around the project site consists primarily of flat open farmland with sparse residential development. The bridge replacement is not anticipated to impair any adopted emergency response or evacuation plan.

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?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

Pacific Gas and Electric Co. (PG&E) is proposing to retire and replace a section of 4" Gas Transmission Line 111A-1 in place and remove two main line valves - Valve 3.79 and Valve 3.88. As part of the pipeline retirement activities, PG&E will remove sections of existing gas line attached to the James Irrigation Canal, Bridge No. 42C0065 and the James Bypass West Channel Bridge (Bridge No. 42C0066) on Manning Avenue as requested by the County of Fresno for the James Bypass Overflow Bridge Replacement Project.

PG&E will install a new 4" replacement line, approximately 1,200 feet in length via Horizontal Direction Drill (HDD) north of the existing gas line within the County Right of Way. Installation of the new line will require excavation of a drill entry pit on the east side James Bypass West Channel bridge (Bridge No. 42C0066) within the upland area of the Bypass. The entry pit will measure approximately 15 feet wide, by 15 feet long, by 6 feet deep and will require a temporary construction and staging area approximately 70 feet wide, by 180 feet long. An approximate 6-foot-wide, by 6-foot-long, by 6-foot-

deep sniff hole will be excavated approximately 100 feet east of the entry pit to check for migration of gas during tie-in. An approximate 10-foot-wide, by 10-foot-long, by 6-foot-deep isolation bell hole will be excavated approximately 1000 feet east of the drill entry pit outside of the Bypass during tie-in of the new line.

A drill exit pit will be located approximately 500 feet west of James Irrigation Canal, Bridge No. 42C0065 and will measure approximately 15 feet wide, by 15 feet long, by 6 feet deep. An approximate 6-foot-wide, by 6-foot-long, by 6-foot-deep sniff hole will be excavated approximately 100 feet west of the exit pit to check for migration of gas during tie-in. A temporary staging and construction area measuring approximately 45 feet wide, by 2350 feet long will be required along the edge of Manning Avenue to stage, weld, test, and string the new segment of pipe.

Once the new pipeline segment is installed and tied in, two approximately 6-foot-wide, by 6-foot-long, by 6-foot-deep bell holes will also be excavated to segment the retired pipeline on either side of both bridges so the pipe can then be removed from the bridges. PG&E will then excavate two approximately 8-foot-wide, by 8-foot-long, by 6-foot-deep bell holes to cut out existing main line valves. A temporary staging and construction area measuring approximately 53 feet wide, by 120 feet long will be required between the two bridges noted above. The remaining underground pipe segments will be abandoned in place after they are purged of gas and cleaned, and then filled with either a concrete slurry, grout, or inert gas from each bell hole.

However, once construction is complete, no increased fire risks are anticipated.

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 project is not anticipated to expose people or structures to risk of flooding or landslide, resulting from increased runoff, post-fire slope instability, or alteration of drainage.

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: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED:

The project does have the potential to create pollution hazards and to affect water quality within the bypass channel as a result of construction materials being discharged into the waterway; and there is potential for adverse impacts to some wildlife and plant communities. Additionally, the potential exists for previously unknown cultural and/or tribal cultural resources to be discovered during ground disturbance. However, with adherence to all included Mitigation Measures, such impacts will be reduced to a less than significant level.

* ***Mitigation Measure(s)***

1. *See Mitigation Measure under Sections IV, V, IX, X, and XVIII above.*

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)?

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The project will not result in cumulatively considerable environmental impact; the replacement bridges will serve the same purpose as those proposed to be removed. Repairs and resurfacing of a section of the roadway adjacent to the bridges will increase the overall safety of the bridges.

CONCLUSION/SUMMARY

Based upon the Initial Study prepared for Initial Study Application No. 7326, 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 Agriculture and Forestry Resources, Land Use and Planning, Mineral Resources, Noise, Population and Housing, Public Services, Recreation, and Wildfire.

Potential impacts related to Aesthetics, Air Quality, Geology and Soils, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Transportation, Utilities and Service Systems have been determined to be less than significant.

Potential impacts relating to Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Hydrology and Water Quality, and Tribal Cultural Resources have been determined to be less than significant with compliance with the listed mitigation measures.

A Mitigated Negative Declaration/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.

JS
G:\4360Devs&Pln\PROJSEC\PROJDOCS\Environmental\Initial Studies - Environmental Assessments\7000-7999\IS 7326 James Bypass Bridge Replacement\IS CEQA\CEQA DOCUMENT PACKAGE 2019\IS 7326 wu 2019.docx

DRAFT

File original and one copy with:	Space Below For County Clerk Only.
Fresno County Clerk **2221 Kern Street** **Fresno, California 93721**	CLK-2046.00 E04-73 R00-00

Agency File No:	**LOCAL AGENCY MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION**	County Clerk File No:
IS 7326		**E-**

Responsible Agency (Name):	Address (Street and P.O. Box):	City:	Zip Code:
County of Fresno	2220 Tulare St. Sixth Floor	Fresno	93721

Agency Contact Person (Name and Title):	Area Code:	Telephone Number:	Extension:
Jeremy Shaw, Planner	(559)	600-4207	N/A

Applicant (Name):	Project Title:
Fresno County Design Division	IS 7326: James Bypass Bridge Replacement Project

Project Description:

The project proposes the replacement of two structurally deficient bridges on Manning Avenue: the James Bypass Overflow Bridge Nos. 42C0066 and 42C0067. The scope of work includes placing an asphalt concrete overlay on approximately 790 feet of Manning Avenue to match the approach work associated with the proposed new bridges and complete the previously placed asphalt concrete overlay outside the current project limits, excavation for new abutments and wingwalls, and PG&E improvements to a section of gas main. The proposed project would increase public safety by replacing the existing structurally deficient bridges with bridges built to current design standards. (hereafter, the "Proposed Project").

Justification for Negative Declaration:

Based upon the Initial Study No. 7326, staff has concluded that the project will not have a significant effect on the environment. It has been determined that there would be no impacts to Aesthetics, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Land Use and Planning, Mineral Resources, Population and Housing, Public Services, Recreation, and Utilities and Service Systems.

Potential impacts related to Agricultural and Forestry Resources, Air Quality, Geology and Soils, Hydrology and Water Quality, Noise, and Transportation/Traffic have been determined to be less than significant.

Potential impacts relating to Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, and Hazards and Hazardous Materials have determined to be insignificant with compliance with compliance to the included mitigation measures.

FINDING: The proposed project will not have a significant impact on the environment.

Newspaper and Date of Publication:	Review Date Deadline:
Fresno Business Journal – December 18, 2019	Board of Supervisors January 21, 2020

Date:	Type or Print Signature:	Submitted by (Signature):

State 15083, 15085 County Clerk File No.:_____

LOCAL AGENCY
DRAFT MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION