



County of Fresno

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

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

APPLICANT: Dirk Poeschel Land Development Services Inc.

APPLICATION NOS.: Initial Study No. 8820 and Variance Permit No. 4194

DESCRIPTION: Allow the creation of a 2.18-acre parcel from an existing 81.32-acre parcel located within the AE-20 (Exclusive Agricultural, 20-acre minimum) Zone District.

LOCATION: The subject parcel is located on the Northeast corner of S. McMullin Grade and W. Lincoln Ave., approximately 6 miles southeast of the City of Kerman. (APN: 035-030-05s) (10698 W Lincoln Ave. & 10684 W Lincoln Ave) (Sup. Dist. 1).

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:

This project is not located in any designated scenic highway or scenic vista area and will not have any physical or visual affect 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 point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project does not propose any new development and only to create a 2.18-acre parcel from an existing 81.32-acre parcel. It will not substantially degrade the existing visual character of the surrounding area.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

This project is not proposing any new developments that would generate a source of light and only aims to create a 2.18-acre parcel from an existing 81.32-acre parcel.

II. AGRICULTURAL AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

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

- 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:

According to the 2022 Fresno County Important Farmland Map, the project site is designated as Prime Farmland. The proposal would create a 2.18-acre parcel containing an existing single-family residence. Approximately 0.83 acres of this area is already occupied by the residence and is not in agricultural production. The project would therefore convert approximately 1.35 acres of Prime Farmland. Because this acreage is small relative to the overall 81.32-acre parcel and the remainder of the site will continue in agricultural production, the loss of farmland is considered less than significant.

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT:

The subject parcel is zoned AE-20 (Exclusive Agricultural, 20-acre minimum parcel size) and is subject to Williamson Act Contract No. AP-369. The proposal involves the creation of a 2.18-acre parcel containing an existing single-family residence from the larger 81.32-acre parent parcel. As proposed, the project would not remove the entirety of the parent parcel from agricultural production or terminate the Williamson Act Contract for the remaining agricultural lands. However, because the proposed 2.18-acre parcel would separate a non-agricultural residential use from the contracted agricultural

land, a partial cancellation of the Williamson Act Contract would be required for the 2.18-acre portion. The remaining 79.14-acre balance would continue to remain under contract and in agricultural production.

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

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project site is not located on land zoned for forest land, timberland or timberland zoned Timberland Production, and as such will not result in the loss of forest land or conversion of land for non-forest use.

- 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 forest land to non-forest use?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT:

The project involves splitting an existing parcel in the AE-20 Zone District project would convert 1.35-acres of Prime Farmland. This is 1.7% of the 81.32-acre parcel, which is less than significant.

III. AIR QUALITY

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

- A. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable Air Quality Plan; or
- B. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The proposed project consists strictly of a variance to create a 2.18-acre homesite parcel from an existing 81.32-acre parcel to separate an existing, occupied primary residence from agricultural acreage. The project does not propose any new physical development, grading, or changes in baseline land use operations. Because no construction or operational expansion will occur, the project will not generate new criteria air pollutants or conflict with the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District's (SJVAPCD) Air Quality Guidelines

- C. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations; or

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

While the nearest sensitive receptor (an adjacent homesite) is located approximately 140 feet south of the project boundary, the proposed parcel split is purely administrative and involves no grading, construction equipment, or new operational emissions. Furthermore, separating the existing primary residence from the surrounding agricultural operations will not introduce any new or localized odor or pollutant sources. Therefore, the project will not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations or adverse emissions.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) did not express concern with the project to indicate impacts to special-status species. Therefore, splitting the parcel is not expected to negatively impact through habitat modification as the site is not occupied or has not significant habitat for special-status species.

- B. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service; or
- C. Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally-protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

No riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community was identified on 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 intends to split the subject parcel. The project does not cut off movement of the site for any wildlife resident. No migratory wildlife corridor or native wildlife nursery site was identified on the project site.

- E. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance; or
- F. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state Habitat Conservation Plan?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

Reviewing Agencies and Departments did not identify a local policy or ordinance adopted for the protection of a biological resource that would be in conflict with the project proposal. No Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan or other approved local, regional, or state Habitat Conservation Plans were identified as being in conflict with the project proposal.

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 intends to split land that has already been disturbed. No reviewing Agencies and Departments expressed concern with the project to indicate that a cultural or historical resource is present on the site and would be affected by the project proposal.

VI. ENERGY

Would the project:

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The proposed project is strictly a land division to separate an existing, occupied primary residence from surrounding agricultural acreage. No new structural development, building expansion, or construction activities are proposed. Because the project will not change the baseline operational energy use of the existing homesite or the surrounding farming operations, it will not result in a wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources. Any future modifications to the existing structures would be subject to standard review under the California Energy Code (Title 24). Furthermore, the administrative parcel split does not conflict with or obstruct any applicable state or local plans for renewable energy or energy efficiency.

VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Would the project:

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

According to Figure 8-1 of the 2024 Fresno County General Plan Background Report and the California Department of Conservation Earthquake Hazard Zone Application (EQ Zapp), the project is not located on a known earthquake fault zone.

2. Strong seismic ground shaking?
3. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

According to the Department of Conservation California Geological Survey the project is not located in an area near a known earthquake fault zone and is not susceptible to liquefaction.

4. Landslides?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

According to the 2024 Fresno County General Plan Background Report the project area is in a low-risk area for landslides.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project would not result in a loss of topsoil or soil erosion where a significant risk of loss, injury, or death would occur. This is because there is no development being proposed.

- 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:

According to the 2024 Fresno County General Plan Background Report the project site is located in an area with low risk for landslides and liquefaction. There have been no known issues with subsidence in the project area. No geologic unit or unstable soil was identified on the project site.

- C. 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:

According to the 2024 Fresno County General Plan Background Report the project site is not located in an area known to have expansive soils.

- D. 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; or
- E. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project does not propose the development or use of a septic system or alternative wastewater disposal system. There were no unique paleontological resources or unique geologic features 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; or
- B. Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

Reviewing Agencies and Departments did not express concern with the project to indicate that a conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases exists as a result of the project.

IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Would the project:

- A. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials; or
- B. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

No hazardous materials are proposed for this project.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project site is not located within a quarter mile of an existing school or proposed school, and therefore there will be no hazardous emissions within one-quarter mile of a school.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

According to the NEPAassist Database, the project site is not located on a listed hazardous materials site and the project would not result or create a significant hazard 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, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project site is not located within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. The nearest airport is Fresno Yosemite International Airport located approximately 16.50-miles northeast from the proposed project site.

- F. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan; or
- G. Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

Reviewing Agencies and Departments did not identify any conflict with the project and any adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. Additionally, no concerns were expressed that the project would result in a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires.

X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Would the project:

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project does not propose to develop the parcel. The project does not propose the use of water resources and would not violate water quality standards, waste discharge requirements or substantially degrade surface or ground water supply. With the project not utilizing water supplies, no impact to groundwater supplies or groundwater recharge would occur.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project does not propose any new development. Surface runoff is anticipated to be kept onsite per County of Fresno standards and is not expected to result in flooding on or offsite. Reviewing agencies and departments did not express concern with the project to indicate that the project would result in runoff water contributions that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide additional sources of polluted runoff.

4. Impede or redirect flood flows?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project site is not located within a flood hazard area. Applicable agencies reviewed the project site and did not have any comments regarding any requirements and asserted the project as proposed would not impede or redirect flood flows.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project site is not located within a flood hazard area, and the project will not increase the risk of release of pollutants due to project inundation. Additionally, the project site is not located near a body of water where a tsunami or seiche risk is prevalent.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project does not anticipate the use of water resources and would not contribute to a degradation of water quality. Reviewing Agencies and Departments did not express concern with the project in regard a conflict with a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan.

XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING

Would the project:

- A. Physically divide an established community?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project proposes no new development. The project will not physically divide an established community.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

There were no land use plans, policies, or regulations for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect identified in the Fresno County General Plan as being in conflict with the project proposal.

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:

According to the 2024 Fresno County General Plan Background Report the project site is not located on or near an identified mineral resource or mineral producing site.

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: NO IMPACT:

The project does not include any new development. Noise levels and vibrations will not be present which will result with no impact.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project site is not located within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. The project site is not located in an airport land use plan. The nearest airport is Fresno Yosemite International Airport located approximately 16.50-miles northeast from the proposed project site.

XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING

Would the project:

- A. Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?; or
- B. Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

There are two single-family homes located within the immediate vicinity of the proposed project. The project proposes to split a 2.18-acre portion of an existing 81.32-acre parcel to retain as a homesite parcel. The project will not induce unplanned population growth or displace any number of 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 public services?
 - 1. Fire protection;
 - 2. Police protection;
 - 3. Schools;
 - 4. Parks; or
 - 5. Other public facilities?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

Reviewing agencies and departments did not provide concerns regarding the project or a need for additional governmental facilities or alteration to existing governmental

facilities. The project does not propose any new development and should not cause negative impact on the public services available.

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:

There is no new development proposed. The project is not expected to increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks and does not include the construction or expansion of recreational facilities.

XVI. TRANSPORTATION

Would the project:

- A. Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities; or
- B. Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project does not include any new development. Reviewing agencies and departments did not express concern with the project in terms of a transportation impact resulting from the project.

- C. Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?; or
- D. Result in inadequate emergency access?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

Reviewing Agencies and Departments did not express concern with the project design or access to indicate that a hazard due to design features or inadequate emergency access will result from the project.

XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

- A. Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:
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: NO IMPACT

Participating California Native American Tribes were notified of the project proposal and given the opportunity to enter into consultation with the County of Fresno in addressing potential tribal cultural resources occurring on the project site. No notified California Native American Tribes expressed concern with the project and did not enter into consultation. The subject parcel has been previously disturbed. No reviewing Agency or Department provided comments to indicate that a listed or eligible historical resource is located on the project site.

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: NO IMPACT:

The project does not propose any new development. Reviewing agencies and departments did not identify any significant environmental effects as a result of the project.

- 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:

There is no new development proposed. The proposed use would not utilize substantial amounts of water while occupying the single-family residence and would not have an impact on water supplies.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project does not propose the development of a wastewater treatment system and would not have employees onsite where wastewater generation would occur. Therefore, the project does not necessitate a wastewater treatment provider.

- 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 project does not propose any new development. The project does not anticipate generating much solid waste as a result of occupying the single-family residence. Reviewing agencies and departments did not provide comments to indicate that the project would result in solid waste generation in excess of State or local standards, or result in a conflict with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulation 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:

As depicted in the 2025 Fresno County Fire Hazard Severity Zones Map, produced by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection, the project site is located within an unzoned Local Responsibility Area near an Incorporated City.

Additionally, this project was routed for review by CalFire. Reviewing Agencies and Departments did not provide comments to indicate that the project would result in impairment to evacuation plans, exposure to pollutant concentrations, exacerbation of fire risk, or exposure to post-fire risks.

XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Would the project:

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The subject site has been determined to be previously disturbed and occupied with human activity. The project does not have the potential to substantially degrade the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a wildlife species and would not cause a wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels.

- 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: NO IMPACT

It has been determined that the project would not result in impacts on Aesthetics, Cultural Resources and Tribal Cultural Resources. The project is not anticipated to result in a cumulative considerable impact and would result in a less significant impact regarding the identified section.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project has been determined to not result in substantial adverse effect on human beings.

CONCLUSION/SUMMARY

Based upon the analysis contained in Initial Study No. 8820 prepared for Variance Application No. 4194, staff has concluded that the proposed project will not have a significant adverse effect on the environment.

The evaluation determined that the project will result in No Impacts to: Aesthetics, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Energy, Geology and Soils, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, 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, Wildfire, and Mandatory Findings of Significance.

Potential impacts related to Agricultural and Forestry Resources, Cultural Resources, and Tribal Cultural Resources were evaluated and determined to be Less Than Significant without requiring project-specific mitigation measures. Standard regulatory conditions of approval will be applied to the project where applicable to ensure compliance with local and state standards.

Consequently, a Negative Declaration (ND) is recommended for adoption by the decision-making body. The Initial Study and associated project materials are available for public review at the Fresno County Department of Public Works and Planning, 2220 Tulare Street, Suite A, Fresno, California.

DN
G:\4360Devs&Pln\PROJSEC\PROJDOCS\VA\4100-4199\4194\CEQA\Initial Study Writeup.docx