



# County of Fresno

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

## EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

- APPLICANT: Roger Van Groningen
- APPLICATION NOS.: Initial Study No. 7504, General Plan Amendment Application No. 555, and Amendment Application No. 3832
- DESCRIPTION: Amend the Land Use Element of the County-adopted Selma Community Plan to redesignate a 18.56-acre parcel and a 9.29-acre parcel from Agriculture to General Industrial; and
- Change the zoning of the said parcels from the AE-20 (Exclusive Agricultural, 20-acre minimum parcel size) Zone District to the M-3 (c) (Heavy Industrial, Conditional) Zone District to allow limited by-right industrial uses and expansion of an existing rail spur and related freight terminal operations located on an adjacent westerly property.
- LOCATION: The subject parcels are located on the southwest corner of E. Manning and S. Leonard Avenues approximately 0.5-miles west of the city limits of the City of Fowler and 0.75-miles north of the city limits of the City of Selma (APN: 348-050-25S & 29) (8309 E. Manning Avenue and 9073 S. Leonard 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; 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, consisting of a 18.56-acre parcel and a 9.29-acre parcel is fallow land. Parcels in the immediate surrounding are developed with industrial and agricultural uses with single-family homes. The site borders with Manning Avenue and Leonard Avenue that are not designated as state scenic road/highway in the County General Plan. There are no scenic vistas or scenic resources, including trees, rock outcroppings, or historic buildings on or near the site that may be impacted by the project. 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 WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED:

As noted above, the subject parcels are uncultivated, designated Agriculture in the County-adopted Selma Community Plan and are located in the AE-20 (Exclusive Agriculture; 20-acre minimum parcel size required) Zone District.

The subject parcels are surrounded by industrial and agricultural parcels ranging from one-half acre to 148.88 acres in size. Parcels immediately to the north, south and east are zoned AE-20, lie fallow, or are planted in vineyards with single-family residences. Parcels immediately to the west are located in the Golden State Industrial Corridor (GSIC), are zoned M-3 and M-3 (c), and are developed with warehouses, offices, storage buildings, machinery, and equipment manufacturing facilities. The proposed M-3 (c) zoning is compatible with the adjacent M-3 zoned parcels within GSIC.

Staff notes that development of industrial uses on the subject parcels may visually/aesthetically impact a single-family residence located approximately 35 feet from the south property line of the 9.29-acre parcel. To minimize the impact to SFR, the project shall adhere to the following mitigation measure:

\* **Mitigation Measure:**

*A seven (7) foot high cyclone fence with privacy slats or other fencing type as approved by Fresno County's Development Services Division shall be erected along southern property line of the subject 9.29-acre parcel to minimize potential visual impacts on adjacent properties due to the development of industrial uses*

- 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 resultant of the proposed industrial uses in the M-3 (c) zone district have the potential of generating glare in the area. However, the project shall be subject to Section 834.4.025.B(1)(a). of the Fresno County 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:

While a minority of the property is prime Farmland, the majority of the project site is not Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance. The majority of the site is designated by 2022 Department of Conservation Important Farmlands Map as Farmland of Local Importance and as Vacant or Disturbed Land. No significant impact on Prime Farmland would occur from this proposal.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The proposed M-3 conditional zoning will not be in conflict with the land use designation of the parcels with the approval of the subject General Plan Amendment (GPA). The GPA Application No. 555 will allow the change of current land use designation from Agriculture to General Industrial and allow the change of current zoning from the AE-20 (Exclusive Agricultural, 20-acre minimum parcel size) to M-3 (c) (Heavy Industrial; Conditional). The subject parcels are within the City of Selma Sphere of Influence and are designated as Light Industrial reserve in the City's 2035 General Plan document.

The parcels are not restricted by Williamson Act Land Conservation Contract.

- C. Conflict with existing zoning for forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production; or
- D. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project site is not identified as forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220[g]) or timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526)

and is not zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104[g]). No forests occur in the vicinity of the project site and therefore no impacts to forests, conversion of forestland, or timberland zoning would occur from the subject proposal.

- 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 would change zoning of subject parcels (totaling 27.85 acres) from agricultural to industrial with limited by-right industrial uses requested by the applicant. This transition will require amendment of Land Use Element of the County-adopted Selma Community Plan to redesignate subject parcels from Agriculture to General Industrial. The proposed industrial uses, including expansion of an existing rail spur and related freight terminal operations, are similar in nature to other industrial uses on M-3 zoned parcels in the area. The change to existing environment would be less than significant as the land has been fallow for a significant amount of time and other industrial uses are planned for and limited to the area designated in the Selma Community Plan for industry, hence the limits of the plan preclude the inducement of growth that would substantially impact the existing environment.

### 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:

An Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Analysis dated September 29, 2020 was originally prepared for the project. In 2025 LSA Associates prepared a Revised Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Analysis dated July 17, 2025. The revised analysis updates the emission modeling using current assumptions and regulatory guidance.

According to the Analysis, the California Environmental Quality Act requires that projects be analyzed for consistency with the applicable air quality plan. For a project to be consistent with the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (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.

The revised analysis confirms that the proposed rezoning would continue to comply with applicable SJVAPCD plans and would not result in the generation of criteria air pollutants that would exceed SJVAPCD thresholds of significance.

- 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:

Per the Revised Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Analysis dated July 17 2025, 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. If a project exceeds the identified significance thresholds, its emissions would be cumulatively considerable, resulting in significant adverse air quality impacts to the region's existing air quality conditions.

Regarding construction emissions, the analysis evaluates potential construction emissions associated with the maximum building that would be allowed with the proposed rezone. Construction emissions were estimated using the California Emissions Estimator Model version 2016.3.2 (CalEEMod).

The July 17, 2025 revised analysis evaluates a conservative maximum buildout scenario and estimates maximum annual construction emissions of approximately 0.9 tons/year ROG, 3.5 tons/year NOx, 3.0 tons/year CO, <0.1 tons/year SOx, 0.4 tons/year PM10, and 0.2 tons/year PM2.5, which are below SJVAPCD thresholds of significance.

The updated analysis estimates maximum annual operational emissions of approximately 1.9 tons/year ROG, 1.8 tons/year NOx, 9.2 tons/year CO, <0.1 tons/year SOx, 1.8 tons/year PM10, and 0.5 tons/year PM2.5, which are below SJVAPCD thresholds of significance. Therefore, the project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of criteria pollutants.

The memo also includes an operational Health Risk Assessment (HRA) for toxic air contaminants. The HRA results show a maximum individual cancer risk of 0.35 in one million at the maximally exposed sensitive receptor and 0.20 in one million at the worker receptor, with chronic and acute hazard indices less than 0.001. These values are below SJVAPCD significance thresholds; therefore, the project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.

The project would not exceed the significance criteria for annual ROG, NOx, CO, SOx, PM<sub>10</sub>, and PM<sub>2.5</sub> emissions; therefore, construction and operation of the proposed project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in nonattainment under an applicable federal or State AAQS.

- 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, day care centers, nursing homes, hospitals, and residential dwelling units. The sensitive receptor to the project site includes residences to the north, east, and south. Per the Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Analysis prepared by LSA Associates and dated September 29, 2020, and confirmed in the revised July 17, 2025 Analysis, the closest residence is approximately 200 feet south of the south edge of the project site.

As discussed in the revised analysis by LSA Associates, the maximum cancer risk for the sensitive receptor would be 0.35 in one million and the cancer risk for the worker receptor would be 0.20 in one million, which would both be less than the threshold of 20 in one million. The total chronic HI would be less than 0.001 for both the sensitive receptor MEI and worker receptor MEI, which would be below the threshold of 1.0. Additionally, the total acute HI would be nominal (0.000), which would also not exceed the threshold of 1.0. As these results show, all health risk levels to nearby residents and workers from operation related emissions of TACs would be well below the SJVAPCD's HRA thresholds. Therefore, the proposed project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.

- 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) addresses odor criteria within the Guidance for Assessing and Mitigating Air Quality Impacts (GAMAQI) and has not established a rule or standard regarding odor emissions. Rather, the District has a nuisance rule which states that any project with the potential to frequently expose members of the public to objectionable odors should be deemed to have a significant impact.

Odors are typically associated with landfills, sewage treatment plants, composting facilities, feedlots, asphalt plants and similar operations. The proposed expansion of an existing rail spur and related freight terminal operations on the subject parcels would not cause a significant impact regarding objectionable odors. Should future activities that produce objectionable odors, it would be subject to SJVAPCD Rule 4102. With implementation of these regulations, odor impacts remain less than significant.

#### IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

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

A Biological Resources Evaluation (BRE) was prepared for the project by LSA Associates, dated July 2025. The BRE explains that the project site has been historically disturbed (including prior agricultural use and subsequent disturbance associated with adjacent industrial activities) and is currently largely barren/disturbed with limited habitat value. Based on habitat conditions and survey/desktop review, the BRE concludes that no special-status plant species have potential to occur on the site and no sensitive natural communities, federally designated critical habitat, or riparian habitat occur within the project footprint.

The BRE identifies that nesting birds protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and California Fish and Game Code could be affected if ground disturbance or vegetation removal occurs during the nesting season. With implementation of Mitigation Measure requiring Nesting Bird Surveys be conducted if project activities occur during nesting season (February 1 to September 15), impacts would be reduced to less than significant.

\* **Mitigation Measure:**

*To mitigate potential impacts to nesting birds should ground disturbance or construction activities occur during the nesting season (February 1 to September 15), nesting bird surveys shall be conducted no more than 14 days prior to the start of construction at the construction site plus a 500-foot buffer. If no active nests are found, no further action is required; If active nests are located, all construction work shall be conducted outside a buffer zone from the nest to be determined by the qualified biologist. The buffer shall be a minimum of 250 feet for non-raptor bird species and at least 500 feet for raptor species, unless determined otherwise by the qualified biologist. Buffer distances for bird nests shall be site-specific and an appropriate distance, as determined by a qualified biologist. The buffer distances shall be specified to protect the bird's normal behavior thereby preventing nesting failure or abandonment. The buffer distance recommendation shall be developed after field investigations that evaluate the bird(s) apparent distress in the presence of people or equipment at various distances. Abnormal nesting behaviors which may cause reproductive harm include, but are not limited to, defensive flights/vocalizations directed towards project personnel, standing up from a brooding position, and flying away from the nest. The qualified biologist shall have authority to order the cessation of all nearby project activities if the nesting birds exhibit abnormal behavior which may cause reproductive failure (nest abandonment and loss of eggs and/or young) until an appropriate buffer is established. Larger buffers may be required depending upon the status of the nest and the construction activities occurring in the vicinity of the nest. The buffer area(s) shall be closed to all construction*

*personnel and equipment until the adults and young are no longer reliant on the nest site. A qualified biologist shall confirm that breeding/nesting is completed, and young have fledged the nest prior to removal of the buffer. The biologist shall submit a report of these preconstruction nesting bird surveys to the County of Fresno's Department of Public Works and Planning to document compliance within 30 days of its completion.*

- 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:

The project site is uncultivated land and does not contain any riparian features, wetlands, or waters under the jurisdiction of the United States.

A query of the National Wetlands Inventory (NWI) Map shows that the nearest wetland feature is approximately 0.78 mile southeast of the project site and will not be impacted by the subject proposal. Additionally, the BRE identifies no jurisdictional wetlands or waters within the project footprint. A man-made canal (Iowa Ditch) occurs within the broader study area; however, the BRE concludes it would not be impacted by the proposed project.

- 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 BRE concludes the project site does not provide an established wildlife corridor function and no native wildlife nursery sites were documented within the project footprint. The site is surrounded by a mix of agricultural, residential, and commercial uses, and the area in general is not conducive to substantial wildlife movement.

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

- 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.

The project site is close to industrially developed area within Golden State Industrial Corridor. This area does not contain critical or important habitat for special status species and is intended for eventual annexation into the City of Selma.

## 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:

A Cultural Resources Assessment was prepared for the project by Peak & Associates, Inc., dated July 7, 2025. According to the Assessment, the survey area was largely disturbed, with much of it paved, covered in imported gravel, or recently affected by new construction. Where the native ground surface was visible, the area could be characterized as a semi-arid environment with vegetation including Prickly Lettuce (*Lactuca serriola*), Horseweed (*Erigeron canadensis*), Shortpod Mustard (*Hirschfeldia incana*), and Yellow Star Thistle (*Centaurea solstitialis*). The native sediment consisted of loosely compacted light brown loamy sand. Ground visibility in these areas ranged from 0% to 100%, with most locations averaging around 30%. The survey was conducted in east–west transects spaced 15 meters apart, with dual-action hoe scrapes every 30 meters in areas where native sediments were present and ground visibility was low. The land surface had been significantly altered by construction activities, railroad tracks, and vehicle traffic. Several areas could not be surveyed due to new building and concrete platform construction.

A historic topographic map from 1924 indicated a possible water catchment feature on the northern side of the parcel, marked by east–west trending high points just south of this natural water catchment. This area received focused attention during the survey due to its elevated potential for cultural materials. However, much of it had been covered with gravel and heavily disturbed by recent construction. Although ground scrapes were conducted, no cultural resources were observed on the surface.

Another area of interest was a man-made water catchment located in the northwest corner of the parcel, which exposed several stratigraphic layers. The edges of this feature were closely examined, looking for any cultural materials along these stratigraphic layers, but no cultural materials were observed. There are either no historic period or prehistoric period resources present in the project area. and the project will have no effect on historical resources.

A records search response from the Southern San Joaquin Valley Information Center (SSJVIC) indicates no recorded cultural resources within the project area and no recorded resources within 0.25 mile of the project boundary (with prior studies noted within the broader search radius). A Sacred Lands File search response from the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) reported negative results for the project area. No tribe requested formal AB 52 consultation; however, Table Mountain Rancheria requested notification in the unlikely event of discovery during ground disturbance. Although no resources were identified, inadvertent discovery procedures are appropriate to ensure unanticipated discoveries are handled in compliance with CEQA and applicable law, the project will adhere to the following mitigation measure.

\* **Mitigation Measure:**

*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?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

Development of industrial uses on the subject parcels 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:

Development of industrial uses on the subject parcels would 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 are submitted. These measures could include insulation; use of energy-efficient heating, ventilation, and air conditioning equipment (HVAC); solar-reflective roofing materials; energy-efficient indoor and outdoor lighting systems; and other measures.

## 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-Priola 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?

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. Future development proposals 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 project 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 an area of erosion hazards. 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 in that a Project Note would require approval of an Engineered Grading Plans and a Grading Permit from the Development Engineering Section of the Development Services and Capital Projects Division 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:

Per Figure 9-6 of Fresno County General Plan Background Report, the project site is not in an area at risk of landslides. Also, the subject proposal involves no underground materials movement and therefore poses no risks related to subsidence.

- 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:

Per Figure 7-1 of the Fresno County General Plan Background Report, the project site is not in an area of expansive soils. However, future development proposals on the property 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 WITH MITIGATION INCORPERATED:

Community sewer is currently unavailable to the subject parcels. The parcels are located within the Selma-Kingsburg-Fowler (SKF) Sanitation District and the City of Selma Sphere of Influence but outside of their existing corporate boundaries.

According to SKF Sanitation District (District), the project site is not contiguous to the district boundaries and no accessible public sewer is available within 200 feet of the parcels. To received District sewer services, the parcels would require annexation to the City of Selma through the approval of Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCo).

According to LAFCo, annexation to the City of Selma is unlikely due to the subject parcels not being contiguous to the city limit. Given the District comments and LAFCo comments, the project will be subject to the following mitigation measure:

\* **Mitigation Measure:**

*At such time sewer services become available the subject site shall pursue annexation to the Selma-Kingsburg Fowler Sanitation (SKF) District.*

According to the Fresno County Public Health Department, Environmental Health Division, only low water uses and uses that generate small amounts of liquid waste shall be permitted until the project site is served by a community sewer and water system. This requirement has been included as a mitigation measure:

\* **Mitigation Measure:**

*Only low water uses and uses that generate small amounts of liquid waste shall be permitted until the project site is served by a community sewer and water system or adequate information is submitted to the Fresno County Public Health Department, Environmental Health Division to demonstrate that the property can accommodate higher volumes of liquid waste.*

- 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 WITH MITIGATION  
INCORPORATED:

A Revised Air Quality, Energy, and Greenhouse Gas Analysis was prepared for the project by LSA Associates, dated July 17, 2025. The memorandum discloses GHG emissions for a conservative maximum buildout scenario. The analysis estimates hypothetical construction emissions of approximately 1,052.1 metric tons (MT) CO<sub>2</sub>e, amortized over a 30-year project life to approximately 35.1 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e per year. Operational emissions for the maximum buildout scenario are estimated at approximately 3,421.5 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e per year, for a total (including amortized construction) of approximately 3,456.6 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e per year.

In the absence of a County-adopted GHG threshold and in the absence of SJVAPCD-adopted GHG thresholds for land use projects, the analysis evaluates GHG significance using a project design-element approach tied to California's long-term climate goals. With implementation of the Mitigation Measure below, future development under the M-3 zoning would incorporate key GHG-reduction design elements (no natural gas and EV

charging consistent with CALGreen Tier 2 voluntary standards). Therefore, GHG impacts would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

\* **Mitigation Measure:**

*To address potential Greenhouse Gas Design impacts, prior to any future development that occurs under the M-3 zoning on the project site and/or prior to initiating a change of occupancy for industrial uses and the commencement of on-site industrial operations, the Project developer or operator shall present documentation to the satisfaction of the County of Fresno that the final project designs include the following design elements:*

- a. Any future development shall not include natural gas appliances or natural gas plumbing.*
- b. Any future development shall provide electric vehicle charging capabilities that meet the requirements of the latest version of the California Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen Code) Tier 2 Voluntary Standards.*

- 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 2025 Revised Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Analysis prepared for the project by LSA Associates, with implementation of the above Mitigation Measure, future development under the proposed zoning would incorporate building and transportation design elements consistent with State efforts to reduce GHG emissions and achieve long-term climate targets. Therefore, the project would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing 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; 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:

The uses allowed under the subject M-3 conditional zoning may result in the handling of potentially hazardous materials. The Fresno County Public Health Department, Environmental Health Division requires Facilities proposing to use and/or store hazardous materials and/or 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. Any business that handles a hazardous material or hazardous waste may be required to submit a Hazardous Materials Business Plan pursuant to the California Health and Safety Code (HSC), Division 20, Chapter 6.95. Any proposal to utilize underground or aboveground petroleum storage tank shall contact Certified Unified Program Agency, obtain permit from FCHD regarding the installation of any underground storage tanks, and contact local Fire authority for construction of aboveground tanks. Future tenants may require obtaining a permit from the California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery (CalRecycle) pursuant to the State of California Public Resources Code, Division 30; Waste Management, Chapter 16; Waste Tire Facilities, Chapter 19; and Waste Tire Haulers.

The nearest school, Andrew Jackson Elementary School, is approximately 1.7 miles southeast of the project site.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project site is not included in the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) Hazardous Waste and Substances Sites (Cortese) List compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5.

- 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:

Per the Fresno County *Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan Update* adopted by the Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) on December 3, 2018, the nearest public airport, Selma Airport, is approximately 1.4 miles southwest of the project site. At that distance, the airport will not result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The subject proposal would not modify the existing street system in the area. Therefore, interference with any adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan would not occur. No concerns related to emergency access were expressed by the Fresno County Sheriff's Department or the Fresno County Fire Protection District.

- 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 protection. No persons or structures will be exposed to wildland fire hazards.

## 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 above in Section VI. E. Geology and Soils for waste discharge requirements.

The proposed industrial uses on the property will utilize onsite well for water supply. According to the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB), Division of Drinking Water (DDW) as the onsite well will serve 35 employees on the property, it would meet the definition of a public water system and would require a drinking water permit from SWRCB-DDW.

According to the Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region (Water Board), regulatory requirements include a construction storm water permit shall be obtained from Water Board for all ground disturbing activities that exceed one-acre.

- 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:

The Water and Natural Resources Division of the Fresno County Department of Public Works and Planning reviewed the proposed project and determined that the project site is not located in a water-short area of Fresno County and the proposed rezone will have a less than significant impact on the existing water levels in the area. No concerns

relative to the availability and sustainability of groundwater for future development proposals were expressed.

As noted in Section VII. E., only low water uses and uses that generate small amounts of liquid waste will be permitted until the project site is served by community sewer and water systems or adequate information is submitted to the Health Department to demonstrate that the property can accommodate higher volumes of liquid wastes.

- 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:

According to the United States Geological Survey Quad Maps, no natural drainage channels run through the subject parcels.

All development proposal pertaining to the uses allowed by the subject applications could compact and over-cover soil and reduced area available for infiltration of storm water, potential runoff, flooding, erosion, and siltation. However, these effects are not considered significant due to each development adhering to mandatory construction practices contained in the Grading and Drainage Sections of the County Ordinance Code which will be implemented through mandatory Site Plan Review.

Additionally, Fresno County regulatory requirements include prior to ground disturbance, an engineered grading and drainage plan shall be approved, and a grading voucher shall be secured from the Development Engineering Section of the Fresno County Department of Public Works and Planning.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

According to FEMA FIRM Panel 2125H, the project site is not subject to flooding from the 100 year storm.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project is not in conflict with any Water Quality Control Plan for Fresno County. Regarding sustainable groundwater management plan, the Central Kings Groundwater Sustainability Area (CKGSA), offered no comments on the project.

## XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING

Would the project:

- A. Physically divide an established community?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project will not physically divide an established community. The project would not introduce new public infrastructure, transportation corridors, or physical barriers such as highways, railways, or canals that would divide an existing community. The proposed development would occur on the subject parcels and would remain compatible with surrounding rural and industrial uses. The project would not interfere with existing circulation patterns or restrict access between adjacent properties.

- 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 site consists of two parcels totaling approximately 27.85 acres designated Agriculture in the County-adopted Selma Community Plan, zoned AE-20 (Exclusive Agricultural; 20-acre minimum parcel size) in the Fresno County Zoning Ordinance, and located within the City of Selma Sphere of Influence (SOI).

The project proposes to amend the Land Use Element of the Selma Community Plan to redesignate the subject parcels from Agriculture to General Industrial, and to rezone the property from the AE-20 Zone District to the M-3(c) (Heavy Industrial; Conditional) Zone District to allow expansion of an existing rail unloading and logistics facility with limited by-right industrial uses consistent with the Fresno County Zoning Ordinance development standards for the M-3 Zone District.

The parcels are located within both the Selma-Kingsburg-Fowler (SKF) Sanitation District Sphere of Influence and the City of Selma Sphere of Influence, but remain outside their respective corporate boundaries. The project does not conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation of the SKF Sanitation District or the City of Selma and is consistent with the Fresno County General Plan.

According to the 2016 Fresno County Important Farmland Map, the majority of the project site is not classified as Prime Farmland. The parcels are also located within the Golden State Industrial Corridor Sphere of Influence, near established industrial uses, and are anticipated to eventually develop with industrial uses. Additionally, the parcels are designated Light Industrial Reserve in the City of Selma 2035 General Plan, indicating long-term planning for industrial development in the area.

Consistent with Fresno County General Plan policies related to urban services and infrastructure, future development of the parcels would require annexation to the Selma-Kingsburg-Fowler Sanitation District to receive community sewer service. Until community sewer and water service become available and feasible, a Project Note would restrict uses to low-water-demand uses and uses generating limited wastewater.

In accordance with Fresno County General Plan interagency coordination policies, the City of Selma was consulted regarding the proposal and provided a “No Comment” response. The City elected not to annex the parcels at this time and released the project to Fresno County for processing.

Future development proposals on the property would also be required to comply with applicable Fresno County Zoning Ordinance development standards, San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District regulations, County noise standards, and applicable transportation requirements, including contributing their fair share toward necessary improvements along Manning Avenue and State Route 99.

Based on the above, the project would not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

## XII. MINERAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

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

## XIII. NOISE

Would the project result in:

- A. Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project 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:

A Noise and Vibration Impact Analysis was prepared for the project by LSA dated July 2025. According to the Analysis existing noise sources in the project area include vehicle traffic from South Leonard Avenue, vehicle traffic from Manning Avenue, and occasional aircraft noise. Long-term (24-hour) noise level measurements were conducted from June 17 to June 18, 2025, using two Larson Davis Spark 706RC Dosimeters. Table G located in the Analysis provides a summary of the measured hourly noise levels and calculated Ldn level from the long-term noise level measurements. As shown in Table G, the calculated Ldn levels range from 65.2 dBA Ldn to 69.8 dBA Ldn. Hourly noise levels at surrounding sensitive uses are as low as 52.5 dBA Leq during nighttime hours and as low as 58.7 dBA Leq during daytime hours.

Two types of short-term noise impacts could occur during the construction of the proposed project. First, construction crew commutes and the transport of construction equipment and materials to the site for the proposed project would incrementally increase noise levels on access roads leading to the site. Although there would be a relatively high single-event noise-exposure potential causing intermittent noise nuisance, the effect on longer-term ambient noise levels would be small when compared to existing daily traffic volumes on Manning Avenue. The results of the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) for the proposed project indicate that during construction, an additional 1,828 acoustically equivalent vehicles, consisting of worker and hauling trips, would be added to the roadway adjacent to the project site. Based on the *Updated Traffic Study* (Peters Engineering Group 2022), existing traffic volumes on Manning Avenue are approximately 12,630. Therefore, construction-related vehicle trips would increase by 0.6 dBA. A noise level increase of less than 1 dBA would not be perceptible to the human ear. Therefore, short-term, construction-related impacts associated with worker commute and equipment transport to the project site would be less than significant.

The second type of short-term noise impact is related to noise generated during construction, which includes site preparation, grading, building construction, paving, and architectural coating on the project site. Construction is completed in discrete steps, each of which has its own mix of equipment and, consequently, its own noise characteristics. These various sequential phases would change the character of the noise generated on the site and, therefore, the noise levels surrounding the site as construction progresses. Despite the variety in the type and size of construction equipment, similarities in the dominant noise sources and patterns of operation allow construction-related noise ranges to be categorized by work phase. Table H lists typical construction equipment noise levels recommended for noise impact assessments, based on a distance of 50 feet between the equipment and a noise receptor, taken from

the Federal Highway Administration's (FHWA) *Roadway Construction Noise Model* (FHWA 2006).

While construction noise will vary, it is expected that composite noise levels during construction at the nearest off-site sensitive residential uses to the southeast would reach 68 dBA Leq during daytime hours. These predicted noise levels would only occur when all construction equipment is operating simultaneously, and therefore they are assumed to be rather conservative in nature. While construction-related short-term noise levels have the potential to be higher than existing ambient noise levels in the project area under existing conditions, the noise impacts would no longer occur once project construction is completed. As it relates to off-site uses, construction-related noise impacts would remain below the 80 dBA Leq 8-hour construction noise level criteria for daytime construction noise level criteria as established by the FTA for residential land uses. Construction would be limited to the hours between 6:00 a.m. and 9:00 p.m. Monday through Friday and between 7:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. on Saturdays and Sundays as per the Noise Ordinance. Therefore, the impact would be considered less than significant.

The Fresno County Department of Public Health, Environmental Health Division reviewed the subject proposal and did not express any concerns related to noise and did not require a Noise Study for the project.

Noise impacts associated with construction will be temporary. A Project Note would require that all construction-related noise shall adhere to the provisions of 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:

Airport-related noise levels are primarily associated with aircraft engine noise made while aircraft are taking off, landing, or running their engines while still on the ground.

The closest airport to the project site is the Selma Airport, approximately 1.8 miles to the southwest. Because the project site is well outside the 60 dBA CNEL noise contour of the Selma Airport (Fresno Council of Governments 2025), no further analysis related to airport noise is required in this report. Additionally, there are no helipads or private airstrips within 2 miles of the project area.

#### 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 limited by-right industrial uses allowed on the subject parcels will not induce direct or indirect population growth in the area, or displace a substantial number of existing people or housing.

#### 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), all development proposals on the subject parcels would require compliance with the California Code of Regulations Title 24 Fire Code and California Code of Regulations Title 19; CalFire conditions of approval; and annex to Community Facilities District No. 2010-01 of CalFire.

- 2. Police protection; or

- 3. Schools; or

- 4. Parks; or

- 5. Other public facilities?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The proposed industrial uses resulting from the subject proposal will not impact existing public services, nor will they result in the need for additional public services related to schools, parks, or police protection.

#### 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 direct or indirect 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 WITH MITIGATION  
INCORPORATED:

An Updated Traffic Study (UTS) (superseding a Traffic Impact Report dated November 17, 2020, and an addendum letter dated August 18, 2022) was prepared for the project by Peters Engineering Group and dated December 21, 2022. The UTS analyzed effects of vehicle traffic resulting from the project and found that all study intersections are currently operating at acceptable levels of service with acceptable queuing conditions, except for the intersection of Manning Avenue/State Route (SR) 99 northbound ramps and Manning Avenue/DeWolf Avenue.

The UTS also found that worst-case development of the project site in accordance with the proposed conditional zoning will increase delays at the intersection of Manning and DeWolf Avenues and would require traffic signals for the intersection to operate at acceptable LOS (Level of Service). Since the proposed operation (expansion of an existing rail spur and related freight terminal operations located on adjacent property west of the subject parcels) differ from the worst-case scenario analyzed (the proposed operation will reduce the number of truck trips as compared to the existing condition and will generate no new peak-hour employee trips), the traffic signal warrants analysis (warrants not satisfied) would remain applicable with the proposed operation.

However, the installation of traffic signals would not be warranted until additional development on the site results in trips generation like the trip generated in a worst-case scenario. Installation of traffic signals would be required only after traffic signal warrants are satisfied based on observed traffic volumes, and not based on the proposed operation alone. Per UTS, a traffic signal warrants analysis shall be performed for the

intersection of Manning and DeWolf Avenues in accordance with the California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (CMUTCD) in order to determine if warrants are satisfied prior to the issuance of building permits for a new development proposal on the project site. If warrants are satisfied, the intersection shall be signalized prior to occupancy granted to the use.

\* **Mitigation Measure:**

1. *A trip generation analysis shall be performed for new on site industrial activities, including a traffic signal warrants analysis and operational analyses performed for the intersection of Manning Avenue and DeWolf Avenue in accordance with the California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (CMUTCD). If development causes the level of service to drop below LOS C or (if the intersection is already operating worse than LOS C) causes an increase in average vehicle delay of 5.0 seconds or more, and if warrants are satisfied, the intersection shall be signalized prior to the granting of occupancy to the use. This analysis shall be submitted concurrently with the required Site Plan Review and reviewed and approved by the County of Fresno. If signalization is required, improvements shall be constructed prior to the issuance of an occupancy change to allow for on-site industrial activities.*

The UTS notes that with eventual signalization of the intersection of Manning and DeWolf Avenues, the existing lane configurations may be maintained, either permissive or split phasing may be implemented in the north-south directions and that protected left-turn phasing be installed for the existing left-turn lanes on the eastbound and westbound approaches. The project will not increase the delays at the intersection of Manning Avenue and the SR 99 northbound off ramp by 5.0 seconds or more and will not increase the calculated 95th - percentile queue by the length of one vehicle. Therefore, the project is not considered to be responsible for improving the intersection. The Buford Travel Center has been conditioned with installing traffic signals at the intersection.

The UTS further notes that the project contributes to future year 2040 Levels of Service (LOS) below the target LOS as well as excessive queuing at the intersections of Manning Avenue/SR 99 northbound ramps and Manning Avenue/ Golden State Boulevard and will be responsible for payment of an equitable share of the cost of the future improvements:

The equitable share of the cost includes widening of overcrossing at Manning Avenue and State Route (SR) 99 and signalizations at Manning Avenue and SR 99 northbound ramps and Manning Avenue and SR 99 southbound ramps. Since the proposed operation (expansion of an existing rail spur and related freight terminal operations) is not expected to generate new peak-hour trips, the required equitable share contribution is not required because of the proposed operation. The share can be deferred and be paid prior to the issuance of building permits for a new development proposal on the project site.

The Fresno County Transportation Planning Unit, Fresno County Road Maintenance and Operations Division and California Department of Transportation concurred with UTS findings and equitable share payment. The project will adhere to the following Mitigation Measures, when implemented, will reduce traffic impact to less than significant.

- **Mitigation Measures:**

1. *A Traffic Mitigation Agreement” shall be entered into with the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), agreeing to participate in the funding of off-site traffic improvements as defined in items a, b and c below and pay for funding deemed appropriate by Caltrans based on the following pro-rata shares:*
  - a) *Widen overcrossing at Manning Avenue and State Route 99 based on Table 25 of Updated Traffic Study dated December 21, 2022. The project’s maximum fair share for the 2040 traffic scenario is \$52,792.22 (13 trips at \$4,060.94 per trip fee). The fee associated with each building permit shall be based on trip generation calculations and trip assignment for that proposed building and shall be calculated using the per trip fee.*
  - b) *Install traffic signal at Manning Avenue and State Route 99 northbound ramps based on Table 25 of Updated Traffic Study dated December 21, 2022. The project’s maximum fair share for the 2040 traffic scenario is \$28,210.93 (31 trips at \$910.03 per trip fee). The fee associated with each building permit shall be based on trip generation calculations and trip assignment for that proposed building and shall be calculated using the per trip fee.*
  - c) *Install traffic signal at Manning Avenue and State Route 99 southbound ramps based on Table 25 of Updated Traffic Study dated December 21, 2022. The project’s maximum fair share for the 2040 traffic scenario is \$15,633.67 (13 trips at \$1,202.59 per trip fee). The fee associated with each building permit shall be based on trip generation calculations and trip assignment for that proposed building and shall be calculated using the per trip fee.*

*This agreement shall be submitted concurrently with the required Site Plan Review and approved by the Fresno County’s Development Services Division prior to the issuance of an occupancy change to allow for on-site industrial activities.*

The project will not cause an increase in the TI (Traffic Index) on the study road segments and will not require a left-turn lane at the site access driveway.

The subject parcels front on Leonard Avenue and Manning Avenue. According to the Road Maintenance and Operations Division, Leonard Avenue is classified as a Local Road requiring an ultimate right-of-way of 60 feet (30 feet east of and 30 feet west of

section line). To meet ultimate right-of-way (ROW) for Leonard Avenue, a Condition of Approval would require that easterly 10 feet of a 9.29-acre parcel (Assessor's Parcel Number 348-050-25S) shall be dedicated in additional ROW. Manning Avenue currently has 53 feet ultimate right-of-way south of section line.

- 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:

The State of California Governor's Office of Planning and Research document entitled Technical Advisory on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA dated December 2018 (Technical Advisory) indicates that projects that generate or attract fewer than 110 trips per day generally may be presumed to cause a less-than-significant transportation impact.

According to an Update Traffic Study (UTS) prepared by Peters Engineering Group and dated December 21, 2022, Section 7.3 Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) states that truck trips typical of those the project will generate are generally excluded from the requirements of CEQA as they pertain to transportation impacts and Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT). Therefore, only employee trips are calculated for VMT purposes. Considering that the daily employee weekday trips of 70 (35 in and 35 out) are less than 110 trips per day, the project the project will cause a less than significant transportation impact based on VMT.

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

All development proposals on the property will gain access from Leonard Avenue. No access from Manning Avenue is allowed due to the roadway classification as expressway. Given the access restrictions, traffic hazard due to proposed site access will be less than significant.

- D. Result in inadequate emergency access?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

All development proposals on the property will be subject to mandatory Site Plan Review to ensure that the design of each use proposed on the property incorporates adequate emergency access acceptable by local fire agency. As noted above, access to the subject parcels will be restricted to Leonard Avenue.

## 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 in an area not designated as highly or moderately sensitive for archeological resources. Pursuant to Assembly Bill (AB) 52, the subject proposal 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. The Table Mountain Rancheria (TMR), however, requested to be informed in the unlikely event that cultural resources are identified on the property. The Mitigation Measure included in the Section V, CULTURAL ANALYSIS of this report will reduce any potential impact to tribal cultural resources, if discovered on the property.

## 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 cause 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: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT 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: NO IMPACT:

The subject proposal involves no development except expansion of an existing rail spur and related freight terminal operations on the subject parcels located. Any waste disposal resulting from future development proposals will be through regular trash collection service.

## 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 within or near state responsibility areas or land classified as very high fire hazard severity zones. No impact would occur.

## 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:

Potential impacts to biological resources are limited to nesting birds and would be reduced to a less than significant level through implementation of the Mitigation Measure described in Section IV.

- 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 subject proposal to overall development in the area is less than significant.

The subject proposal will adhere to the permitting requirements and rules and regulations set forth by the Fresno County Ordinance, San Joaquin Air Pollution Control District, and California Code of Regulations Fire Code at the time development occurs on the property. No cumulatively considerable impacts relating to Agricultural and Forestry Resources, Air Quality, and Energy were identified in the project analysis. Impacts identified for Aesthetics, Cultural Resources, Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Transportation will be addressed with the aforementioned Mitigation Measures.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

No substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly were identified in the analysis.

## **CONCLUSION/SUMMARY**

Based upon the Initial Study (IS) No. 7504 prepared for General Plan Amendment Application No. 555 and Amendment Application No. 3832, 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 Population and Housing, Recreation or Wildfire.

Potential impacts related to Agricultural and Forestry Resources, Air Quality, Energy, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Hydrology and Water Quality, Land Use and Planning, Noise, Public Services, Utilities and Service Systems have been determined to be less than significant.

Potential impacts to Aesthetics, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Geology and Soils, Mineral Resources, and Transportation have been determined to be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

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&PIn\PROJSEC\PROJDOCS\AA\3800-3899\3832 - See GPA 555\IS-CEQA- Revised 2025\AA 3832 IS WU 2025.docx