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

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

APPLICANT: Salvador Ramirez

APPLICATION NOS.: Initial Study No. 8544; Amendment Application No. 3866.

DESCRIPTION: Rezone two parcels totaling approximately 1.26 acres, from the C-6 (General Commercial, Neighborhood Beautification Overlay) Zone District to the M-1 (Light Manufacturing Neighborhood Beatification Overlay) Zone District.

LOCATION: The subject parcels are located at the southeast corner of E. Malaga Avenue and S. Maple Avenue, southerly adjacent to the city limits of the City of Fresno (APNs:330-212-01, 02) (4432, 4424, 4412 S. Maple) (Sup. Dist. 3).

I. AESTHETICS

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

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

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project site is in an urbanized area, there were no scenic vistas or scenic resources, rock outcroppings, or historic buildings identified on or near the project site which may be impacted by the proposal. The project will have no impact on scenic resources.

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 subject parcel is currently vacant, and surrounding land uses to the east and south are zoned industrial, to the north is approximately 92 acres of agricultural land, which is withing the City of Fresno limits, and to the west the zoning is AL-20 which includes some low-density residential development and some low intensity agricultural operations.

The subject parcel is designated General Industrial in the County-adopted Roosevelt Community Plan. The surrounding area is also designated for General Industrial to provide for the establishment of industrial uses essential to the development of a balanced economic base with the zone change.

The proposed zone change from the C-6 Zone District to M-1 Zone District is consistent with the General Plan designation for the area and matches the existing M-3 and M-3 (c) zoning on the adjacent parcels. In fact, the proposed conditional M-1 zoning with limited light industrial uses is less intensive compared to the existing M-3 zoned parcels in the area developed with heavy industrial uses.

Given the existing zoning and improvements in the area, the proposed rezone from Commercial Zoning to Industrial Zoning will have a less than significant impact on the existing visual character of the immediate area.

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

Any outdoor lighting that might have the potential of generating glare in the area is limited by Zoning Ordinance Chapter 820.3.020 which requires it to be “directed downward and shielded so that all direct light and glare is confined within the boundaries of the subject parcel, thereby minimizing off-site glare” and that “light sources shall be shielded to direct light rays onto the subject parcel only. The light source, whether bulb or tube, shall not be directly visible from an abutting property or public street rights-of-way.” With adherence to the aforementioned standards, the project is not anticipated to create any new adverse lighting conditions in the vicinity.

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: NO IMPACT:

   The subject parcel is not Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance. The 2016 Department of Conservation Important Farmlands Map designates the parcel as a Rural Residential Land not qualified for agriculture. As such, the project will have no impact on valuable farmland.

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

   FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

   The subject parcel is currently zoned C-6 (General Commercial), and contains no agricultural land. Conflict with existing zoning for forest land, timberland or timberland zoned Timberland Production.

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

   FINDING: NO IMPACT:

   The project site does not contain any forest land or timber land and is designated as General Industrial in the County-adopted Roosevelt Community Plan. Therefore, no impacts to forests, conversion of forestland, or timberland zoning would result from the project.

D. 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 forestland to non-forest use?

   FINDING: NO IMPACT:

   Land in the project vicinity is designated General Industrial in the County-adopted Roosevelt Community Plan. The proposed M-1 conditional rezone is compatible with General Industrial in the Roosevelt Community Plan. It is the intent of the Roosevelt Community Plan that parcel designated General Industrial eventually be industrial in nature. As such, the conversion of the subject parcel to that goal 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:

The applicant provided an Air Quality/Greenhouse Gas Assessment (AQ/GHGA) by JK consulting Group, Inc, dated April 24, 2023. The San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD) reviewed AQ/GHGA and stated that the mitigated baseline emissions for construction and operation of the proposed project would be less than two tons NOx per year and two tons PM_{10} per year and that pursuant to District Rule 9510 Section 4.3, the project is exempt from the requirements of Section 6.0 (General Mitigation Requirements) and Section 7.0 (Off-site Emission Reduction Fee Calculations and Fee Schedules) of the Rule. Additionally, the project complies with the emission reduction requirements of District Rule 9510 and is not subject to payment of off-site fees.

Construction and operation of the uses allowed in the M-1 Zone District would contribute the following criteria pollutant emissions: reactive organic gases (ROG), carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen dioxide (NO_2), sulfur dioxide (SO_2), and particulate matter (PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$). Per the AQ/GHGA, Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions for the project were estimated using the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) version 2020.4.0. The total estimated GHG emissions during construction of the project was projected to be 188.0 metric tons of CO2e, which when amortized over a thirty (30) year period (estimated project lifetime) equates to 6.27 metric tons of CO2e per year. Operational emissions combined with the amortized construction emissions, estimates that the project would result in GHG emissions of approximately 54.13 metric tons of CO2e annually. The projected annual project emissions were estimated to represent between one and six percent of the established thresholds of significance identified by surrounding air quality management districts, and can therefore be considered to result in a less than significant impact to cumulative GHG emissions.

An Air Quality Plan (AQP) describes air pollution control strategies to be implemented by county, or region classified as a non-attainment area. The main purpose of AQP is to bring the area into compliance with the requirements of the Federal and State air quality standards. The CEQA requires that certain proposed projects be analyzed for consistency with the applicable air quality plan. For a project to be consistent with SJVAPCD air quality plans, the pollutants emitted from a project should not exceed the SJVAPCD emission thresholds or cause a significant impact on air quality. In addition, emission reductions achieved through implementation of offset requirements are a major component of the SJVAPCD air quality plans.

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The project area is within the San Joaquin Valley Air Basin (SJVAB), which consists of eight counties that comprise the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District. Under

the provisions of the U.S. Clean Air Act, the attainment status of the SJVAB with respect to national and state ambient air quality standards has been classified as non-attainment/extreme, non-attainment/severe, non-attainment, attainment/unclassified, or attainment for various criteria pollutants which includes O_3, PM_{10}, $PM_{2.5}$, CO, NO_2, SO_2, lead and others. No single project is sufficient in size to, by itself, result in nonattainment of ambient air quality standards. Instead, a project's individual emissions contribute to existing cumulatively significant adverse air quality impacts. If a project's contribution to the cumulative impact is considerable, then the project's impact on air quality would be considered significant.

In developing thresholds of significance for air pollutants, the SJVAPCD considered the emission levels for which a project's individual emissions would be cumulatively considerable.

Therefore, operation of the project, or its operation as per the discussion in Section A above, would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in nonattainment under an applicable Federal or State Ambient Air Quality Standards.

C. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

Sensitive receptors are defined as people that have an increased sensitivity to air pollution or environmental contaminants. Sensitive receptor locations include schools, parks and playgrounds, daycare centers, nursing homes, hospitals, and residential dwelling units. The closest sensitive receptor, a single-family residence, is located approximately 78 feet south of the project site.

Per the Air Quality/Greenhouse Gas Assessment (AQ/GHGA), most of the estimated health risk come from Toxic Air Contaminants (TACs), the most significant of which is PM from diesel-fueled engines, also known as diesel particulate matter (DPM). Heavy-duty vehicles and off-road construction equipment are main sources of diesel-related emissions.

As a result, the project would not expose adjacent sensitive receptors to toxic air emissions or generate TAC's that would have a significant impact on the environment.

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD) has not established a rule or standard regarding odor emissions. Rather, District Nuisance Rule 4102 (Nuisance) requires that any project with the potential to frequently expose members of the public to objectionable odors should be deemed to have a significant impact. Per the Air Quality/Greenhouse Gas Assessment (AQ/GHGA), the proposed uses are not

among the uses that have been reported to cause odor by SJVAPCD. During construction, some odors may be present due to diesel exhaust. However, these odors would be temporary and limited to the construction period. The project would not involve any activities or operations that generate objectionable odors and it is not expected to be a source of odors once operational. Therefore, the project would not result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people.

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?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project site is fallow and contains no river or stream to hold riparian features that could potentially be impacted by the project. The immediate surrounding area consist of industrial uses, and its proximity to the City of Fresno urban development reduces the probability that there is habitat to support special-status species.

The project was routed to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the California Department of Fish and Wildlife for comments. Neither agency offered any comments nor expressed any concerns regarding the project's impact on biological resources.

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:

No historic drainages were identified within the project area. A query of the National Wetlands Inventory (NWI) Map shows no drainage pattern, aquatic feature, wetlands, waters of the United States or waters of the State of California present on or near the project site.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project area is near the City of Fresno and is not designated as a migratory wildlife corridor. Likewise, the project site contains no water feature to provide for the migration of wildlife.

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 site is not in an area restricted by any general policies or ordinances to protect biological resources, or in an area subject to a Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or State Habitat Conservation Plan. As discussed above, the project site is a transitional area between the urbanized city of Fresno and the rural County, and it does not contain any critical or important habitat for special status species.

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: NO IMPACT:

The project site is not designated as highly or moderately sensitive for archeological resources. It is in an area of industrial and limited agricultural uses. The subject parcels are currently zoned for commercial uses. The proposal

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:

Development of the industrial uses on the property would result in less than significant consumption of energy (gas, electricity, gasoline, and diesel) during construction or operation of the facility. Construction activities and corresponding fuel energy consumption would be temporary and localized. There are no unusual project characteristics that would cause the use of construction equipment to be less energy efficient compared with other similar construction sites in the County. Therefore, construction-related fuel consumption by the project would not result in inefficient, wasteful, or unnecessary energy use compared with other construction sites in the area.

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 or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency.

All construction activities would comply with the 2019 Building Energy Efficiency Standards. Pursuant to the California Building Standards Code and the Energy Efficiency Standards, the County would review the design components of the project's energy conservation measures when the project's building plans for building/structures are submitted.

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; or

2. Strong seismic ground shaking; or

3. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

Per Figure 9-5 of the Fresno County General Plan Background Report, the project area has 10 percent probability of seismic hazard in 50 years. Development of industrial uses on the property would be subject to building standards at the time of development, which include specific regulations to protect against damage caused by earthquake and/or ground acceleration.

4. Landslides?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

Per Figure 9-6 of the Fresno County General Plan Background Report, the project site is not located in an area of landslide hazards. The site is flat with no topographical variations, which precludes the possibility of landslides.

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

Per Figure 7-3 of the Fresno County General Plan Background Report, the project site is not in located in an erosion hazard area. Grading activities resulting from future development proposals may result in loss of some topsoil due to compaction and over covering of soil for construction of buildings and structures for the project. However, the impact would be less than significant with a Project Note requiring an Engineered Grading Plans to show how additional storm water runoff generated by the proposed development will be handled without adversely impacting adjacent properties and securing a Grading Permit prior to any on-site grading activities.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

As noted above, the project site is flat with no topographical variations. As a standard practice, a soil compaction report may be required to ensure the weight-bearing capacity of the soils for any proposed building. The project site bears no potential for lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse due to the site development.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

Per Figure 7-1 of Fresno County General Plan Background Report, the project site is not in an area where soils have been determined to exhibit moderately high to high expansion potential. However, the project development will implement all applicable requirements of the most recent California Building Standards Code and will consider any potential hazards associated with shrinking and swelling of 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: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The project site is within the Malaga County Water District (MCWD) boundary. According to MCWD, sanitary sewer system is adjacent to the property and to connect to the system, the developer shall submit utility plans, construct sewer service, and connect in accordance with District requirements/standards.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

No paleontological resources or geologic features were identified on the project site.

VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Would the project:

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

Construction and operational activities associated with the project would generate greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. During construction, GHGs would be emitted through the operation of construction equipment and from worker and builder supply vendor vehicles, each of which typically uses fossil-based fuels to operate. The combustion of fossil-based fuels creates GHGs such as CO_2, CH_4, and N_2O. Furthermore, CH_4 is emitted during the fueling of heavy equipment. In the *Air* Quality/Greenhouse Gas Assessment (AQ/GHGA), by JK Consulting Group, Inc, dated April 24, 2023, GHG emissions were estimated using the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) version 2020.4.0.

According to the Air Quality/Greenhouse Gas Assessment, during construction, the project would generate approximately 188 metric tons of CO_2e. When amortized over a 30-year project lifetime (estimated), yield would be approximately 6.27 MT CO_2e per year.

Long-term GHG emissions are typically generated from mobile sources (vehicle trips), area sources (maintenance activities and landscaping), indirect emissions from sources associated with energy consumption, and waste sources (land filling and waste disposal). During operation, the project would generate a total of approximately 54.13 MT CO_2 per year.

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

Per the Air Quality/Greenhouse Gas Assessment, the project would not conflict with the State's GHG emissions reductions objectives embodied in AB (Assembly Bill) 32, SB (Senate Bill) 375, Executive Order B-30-15 (GHG emissions reductions target of at least 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030), AB 1279 (achieve net zero GHG emissions by year 2045) and 2022 Scoping Plan. Therefore, the project's incremental contribution to cumulative GHG emissions would not be cumulatively considerable.

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?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

The allowed uses allowed in the proposed M-1 Zone District could involve handling of potentially hazardous materials.

According to the Fresno County Health Department, Environmental Health Division, all uses in the proposed M-1 (c) Zone District requiring the use and/or storage of hazardous materials/hazardous wastes, shall meet the requirements set forth in the California Health and Safety Code (HSC), Division 20, Chapter 6.95, and the California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 22, Division 4.5. Furthermore, any business that handles a hazardous material or hazardous waste may be required to submit a Hazardous Materials Business Plan pursuant to the HSC, Division 20, and Chapter 6.95. These requirements will be included as Project Notes.

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

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

See discussion in Section A., B. above. There are no schools within one quarter mile of the project site. The nearest school, Malaga Elementary School, is approximately 0.72 mile south of the project site.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

Per the California Department of Toxic Substances Control Site (EnviroStor), the project site is not listed as a hazardous materials site. The project will not create hazards to the public or the environment.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

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

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project site is in an area where existing emergency response times for fire protection, emergency medical services, and sheriff protection meet adopted standards. The future development proposals do not include any characteristics (*e.g.*, permanent road closures) that would physically impair or otherwise interfere with emergency response or evacuation in the project vicinity. No impacts would occur.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

Per Figure 9-9 of the Fresno County General Plan Background Report, the project site is outside of the State Responsibility area for wildland fire. No impact from wildland fire hazards would occur.

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:

See discussion in Section VII. E. GEOLOGY AND SOILS above regarding waste discharge.

The project site is within the Malaga County Water District (MCWD) boundary. According to MCWD, water system is adjacent to the property and would require connection as appropriate to the proposed development and destruction of any onsite water well in accordance with Fresno County Department of Public Health, Environmental Health Division (Health Department) requirements.

According to the County Health Department, Environmental Health Division, as a measure to protect ground water, all water wells and/or septic systems that exist or have been abandoned within the project area will require to be properly destroyed by a licensed contractor.

No concerns regarding the project impact on groundwater quality were expressed by the Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region or the State Water Resources Control Board, Division of Drinking Water.

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 noted above, the project site is within the Malaga Water District (MCWD) boundary. According to the State Water Resources Control Board, Division of Drinking Water (SWRCB-DDW), the project shall be served water by a permitted public water system operated by Malaga County Water District and regulated by SWRCB-DDW.

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; or

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

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:

Development of industrial uses on the property will cause no significant changes in the absorption rates, drainage patterns, or the rate and amount of surface run-off with adherence to the mandatory construction practices contained in the Grading and Drainage Sections of the County Ordinance Code.

Included as Project Notes, these requirements will be addressed through mandatory Site Plan Review prior to the establishment of a use on the property.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

According to FEMA FIRM Panel 2140H the subject at
property is located within Zone X, and area of minimal flood hazard.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project site is within North Kings Groundwater Sustainability Area (NKGSA). The NKGSA expressed no concerns related to groundwater sustainability management plan.

XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING

Would the project:

A. Physically divide an established community?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project site will not physically divide an established community. The project site is outside of the City of Fresno boundary and the community of Malaga boundary.

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The project entails rezoning of two parcels totaling 1.26-acres from the C-6 (General Commercial) Zone District to an M-1 (Light Industrial) for use a contractors storage yard, and to allow for the full range of uses allowed in the M-1 Zone District.

The C-6 Zone District is intended to provide for a wide range of uses allowed in the commercial zones which are not considered appropriate in the neighborhood, community, or central trading zones. The M-1 Zone District is applied to areas appropriate for restricted non-intensive manufacturing and storage uses, including fabrication, manufacturing, and assembly of processed materials, which do not adversely impact surrounding uses. The M-1 zone is consistent with the Limited Industrial and General Industrial designations of the General Plan. The proposed contractor’s storage yard is consistent with the M-1 Zoning.

The project site is designated General Industrial in the County-adopted Roosevelt Community Plan and is outside of the City of Fresno Sphere of Influence boundary. As such, the project was not referrable to the City for annexation, and is not in conflict with a land use plan, policy, or regulation of any agency. The project is consistent with the following General Plan policies.

Regarding consistency with General Plan Policy LU-F.29. Criteria a, b, c & d, all development proposals on the property will adhere to the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District rules and regulations, provisions of Fresno County Noise Ordinance, and the M-1(c) Zone District development standards and be analyzed against these standards during mandatory Site Plan Review.

XII. MINERAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

A. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state; or

B. Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local General Plan, Specific Plan or other land use plan?
FINDING: NO IMPACT:

Per Figure 7-8 of the Fresno County General Plan Background Report, the project site is outside mineral-producing areas of the County.

XIII. NOISE

Would the project result in:

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

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

As per the Fresno County Department of Public Health, Environmental Health Division, the project could result in an increase in noise level due to construction activities on the property. Noise impact associated with construction are expected to be temporary and will be subject to the County Noise Ordinance.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

Per the discussion in Section IX. E. above, the project will not be impacted by airport noise.

XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING

Would the project:

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

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project will allow for specific industrial uses on the property. As these uses involve no housing, no increase in population would occur from this proposal.

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?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

According to the Fresno County Fire Protection District (CalFire), the project shall adhere to the requirements of the California Code of Regulations title 24 – Fire Code when building permit or certificate of occupancy is sought, and annex to Community Facilities District No. 2010-01 of Cal Fire.

2. Police protection; or

3. Schools; or

4. Parks; or

5. Other public facilities?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project will not impact existing public services, nor will it result in the need for additional public services related to schools, parks, or police protection by the Fresno County Sheriff's Office.

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 induce population growth which may require new or expanded recreational facilities in the area.

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: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The Transportation Planning Unit (TPU) of the Fresno County Department of Public Works and Planning reviewed the subject proposal and required that a Traffic Impact Study (TIS) be prepared to assess the project's potential impacts to County roadways and intersections proximate to the project site. A Traffic Impact Study was prepared for the project by Total Engineering Solutions, Inc. dated July 23, 2024. The traffic study concluded that the four intersections and road segments included in the study are operating at an acceptable level of service, and would continue to do so with implementation of the project; ten years into the future of the project and twenty years into the future of the project.

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

Vehicle Miles Travelled (VMT) refers to total miles of travel by passenger vehicles that a project is expected to generate in a day. The proposed project is projected to generate

approximately 445 daily trips on average. The Fresno County Council of Governments (COG) has maintained that projects which generate fewer than 500 daily trips can be presumed to have a less than significant impact on cumulative VMT. The County's Transportation Planning Unit has reviewed the traffic impact analysis and concurs with its conclusions.

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

D. Result in inadequate emergency access?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The subject rezone application to ensure that the site is provided with ingress and egress of adequate width to minimize traffic hazards and to provide for adequate emergency access acceptable to the local fire agency.

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:

The project site is not designated as highly or moderately sensitive for archeological resources. Pursuant to Assembly Bill (AB) 52, the project was routed to the Santa Rosa Rancheria Tachi Yokut Tribe, Picayune Rancheria of the Chukchansi Indians, Dumna Wo Wah Tribal Government, and Table Mountain Rancheria offering them an opportunity to consult under Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 21080.3(b) with a 30-day window to formally respond to the County letter. No tribe requested consultation, resulting in no further action on the part of the County.

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:

See discussion in Section VII. E. GEOLOGY AND SOILS above. The project will not result in the relocation or construction of new electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities.

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:

See discussion in Section X. B. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY above.

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

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

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

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The proposed rezone to allow for a contractor', is not anticipated to generate solid waste more than capacity of local landfill sites. All solid waste disposal will be required to comply with applicable federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

XX. WILDFIRE

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

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

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

C. Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment; or

D. Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project site is not in or near a state responsibility area or fire hazard severity zones. As such no impact to fire hazard risks would occur as a result of project implementation.

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?

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

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

The proposed project will adhere to the permitting requirements and rules and regulations set forth by the Fresno County Grading and Drainage Ordinance, San Joaquin Air Pollution Control District, and California Code of Regulations Fire Code at the time development occurs on the property. No cumulatively considerable impacts were identified in the analysis.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

No potential for adverse impacts on human beings, either directly or indirectly, were identified in the analysis.

CONCLUSION/SUMMARY

Based upon the Initial Study prepared for Amendment Application No. 3866, 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, agriculture and forestry resources, air quality, biological resources, cultural and tribal cultural resources, geology and soils, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use and planning, mineral resources, noise, population and housing, public services, recreation, transportation, utilities and service systems, or wildfire.

Potential impacts related to energy and greenhouse gas emissions, have been determined to be less than significant.

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

JS:sy:jp
G:\4360Devs&Pln\PROJSEC\PROJDOCS\AA\3800-3899\3866\CEQA\drafts\AA 3866 IS wu.docx