



County of Fresno

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

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

APPLICANT: Danny Sozinho

APPLICATION NOS.: Initial Study No. 8631 and Unclassified Conditional Use Permit No. 3813

DESCRIPTION: Allow a solid waste processing facility, consisting of four (4) Biofiltro wastewater processing beds, one (1) lift station, one (1) mechanical separator, one (1) weeping wall, and one (1) concrete wall to split an existing settling cell into two cells on an 159.68-acre parcel for an existing pre-October 23, 2007 dairy located within the AE-20 (Exclusive Agricultural, 20-acre minimum parcel size) Zone District.

LOCATION: The subject parcel is located on the southwest corner of east Elkhorn Ave. and south Highland Ave., approximately 3.7-miles from the City limits of the City of Kingsburg. (APN: 056-031-35s) (ADDRESS: 8486 E. Elkhorn Avenue) (Sup. Dist. 4).

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 project is located within an agricultural area on an established dairy. The proposed solid wastewater processing facility includes biofiltro wastewater processing beds (4), lift station, mechanical separator, a weeping wall, and a concrete wall to split an existing settling cell into two cells. There were no scenic vistas identified as being impacted by the project.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

No scenic resources, including trees, rock outcroppings, or historic buildings were identified in the analysis or by any reviewing agencies.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project area is entirely located in a rural area characterized by large-scale agricultural operations. As previously stated, the project does not entail the addition of any structures that would negatively impact viewsheds from surrounding properties or public roadways, or substantially degrade the visual character or quality of public views of any of the project sites. The proposed improvements are consistent with the existing dairy operations.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The proposal does not include any additional lighting. Additionally, the project shall be subject to Section 834.4.025.B(1)(a). of the Zoning Ordinance, which requires that any new exterior lighting must be directed downward and shielded so that all direct light and glare is confined within the boundaries of the subject parcel; and, exterior lighting shall be installed so that lights do not blink, flash, or be of unusually high intensity or brightness; and lighting fixtures shall be of an appropriate height, intensity, and scale to the structures and uses they are serving.

II. AGRICULTURAL AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

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

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

Farmland on the subject parcel have been classified as a mixture of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, and Confined Animal Agriculture. The confined animal designation is limited to the area where the dairy cows are housed and the new improvements will be located in the area of the existing dairy where the land has been designated for confined animal agriculture. The proposed addition will not hinder agricultural operations. The new improvements will be supportive of the dairy operations and already previously disturbed land.

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The parcel involved with the proposal is currently restricted by the Williamson Act Contract No. 3916. Due to the future potential to export and sell material from the site, the area of the dairy where the proposed solid waste facility is located will be required to non-renew that portion (estimated about 8-acres) of the Williamson Act Contract. The amount of land that will be non-renewed does not represent a significant reduction in land restricted by Williamson Act Contract and will not result in the reduced production of agricultural commodities.

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

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project is not located near any land that is used or zoned for Timberland Production. Therefore, there are no conflicts with, or loss of, timberland or forest land as a result of this project. All of the land involved is zoned Agricultural and limited to uses allowed in such zone districts.

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The project entails the installation of a new solid waste processing facility with ancillary equipment. The portion of the parcel where the proposed solid waste processing facility will be located will be required to submit a partial non-renewal of the Williamson Act Contract (No. 3916). The conflict with the Williamson Act is primarily due to the commercial nature of the proposed operation, which proposes to have the option to sell and export material from the site. The dairy operation on the parcel is to remain. The

land that the proposal is to occupy is classified as Confined Animal Agriculture by the 2022 California Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program. Therefore, approval of this project will not result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses.

III. AIR QUALITY

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

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

This project proposal was reviewed by the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD). The District indicated that the Project specific annual criteria pollutant emissions from construction and operation are not expected to exceed any of the significance thresholds as identified in the District's Guidance for Assessing and Mitigating Air Quality Impacts (GAMAQI). It was also noted that the Project will be subject to District Rule 2010 (Permits Required) and Rule 2201 (New and Modified Stationary Source Review) and the SJVAPCD currently has received an ATC application (ATC project #C-1241979).

With adherence to the rules and requirements of the SJVAPCD, the estimated construction and operational emissions from the proposed project will be less than significant.

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

An Air Quality and Greenhouse Analysis report was prepared for the project by CORE Environmental Consulting dated June 17, 2025. The analysis states, the Project would result in air pollutant emissions during and construction and operation.

The analysis notes construction emissions consist mainly of exhaust emissions from construction equipment, vehicle trips, and fugitive dust emissions from earth moving activities. The Project was modeled using the CalEEMod defaults for construction of other non-asphalt surfaces (concrete), to account for the 328,000 square foot area of concrete shown on the site plan, and material import (during grading phase) to account for the placement of vermifiltration media. The four beds are each 1,155 feet long by 17 feet wide, with a maximum expected depth of approximately 3 feet, for a total volume of 235,620 cubic feet or 8,727 cubic yards. Based on the air quality impact analysis, the short-term construction emissions would not exceed the Air District's significant thresholds for criteria pollutant levels and would therefore, be less than significant.

Additionally, the analysis addresses the Project's operational emissions could occur from gases produced during the vermifiltration process. By nature, the process would only produce Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC), which are not a criteria pollutant but an important component of Ozone and sometimes Particulate Matter.. Vermifilters operate as mesophilic (15-40°C) aerobic biological treatment systems where thermodynamically favorable oxidation reactions and biological metabolism pathways inherently limit the formation and emission of criteria pollutants. Under aerobic mesophilic conditions, biological systems favor thermodynamically stable end products (CO₂, H₂O, NO₃⁻, SO₄²⁻) rather than intermediate oxidation products that characterize high-temperature combustion processes where criteria pollutants form. Thus, the fundamental biochemistry and physics of mesophilic aerobic biological treatment create conditions that are thermodynamically and kinetically incompatible with criteria pollutant formation mechanisms.

The analysis states while the vermifiltration beds would only emit VOC, the Project would result in additional diesel fuel use. The resulting annual emissions were below the CalEEMod precision level (except for ROG) and thus were reported as <0.005.

In conclusion the analysis states the Project would not 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. Impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation is required outside of compliance with existing requirements.

- 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:

According to the analysis, the exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentration can occur if the Project would result in localized exceedances of National or California Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS/CAAQS), or if Project emissions of Toxic Air Contaminants (TAC) would exceed SJVAPCD thresholds of significance. None of the maximum daily criteria pollutant emissions from the Project would exceed 100 pounds per day for operation or construction. Therefore, the Project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations by resulting in a localized exceedance of NAAQS or CAAQS.

Additionally, the emissions were input in the SJVAPCD Prioritization Calculator to determine whether full modeling and risk calculations for a Health Risk Assessment would be required. The nearest sensitive receptor is a residence located approximately 295 meters from the Project. The combined maximum prioritization risk score was 7.00 at the applicable distance range (250m – 500m). Therefore, based on the results of the

highly-conservative Prioritization Calculator, TAC emissions from the Project would be less than the SJVAPCD significance thresholds and no further health risk assessment is required. The results of both the measurements and scaling calculations, along with the Prioritization Calculator inputs and results were provided to SJVAPCD.

The conclusion of the analysis noted because the project would not result in localized exceedances of NAAQS or CAAQS, and risks to sensitive receptors from TAC emissions would be below thresholds of significance, the Project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. Impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation is required outside of compliance with existing requirements.

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

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

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

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

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

The Project will not conflict with local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources or any Natural Conservation Community Plans or other approved conservation plans in the project area. Therefore, the project will not conflict with adopted or approved plans.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED:

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

* **Mitigation Measure(s)**

1. *In the event that cultural resources are unearthed during ground-disturbing activities, all work shall be halted in the area of the find. An Archeologist shall be called to evaluate the findings and make any necessary mitigation recommendations. If human remains are unearthed during ground-disturbing activities, no further disturbance is to occur until the Fresno County Sheriff-Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition. All normal evidence procedures should be followed by photos, reports, video, etc. If such remains are determined to be Native American, the Sheriff-Coroner must notify the Native American Commission within 24 hours.*

VI. ENERGY

Would the project:

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

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

VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Would the project:

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

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

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The proposed improvements to the existing dairy will not represent a significant expansion of graded area. Any grading that is performed will require a grading permit

or voucher and ministerial review of those permits will ensure that substantial erosion or loss of topsoil does not occur.

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

The project site is not located in an area that is at risk of on-site or offsite landslide, lateral spreading, liquefaction, or collapse, according to Figure 7-1 (FCGPBR), and will not be located on expansive soils.

- 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 currently operates with the use of the existing permitted septic systems. No new septic is proposed as part of this application.

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED:

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

Mitigation Measure(s)

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

VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Would the project:

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

Project construction and operational activities would generate greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. In the Air Quality Impact Analysis, GHG emissions were estimated using the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod). The operational GHG emissions calculations, indicate that construction GHG emissions would be offset by less than one month of operation.

The Project will integrate BioFiltro's BIDA® vermifiltration system, enhancing manure management through a combination of natural processes. This system, deploying a sequence of modular units, leverages both physical separation and aerobic treatment to manage dairy manure efficiently. It is built around multilayered vermifiltration beds where wastewater undergoes filtraon, subsequently enabling earthworms to break down the captured solids and nutrients. Emissions reductions are achieved by diverting volatile solids (VS) before reaching the anaerobic lagoon currently used, thereby reducing methane production. BIDA vermifiltration also removes nitrogen from the wastewater before it is stored and then used for crop irrigation.

The analysis also indicates, currently, approximately 92% of volatile solids find their way into the long-term anaerobic storage lagoons. This situation notably leads to substantial methane production due to the anaerobic decomposition of organic material (VS) of the untreated manure. After project implementation, only about 13% of the VS will reach the effluent pond, substantially decreasing methane emissions from prolonged storage. Moreover, decreasing nitrogen levels helps the dairy's manage the manure nutrients and reduces nitrous oxide (N₂O) emissions from irrigated soils. These strategies not only mitigate potential nutrient excess in the soil and groundwater but also improve the quality of water recycled for flushing. Overall, the project is anticipated to reduce GHG emissions by 12,000 MT CO₂eq annually.

Therefore, the GHG emissions increases associated with this project would have a less than significant individual and cumulative impact on global climate change.

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:

While the routine use of the hazardous materials may occur, risk to the public as a result of its transport or accidental release is less than significant. With compliance to the existing local and state regulations, there will be a less than significant impact on public hazards as a result of the transport or use of hazardous materials.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The nearest school to the proposed site is Eric White Elementary School within City of Kingsburg, approximately 3.86 miles northeast of subject site.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

According to a search of the Environmental Protection Agency's NEPAAssist tool, and the California Environmental Protection Agency's (Cal EPA), Department of Toxic Substances Control, EnviroStor mapping tool, the proposed project is not located on or near a known hazardous material site.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The Project is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, the closest airport is the Selma Airport which is approximately 6 miles from the project: therefore, the project will not result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing of working in the project area.

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

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

Approval of this project will not impair the implementation of an Emergency Response Plan or Emergency Evacuation Plan. Following construction, there will be a negligible increase in the amount of traffic generated by this project for maintenance and

operation of the system. The project site is located in an area of local responsibility for fire protection and is not at significant risk of damage due to wildfire.

X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Would the project:

- A. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality; or
- B. Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

No concerns related to groundwater supplies were expressed by any of the reviewing agencies or departments. The subject dairy submitted a Waste Management Plan to the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board in August of 2024. The Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board is responsible for monitoring the quality of water produced by this dairy. With compliance with the Water Boards' standards, the impact will be less than significant and will not violate any water quality standards.

- C. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:
 - 1. Result in substantial erosion or siltation on or off site?
 - 2. Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on or off site?
 - 3. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or
 - 4. Impede or redirect flood flows?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The Project will not result in the alteration of an existing drainage pattern of any of the individual sites or the larger project area. The project site is not located in an area of special flood hazard. Additionally, County of Fresno requires all grading to obtain a grading permit or voucher. Compliance to the provisions in the permit or voucher will ensure that excessive flooding and erosion do not occur.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The proposed project is not located in an area prone to flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project will not conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan. The dairy will be required to meet all set regulations for all state and local agencies.

XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING

Would the project:

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project will not conflict with any land use plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. The proposed use is allowed in the County of Fresno with the approval of an Unclassified Conditional Use Permit.

XII. MINERAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

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

XIII. NOISE

Would the project result in:

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The project is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. Noise generated by the project equipment will not be above typical agriculture facility levels and the project is distant to sensitive receptors. Therefore, due to the project's distance from sensitive receptors, there will be no increase in the exposure of persons to severe or adverse noise levels or ground borne noise or vibration.

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:

This will not induce substantial population growth because it will not create a significant number of new job opportunities or otherwise increase the desirability of living in this area. No housing will be displaced as a result of this project. This project similarly will not displace substantial numbers of people. It will be developed on areas of farmland that were previously dedicated to agricultural production.

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:

This project will not increase the need for public facilities associated with fire or police protection. As this project will not lead to population growth, there will be no impacts on schools or parks. Any structures associated with this project will be reviewed by the Fresno County Fire Protection District to ensure compliance with California Code of Regulations Title 24 – Fire Code.

XVI. RECREATION

Would the project:

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

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

XVII. TRANSPORTATION

Would the project:

- A. Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities; or
- B. Be in conflict or be inconsistent with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b); or
- 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:

Per the Applicant’s operational statement, this proposal will add very minimal increased traffic to the current dairy operations. Additionally, with this proposal, only two additional employees are expected and no increase to customers or on-site visitors. There are no plans, policies, or programs that relate to public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities in this area. The surrounding development consists of large parcels, which have been planted with row crops or support dairies similar to the project site.

XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED:

Under the provisions of Assembly Bill (AB) 52, the County was required to provide a Notice Preparation of this Initial Study to Native American Tribes who had previously indicated interest in reviewing CEQA projects. Notices were sent on April 22, 2015 to representatives of the Dumna Wo Wah, Table Mountain Rancheria, Santa Rosa Rancheria Tachi-Yokut

Tribe and the Picayune Rancheria of the Chukchansi Indians. None of the Tribal Governments responded. The project site is not located in an area of archaeological sensitivity and no cultural resources inventory was recommended by any reviewing agency.; however, the potential exists for undiscovered subsurface cultural resources to be discovered during ground disturbance. Therefore, the following mitigation measure is proposed to reduce impacts to yet unknown tribal cultural resources to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measure(s)

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

XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Would the project:

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The project will be required to file a Waste Management Plan and meet all requirements with the Regional Water Quality Control Board. Per the submitted Operational Statement, the volume of water to be used with this proposal is not to increase current dairy usage (up to 100 gallons per day, per cow). The project site is not in an area that is known to be short of water, so there are no concerns that the limited increase in use will result in the need to obtain additional water entitlements.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project is not in a water short area. The Water and Natural Resources Division had no concerns with the project.

- C. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments; or
- D. Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals; or
- E. Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

Upon completion of construction, the applicants will be required to submit technical reports to the California Regional Water Quality Control Board. The operation will also be required to obtain a permit to operate a Solid Waste Facility from the County of Fresno, Environmental Health Division, acting as the Local Enforcement Agency. With compliance with the Water Quality Control Board, the Project will have no adverse impact regarding noncompliance with statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

XX. WILDFIRE

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

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project is not located in or near a state responsibility area or land classified as very high fire hazard severity zones and will not impair an adopted emergency response or evacuation plan. The project will adhere to the site development and operational requirements of the Fresno County Fire Protection District.

XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Would the project:

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

animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

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

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

Emissions of criteria pollutants from this project will be consistent with the State Implementation Plan administered by the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District. The proposed improvements do not represent a substantial increase in the size of the dairy and will not result in adverse cumulative aesthetic or odor impacts. With compliance with all regulatory requirements from the SJVAPC, this project’s impacts will be less than significant.

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The proposed improvements will generally decrease the odor in the area of the project site and improve the overall waste management of the dairy.

CONCLUSION/SUMMARY

Based upon the Initial Study prepared for Unclassified Conditional Use Permit Application No. 3813, 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 Land Use and Planning, Population and Housing, Public Services and Wildfire.

Potential impacts related to Agriculture, Air Quality, Aesthetics, Energy, Biological Resources, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Hydrology and Water Quality, Geology and Soils, Mineral Resources, Noise, Utilities and Service Systems, and Transportation have been determined to be less than significant. Potential impacts relating to Cultural Resources, and Tribal Cultural Resources have determined to be less than significant with compliance with noted Mitigation Measures.

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

AA

G:\4360Devs&Pln\PROJSEC\PROJDOCS\CUP\3800-3899\3813\CEQA\CUP 3813 Initial Study Writeup.docx