

MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

MND 2026-09

RE: Oakstone LLC – Conditional Use Permit (CUP #2025-008)

LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT:

The project site is located on the west side of Highway 41 at its intersection with Golden Horse Dr. (42484 Highway 41), Oakhurst. The site is identified as Assessor's Parcel Number (APN) 057-200-054. Conditional Use Permit to enhance the existing RV Resort and Event Venue by adding five new RV spaces to the current thirty. Install a new septic system to connect all spaces, ensuring that waste is treated on site. Additionally, introduce tent glamping sites and tiny home-style cabin rentals alongside the improved RV spaces. Renovate the existing Event Hall and Bar and add campground amenities such as a pool and improved parking facilities. The Resort already features seven short-term rental rooms and 30 RV camping spots.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT:

No adverse environmental impact is anticipated from this project. The following mitigation measures are included to avoid any potential impacts.

BASIS FOR NEGATIVE DECLARATION:

1. Please see the attached Mitigation Monitoring Report.


Madera County Environmental Committee

A copy of the mitigated negative declaration and all supporting documentation is available for review at the Madera County Community & Economic Development Department - Planning Division, 200 West 4th Street, Ste. 3100, Madera, California.

DATED: August 12, 2026

FILED:

PROJECT APPROVED:

**County of Madera
California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)
Initial Study**

- 1. Project title:** Conditional Use Permit #2025-008 – APN: 057-200-054
- 2. Lead agency name and address:** County of Madera
Community and Economic Development Department
200 West 4th Street, Suite 3100
Madera, California 93637
- 3. Contact person and phone number:** Annette Kephart, Administrative Services Manager
559-675-7821

annette.kephart@maderacounty.com
- 4. Project Location & APN:** The project site is located on the west side of Highway 41 at its intersection with Golden Horse Dr. (42484 Highway 41), Oakhurst. The site is identified as Assessor's Parcel Number (APN) 057-200-054
- 5. Project sponsor's name and address:** Oakstone LLC
Josiah Maddock Architects
388 Beale St., STE 1809
San Francisco, CA 94105
- 6. General Plan Designation:** CC (Community Commercial)
- 7. Area Plan Designation:** CC (Community Commercial)
- 8. Zoning:** PDD (Planned Development District)

9. Description of project:

The Oakstone Yosemite Resort Project aims to renovate, enhance, and modestly expand the existing RV resort and event venue located on approximately 8 acres at 42484 State Route 41 in the unincorporated community of Oakhurst, Madera County, California (APN 057-200-054).

The current site includes an operational RV resort with 30 RV spaces, supporting infrastructure, a banquet hall, a restaurant and bar, and seven short-term lodging rooms. The project's purpose is to modernize the existing resort, improve guest amenities, and utilize the property's developed areas while maintaining its current visitor-serving use and compatibility with surrounding land uses.

The completed project will consist of 42 lodging units, including 14 glamping tents, 4 stargazing domes, 4 Airstream RV trailers, 13 park-model RV units, and 7 short-term lodging rooms. Additionally, the existing event center will undergo renovations to feature a banquet hall, a cooking kitchen, a catering kitchen office, a restaurant, a bar, and restrooms, totaling approximately 9,025 square feet.

The event center can accommodate up to 250 guests in its 2,625 square foot banquet hall, making it

suitable for various events. The restaurant and bar will cover around 999 square feet and will seat approximately 50 guests, providing a dining area accessible to resort guests, event attendees, and the general public.

The project will also convert some of the existing 30 RV sites and add 5 new sites to include the previously mentioned lodging options.

The site improvements will involve reconfiguring the on-site circulation and parking areas, upgrading internal access roads and driveways, and enhancing pedestrian walkways. These enhancements aim to improve overall circulation, accessibility, and safety. The project will also include upgrades to guest amenities and outdoor spaces.

The existing restaurant and bar, which accommodate around 50 guests, will be renovated to serve both resort guests and the general public. The restaurant will operate year-round, while recreation and overnight stay areas will operate at reduced capacity from November through March. The proposed hours of operation for the restaurant are 11:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m. Sunday through Thursday, and 11:00 a.m. to midnight on Friday and Saturday.

A Trip Generation Worksheet prepared for the project estimates approximately 107 average daily external vehicle trips under the proposed conditions. After accounting for traffic associated with existing entitled uses, the project will result in approximately 19 new net average daily trips. The project will continue to utilize the existing access points from State Route 41 and Golden Horse Drive, with no new roadway or access connections proposed.

Improvements to onsite utility and infrastructure systems will also be included in the project. Wastewater improvements will involve upgrades to the onsite wastewater treatment system, subject to review and approval by Madera County Environmental Health and other applicable regulatory agencies. Water system enhancements will include additional on-site water storage and improvements to the water distribution and fire protection systems. The current site plan identifies an existing 5,000-gallon water tank, a proposed 10,000-gallon water tank, and a proposed 15,000-gallon fire-protection water tank with connections for the Fire Department. Solid waste and recycling facilities will be provided in accordance with County, State, and federal requirements, including Senate Bill 1383 (SB 1383).

The project will provide 118 onsite parking spaces, including those for the lodging units, restaurant/bar, and event center, in line with the current site plan. Parking and maneuvering areas will consist of all-weather permanent surfacing, including concrete and asphalt, as delineated in the current site plan. Accessible parking and pedestrian access will be provided in compliance with applicable accessibility requirements.

The project provides 42 parking spaces for the 42 RV and lodging units at a rate of one parking space per unit, consistent with the parking standard applied to the proposed RV spaces, non-hotel lodging units, and short-term lodging rooms. In addition, 76 parking spaces are provided for the restaurant and banquet hall, for a total of 118 onsite parking spaces.

Name of Space	Category	Requirement per MCC 18.102	Size	Spaces required	Provided
Restaurant/bar	Eating/Drinking Establishment	1 space per 100 sf	999 sf	10	10
Banquet Hall	Meeting	1 Space per 40	2625 sf	66	66

	Hall/Assembly	sf or 5 seats			
RV and Lodging Units	Travel Trailer Parks MCC 18.94.100	1 space per unit	42 units	42	42
			Total	118	118

The project will also include a variety of new outdoor amenities designed to improve the guest experience while utilizing existing developed areas of the property. Proposed improvements include a new swimming pool and hot tub with a deck and trellis, a cedar hot tub and viewing deck, an outdoor group amenities area featuring barbecue facilities, a propane fire pit, and seating areas, as well as stargazing decks and other gathering and recreation areas. Pedestrian walkways and other site improvements will connect the lodging units with guest amenities.

Fire safety and wildfire protection features will be integrated throughout the project site. The current site plan identifies the use of Wildland-Urban Interface (WUI) defensible-space practices, prohibits wood-burning fires, and provides improved on-site water storage and Fire Department connections. The project will retain the existing 5,000-gallon water tank while adding a 10,000-gallon water tank and a 15,000-gallon fire-protection water tank. Emergency access and fire protection upgrades will be subject to review and approval by the Madera County Fire Department and Fire Marshal.



Figure 1 Project Area Map

10. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:

Surrounding properties include agricultural, rural residential, and community commercial.

11. Other Public Agencies Whose Approval is Required:

- Madera County Environmental Health
- Madera County Building and Fire Safety/ Fire Marshal
- Madera County Public Works

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

In accordance with Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1, notification letters were sent to representatives of California Native American tribes that have requested to be notified of projects within Madera County. Five notification letters were sent on July 30, 2025, to representatives of the Table Mountain Rancheria, Picayune Rancheria of the Chukchansi Indians, Dumna Wo Wah Tribal Government, Chowchilla Yokuts Tribe, and North Fork Mono Tribe. The tribal representatives were provided information regarding the Project and were invited to request formal consultation with the County regarding potential impacts to tribal cultural resources within 30 days of receiving the notification. No tribes requested consultation or provided comments regarding the Project. Therefore, no formal AB 52 consultation was conducted. Section XVIII of this Initial Study provides additional discussion of tribal cultural resources.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

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

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

DETERMINATION (to be completed by Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| ☐ | I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared. |
| ☒ | I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared. |
| ☐ | I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required. |
| ☐ | I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed. |
| ☐ | I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required. |

Signed: _____ Date: _____

I. AESTHETICS

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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☒	☐	☐
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	☐	☒	☐	☐

Responses:

(a) Less Than Significant Impact. The Project site is located within a developed area of the unincorporated Oakhurst community and is not situated within or adjacent to a designated scenic vista. The Project does not include construction of tall structures or features that would block or obstruct views of regionally significant scenic vistas. Improvements would occur within the existing developed footprint and would not interfere with long-range views toward surrounding foothills or natural features. Therefore, the Project will not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista.

(b) Less Than Significant Impact. The Project site is located near State Route 41, which serves as a regional roadway. However, the Project will not significantly harm any scenic resources related to a designated State Scenic Highway, as State Route 41 is not officially designated as such in the area. The improvements for the Project will primarily occur in areas that have already been disturbed and developed. There are no plans to remove scenic rock outcroppings or historic buildings. Existing trees will be preserved as much as possible, and the landscaping enhancements will include native and drought-tolerant plant species. The Project will not significantly affect the scenic resources along the corridor of a state scenic highway.

(c) Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporation. The Project site is in an area characterized by existing commercial, lodging, and recreational uses. The proposed improvements, including renovation of existing structures, additional RV and glamping accommodations, and outdoor amenities, would be consistent with the visual character of surrounding development. The Project would not introduce land uses or visual elements that are incompatible with the area. Public views from nearby roadways and publicly accessible vantage points would not be substantially degraded. The Project would comply with applicable zoning

requirements and County design standards governing site development and visual quality. Accordingly, impacts would be less than significant.

(d) Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporation. The Project would include additional exterior lighting associated with circulation areas, parking, buildings, and outdoor amenities. All exterior lighting would be designed and installed in compliance with Madera County standards to minimize light spillover, glare, and skyglow, including the use of shielded and downward-directed fixtures. Lighting would be limited to levels necessary for safety and security. With adherence to applicable County lighting requirements, the Project would not create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the surrounding area.

AES-MM-1: Project structures and site improvements shall utilize non-reflective materials and natural or earth-tone colors and shall be designed to be visually compatible with surrounding development, subject to County review.

AES-MM-2: All exterior lighting shall be shielded and directed downward in compliance with Madera County lighting standards to avoid glare onto the roadway.

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

II. AGRICULTURAL AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

In determining whether agricultural 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 provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board.

Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Responses:

(a-e) No Impact. The site is not designated as Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, or subject to a Williamson Act contract. No agricultural or forest resource impacts would occur.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) 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?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Responses:

(a) Less Than Significant Impact. The Project is consistent with the goals and control measures of the applicable air quality management plan adopted by the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD). The Project involves renovation and modest expansion of an existing RV resort and event venue and does not include industrial uses or activities that would generate substantial long-term emissions. Construction would be temporary and short-term, and operational emissions would remain consistent with similar existing land uses in the area. Compliance with applicable SJVAPCD rules and regulations, including dust control and equipment standards, would ensure that the Project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan.

(b) Less Than Significant Impact. Construction-related emissions would be temporary and limited in duration, consisting primarily of emissions from construction equipment and vehicle trips. The Project does not include extensive grading, export or import of soil, or prolonged heavy equipment operation. Operational emissions would result from guest vehicles and on-site activities associated with existing recreational use and would not represent a substantial increase over baseline conditions. Given the Project's scale, short construction duration, and ongoing compliance with SJVAPCD regulations, the Project would not result in a material net increase in criteria pollutants. Operational emissions would also include vehicle trips associated with patrons of the on-site restaurant and bar during daytime and evening hours. Operational emissions are based on approximately 107 average daily external trips, resulting in only about 19 net new average daily trips above existing entitled conditions. These emissions would be typical of small-scale visitor-serving commercial uses and would not result in a substantial increase in criteria pollutants or odors.

Operational air quality emissions associated with the restaurant and bar would primarily consist of vehicle exhaust from patron and employee trips and minor emissions from food preparation activities. These emissions would be minimal and consistent with existing commercial uses in the area. The project would not conflict with applicable air quality plans.

(c) Less Than Significant Impact. Sensitive receptors in the vicinity of the Project include nearby residential and lodging uses. Construction activities would be temporary and intermittent, and emissions would disperse rapidly in the open, rural setting. Standard construction best management practices, including dust suppression measures, would be

implemented to minimize fugitive dust and exhaust emissions. Operational emissions would be similar to those associated with the site's ongoing use. Therefore, the Project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.

(d) Less Than Significant Impact. The Project does not include land uses typically associated with objectionable odors, such as industrial processing, waste handling, or agricultural operations. Temporary construction-related odors (e.g., diesel exhaust) would be short-term and limited to the construction period. Operational activities would be consistent with an existing RV resort and event venue and would not generate odors that would adversely affect a substantial number of people. As a result, odor impacts would be less than significant.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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 Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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 a native wildlife nursery site?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
☐	☐	☐	☒

Responses:

The project site spans approximately 8 acres and includes the following APN: 057-200-054. The California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB) was reviewed to determine which special status species could be present within the area of the Project site. The Project is located in the Ahwahnee quadrant according to the California Department of Fish and Wildlife with four species identified as endangered, threatened, Species of Special Concern (SSC) or Watch List (WL) (refer to table 1). Species listed represent those with potential regional occurrence; only a subset have suitable habitat onsite.

Table 1 Species List (California Department of Fish and Wildlife , 2022)

Common_Name	Federal_Status	State_Status	CDFW_Status
foothill yellow-legged frog - south Sierra DPS	Endangered	Endangered	-
valley elderberry longhorn beetle	Threatened	None	-
Sierra Nevada red fox - Sierra Nevada DPS	Endangered	Threatened	-
northwestern pond turtle	Proposed Threatened	None	SSC

(a) Less Than Significant Impact. The Biological Resources Assessment (BRA) prepared for the Project evaluated the existing biological conditions on the site and surrounding area. The Project site is primarily developed and disturbed as part of the existing RV resort and event venue, with previously graded roads and other developed areas. No special-status plant or wildlife species were observed during the biological survey. Although several special-status species have been documented in the surrounding area, the BRA determined that the Project is not expected to directly or indirectly affect these species. Based on the existing conditions and the limited amount of new disturbance proposed, impacts to special-status species would be less than significant.

(b) Less Than Significant Impact. The Project site contains areas of existing development and disturbance, as well as oak woodland and other vegetation. The BRA did not identify a sensitive natural community within the area that would be significantly affected by the Project. The surrounding vegetation provides habitat for common wildlife species; however, the proposed improvements would occur primarily within areas that have already been developed or disturbed.

Therefore, the Project would not result in a significant adverse effect on sensitive natural communities, and impacts would be less than significant.

(c) Less Than Significant Impact. The BRA did not identify jurisdictional waters or other sensitive water resources that would be affected by the proposed improvements. The Project does not propose to fill, dredge, or otherwise alter wetlands or jurisdictional waters. Based on the existing site conditions and the proposed development, the Project is not expected to result in direct or indirect impacts to water resources. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

(d) Less Than Significant Impact: The Project is located within an existing developed RV resort and event venue and includes previously disturbed roads and developed areas. While wildlife may move through the surrounding oak woodland and other undeveloped areas, the BRA determined that the Project would not substantially interfere with wildlife movement or established wildlife corridors. The Project would not create a significant barrier to wildlife movement or result in the loss of an important wildlife nursery site. Therefore, impacts to wildlife movement would be less than significant.

(e) No Impact. The Project would comply with all applicable County policies and ordinances related to biological resources. Therefore, no conflict with local biological resource policies would occur.

(f) No Impact. The Project site is not located within the boundaries of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP), Natural Community Conservation Plan (NCCP), or other approved habitat conservation plan. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with any such plans.

Appendix Reference: **Appendix A – Biological Resources Assessment**, Soar Environmental Consulting (March 27, 2026).

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5?	☐	☒	☐	☐
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	☐	☒	☐	☐
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	☐	☒	☐	☐

Responses:

(a) Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation. A Cultural Resources Assessment (CRA) was prepared for the Project in accordance with CEQA. The records search identified a previously recorded historical resource (CA-MAD-232/H) that overlaps portions of the Project area and has been determined eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places. Although no historic structures were identified within the Project footprint during the field survey, ground-disturbing activities associated with the Project could affect subsurface components of this resource. With the implementation of the mitigation measures identified below, potential impacts on historical resources would be reduced to a level less than significant.

(b) Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation: The CRA included an intensive pedestrian survey of the approximately 8-acre Project site, which did not identify any new archaeological resources on the ground surface. However, due to the presence of previously recorded resources in the vicinity and positive results from the Native American Heritage Commission Sacred Lands File search, there is potential for buried archaeological resources to be encountered during construction. With the implementation of the mitigation measures identified below, impacts to archaeological resources would be less than significant.

(c) Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation: No known human remains are present within the Project site. However, ground-disturbing activities could potentially encounter previously unknown human remains. With the implementation of the mitigation measure identified below, impacts would be reduced to a level that is less than significant.

MM CUL-1: Before ground-disturbing activities, a qualified archaeologist shall conduct Cultural Resources Awareness Training for all construction personnel. The training shall include examples of potential cultural materials, reporting protocols, penalties for unauthorized disturbance, and procedures for immediate notification of the archaeologist. Attendance shall be documented on a sign-in sheet retained by the contractor and provided to Madera County upon completion of construction.

MM CUL-2: Ground-disturbing activities shall be located at least 100 feet (30 meters) from known archaeological resources. If resources are discovered, work within 100 feet (30 meters) of the find shall halt immediately, and the area shall be protected from further disturbance. The archaeologist, in consultation with a Native American representative, if applicable, shall evaluate the find for significance and recommend treatment consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.4(b)(3)(C). Avoidance shall be the preferred mitigation; if avoidance is infeasible, data recovery or other appropriate treatment may be implemented. Construction shall resume only after approval by the qualified archaeologist.

MM CUL-3: If human remains are encountered during construction, all work in the vicinity shall cease. The Madera County Coroner shall be notified immediately. If the remains are determined to be Native American, the NAHC shall be notified in accordance with PRC Section 5097.98, and a Most Likely Descendant shall be identified. The County and the descendant shall confer to determine appropriate treatment and disposition of the remains. Construction shall not resume until approved by the County and the qualified archaeologist.

Reference: Cultural Resources Assessment, SSJVIC records search, NAHC Sacred Lands File search.

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?

Potentially
Significant
Impact

Less Than
Significant
With
Mitigation
Incorporation

Less Than
Significant
Impact

No
Impact

☐
☐
☒
☐

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

☐
☐
☒
☐

Responses:

(a) Less Than Significant Impact. Construction of the Project would require the temporary use of energy in the form of diesel fuel for construction equipment and gasoline for worker and delivery vehicles. Construction activities would be limited in duration and scope and would not involve unusually energy-intensive processes or prolonged heavy equipment use. As a result, construction-related energy consumption would be typical of similar projects and would not constitute wasteful or inefficient use of energy resources.

During operation, the Project would continue to operate as an existing RV resort, lodging, and event venue, with incremental increases in energy demand associated with additional RV spaces, glamping units, and renovated facilities. The Project incorporates energy-efficient building upgrades and operational practices, including energy-efficient lighting and appliances. These measures would reduce reliance on nonrenewable energy sources and avoid unnecessary or inefficient energy consumption. Therefore, the Project would not result in a potentially significant environmental impact related to energy use.

(b) Less Than Significant Impact. The Project would be consistent with applicable state and local plans and policies related to renewable energy and energy efficiency. All structures will be required to meet current California Building Code (CBC) standards. The Project does not include features that would preclude future renewable energy installations or otherwise obstruct implementation of state or local energy plans. Accordingly, the Project would not conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency.

VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Would the project:

Potentially
Significant
Impact

Less Than
Significant
With Mitigation
Incorporation

Less Than
Significant
Impact

No
Impact

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone Map issued by the State Geologist for the area, or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	☐	☐	☐	☒
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	☐	☐	☒	☐
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	☐	☐	☒	☐
iv) Landslides?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Be located on a geological 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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Responses:

(a-i) No Impact. The Project site is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone, as shown on the most recent maps issued by the State Geologist. No known active faults have been identified crossing the Project site. Therefore, the Project would not expose people or structures to surface-rupture hazards, and no impacts would occur.

(a-ii) Less Than Significant Impact. The Project site is located in a region of California subject to seismic activity; however, no active Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zones are mapped within the Project site. As with most areas of the State, the Project could be subject to strong seismic ground shaking from regional seismic events.

The Project involves improvements and modest expansion of an existing RV resort, lodging, and event venue. Any new construction or structural improvements associated with the Project would be required to comply with the current CBC, which includes seismic design standards intended to minimize risks to life and property. Compliance with these requirements would ensure that buildings and infrastructure are designed to withstand anticipated seismic forces.

With adherence to applicable building codes and engineering standards, the Project would not substantially increase the exposure of people or structures to seismic hazards. Therefore, impacts related to strong seismic ground shaking would be less than significant.

(a-iii) Less Than Significant Impact. Soils in the Project area are not identified as having a high potential for liquefaction. The Project does not propose deep excavation or structural features that would increase the risk of seismic-related ground failure. Compliance with CBC requirements, including site-specific foundation design as necessary, would ensure that potential impacts related to liquefaction or other seismic-related ground failure would be less than significant.

(a-iv) Less Than Significant Impact. The Project site is not located within an area identified as having a high landslide risk. Project activities would primarily occur within previously developed and relatively level areas. Minor grading, if required, would comply with County standards and applicable erosion control requirements. As a result, the Project would not substantially increase the risk of landslides, and impacts would be less than significant.

(b) Less Than Significant Impact. Construction activities associated with the Project may involve limited ground disturbance; however, the Project does not include extensive grading or mass earthmoving. Standard erosion and sediment control measures would be implemented during construction in compliance with County requirements. With these measures in place, the Project would not result in substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil.

(c) Less Than Significant Impact. The Project site is not located on geologic units known to be unstable. The proposed development would not substantially alter existing soil or geologic conditions. Compliance with applicable building and grading standards would ensure site stability. Therefore, impacts related to unstable soils or geologic conditions would be less than significant.

(d) Less Than Significant Impact. Expansive soils may be present in portions of Madera County. However, any new construction or structural improvements would be designed in accordance with the CBC, which includes requirements for foundation design to address expansive soil conditions. Compliance with these standards would reduce potential impacts to a less-than-significant level.

(e) Less Than Significant Impact. The Project relies on onsite wastewater treatment systems that are subject to review and approval by Madera County Environmental Health. Soil suitability, system design, and operational requirements would be evaluated as part of the permitting process. Compliance with County and State requirements would ensure that soils can support the proposed wastewater disposal systems. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

(f) Less Than Significant Impact. The Project site does not contain any known unique geologic features and is not located within an area identified as having significant paleontological resources. The proposed improvements consist primarily of the renovation and expansion of an existing developed RV resort, including site improvements, utility upgrades, circulation improvements, and associated amenities. Ground-disturbing activities would be limited in scope

and would occur largely within previously disturbed areas of the site.

The Project area is located within the Sierra Nevada foothills and is underlain by granitic and metamorphic rock formations that are generally considered to have a low potential to contain significant paleontological resources. No paleontological resources or unique geologic features were identified during site investigations, and none are recorded within the Project area. Accordingly, the Project is not expected to directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource, site, or unique geologic feature.

Therefore, impacts related to paleontological resources and unique geologic features would be less than significant.

Reference: California Geological Survey, *California Geologic Map Data Series*; Madera County General Plan Background Report; and site-specific biological and environmental investigations prepared for the Oakstone Yosemite Resort Project.

VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Responses:

(a-b) Less than Significant Impact. The Project would generate greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions during construction from the use of construction equipment and worker vehicle trips. These emissions would be temporary. Operational GHG emissions would result from guest and employee vehicle trips, energy use in buildings, and maintenance activities. The Project represents an improvement and modest expansion of an existing RV resort, lodging, and event venue, and would not introduce land uses that are inherently GHG-intensive.

A Trip Generation Worksheet prepared for the project estimates that the proposed development would generate approximately 107 average daily external vehicle trips. After accounting for traffic associated with the site's existing entitled RV park, short-term lodging rooms, and event center, the project would generate approximately 19 net new average daily external trips.

The Project would comply with applicable State energy efficiency standards and building codes, which are designed to reduce energy consumption and associated GHG emissions. Considering the Project's scale, the existing developed setting, the temporary nature of construction

emissions, and the incorporation of energy-efficient design features, the Project would not generate GHG emissions that would result in a significant environmental impact.

The Project would be consistent with applicable State and local plans and policies adopted to reduce GHG emissions, including California's climate change regulatory framework and energy efficiency requirements. The Project would not include features that would impede the implementation of GHG reduction plans or policies. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

Reference: Trip Generation Worksheet

IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed 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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f) Impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	☐	☐	☒	☐
	☐	☐	☒	☐

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

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

Responses:

The operational statement does not indicate that any hazardous chemicals will be stored or produced on-site as a result of the proposal. New development is not expected to create any significant hazards.

(a) Less Than Significant Impact: The Project does not propose the routine use, transport, or disposal of hazardous materials beyond common construction-related materials (e.g., fuels, lubricants, paints) that would be used in small quantities and in accordance with applicable regulations. During operation, the Project would continue to function as an RV resort, lodging, and event venue, and would not involve industrial processes or the handling of hazardous materials. Compliance with all applicable federal, state, and local regulations would ensure that no significant hazard to the public or the environment would occur.

(b) Less Than Significant Impact: The Project does not include land uses or activities that would involve the storage or handling of hazardous or acutely hazardous materials in quantities that could result in significant release under upset or accident conditions. Construction and operational activities would involve only limited quantities of standard materials, which would be managed in accordance with regulatory requirements. Therefore, the Project would not create a significant hazard under reasonably foreseeable accident conditions.

(c) No Impact: The Project would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials. No existing or proposed schools are located within one-quarter mile of the Project site. Accordingly, the Project would not pose a hazard related to hazardous emissions or materials in proximity to a school.

(d) No Impact: The Project site is not listed on the hazardous materials sites list compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 (Cortese List). Therefore, the Project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment due to the presence of hazardous materials contamination.

(e) No Impact: The Project site is not within two miles of a public or public-use airport. As a result, the Project would not result in airport-related safety hazards or excessive aircraft noise affecting people residing or working at the site.

(f) Less than Significant Impact: The Project would not impair implementation of adopted emergency response or evacuation plans. The Project includes improvements to internal circulation, emergency access, and fire protection infrastructure to maintain or enhance emergency response capabilities. Access to the site would remain available during construction and operation. Therefore, the Project would not substantially interfere with emergency response or evacuation plans, and impacts would be less than significant.

(g) Less than Significant Impact: The Project site is in a region subject to wildland fire risk. However, the Project incorporates fire safety and wildfire resilience measures, including defensible space, fuel reduction, fire-safe design, improved emergency access, and enhanced

water supply for fire protection, in compliance with CAL FIRE requirements, County Wildland–Urban Interface (WUI) standards, and Fire Marshal conditions. With the implementation of these measures, the Project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk related to wildland fires.

X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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:	☐	☐	☒	☐
(i) Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;	☐	☐	☒	☐
(ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite;	☐	☐	☒	☐
(iii) 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; or	☐	☐	☒	☐
(iv) Impede or redirect flood flows?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Responses:

The Project would be served by the existing onsite well and water storage system. Based on typical water use assumptions for lodging, restaurant, employee, and landscape uses, the estimated average daily water demand for the Project is approximately 6,920 gallons per day (gpd). This estimate includes 35 non-hotel lodging units at 100 gpd per unit, seven existing short-term lodging rooms at 150 gpd per room, restaurant and bar use based on 50 seats, six employees, and approximately 2,000 square feet of landscaped area. Pool makeup water is not included because the final pool design and water requirements have not yet been established. Any additional water demand associated with the pool will be addressed during final project design and permitting.

The existing onsite well is reported to produce approximately 8.5 gallons per minute (gpm). If operated continuously at that rate, the well could theoretically produce approximately 12,240 gpd. For planning purposes, the estimated maximum day demand is approximately 10,380 gpd, based on 1.5 times the estimated average daily demand. Therefore, the reported well production is greater than the estimated average and maximum day water demands for the Project. The well production rate represents the reported capacity of the well and should not be considered a guaranteed sustainable yield.

The Project also includes improvements to the onsite water storage system. The existing 5,000-gallon water tank would remain, with an additional 10,000-gallon tank proposed to provide increased storage capacity. A separate 15,000-gallon tank would provide water for fire protection.

Based on the information provided by the applicant, the existing well and proposed water storage improvements appear adequate to serve the anticipated water demand of the Project. Final verification of well capacity, water system design, storage requirements, and any additional water demand associated with the pool will be required through the County's applicable permitting and review processes prior to operation of the Project.

Source: California Department of Water Resources (2023). *California Water Plan Update 2023*; Water Use Efficiency Data (WUED) Database. Sacramento, California. Available through the California Department of Water Resources.

(a) Less Than Significant Impact. The Project would include upgrades to onsite wastewater treatment, water storage, and drainage facilities, all of which would be subject to review and approval by Madera County Environmental Health and applicable regulatory agencies. Construction activities could temporarily disturb soils and create the potential for sediment runoff; however, standard erosion and sediment control measures would be implemented during construction. With compliance with applicable waste discharge requirements, County standards, and permit conditions, the Project would not violate water quality standards or substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality.

(b) Less Than Significant Impact. The Project would continue to rely on existing onsite water supply sources, with incremental increases in water demand associated with additional non-hotel lodging units, lodging improvements, and amenities. The Project would increase water demand compared with existing conditions; however, based on the reported well production, proposed

storage improvements, and estimated Project demand, the increase is not expected to substantially decrease groundwater supplies. The Project would not substantially alter natural recharge patterns or interfere with sustainable groundwater management. Therefore, impacts to groundwater supply and recharge would be less than significant.

(c) Less Than Significant Impact. The Project would include minor site reconfiguration and the addition of impervious surfaces associated with circulation improvements and amenities. However, the Project would not alter the course of any stream or river. Drainage improvements would be designed to comply with County standards and would ensure that post-development runoff conditions do not exceed pre-development conditions.

(c-i) Erosion and sediment control measures would be implemented during construction to prevent off-site transport of sediment. With these measures in place, the Project would not result in substantial erosion or siltation.

(c-ii) Drainage facilities would be designed to manage stormwater flows and prevent increases in runoff that could result in flooding. The Project would not substantially increase surface runoff rates or volumes beyond the capacity of existing drainage systems.

(c-iii) Stormwater runoff would be managed through onsite drainage features designed in accordance with County requirements. Implementing construction best management practices would reduce pollutant runoff. As a result, the Project would not exceed stormwater system capacity or substantially contribute to polluted runoff.

(c-iv) The Project site is not located within a mapped floodway, and the Project would not include structures or grading that would impede or redirect flood flows. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

(d) No Impact. The Project site is not located within a flood hazard zone, tsunami inundation area, or seiche hazard area. As a result, the Project would not risk the release of pollutants due to inundation.

(e) Less Than Significant Impact. The Project would comply with applicable water quality control requirements and County regulations related to wastewater treatment, stormwater management, and water supply. The Project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or a sustainable groundwater management plan.

XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING

Would the project:

a) Physically divide an established community?

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
☐	☐	☐	☒
☐	☐	☐	☒

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?				

Responses:

(a) No Impact. The Project consists of improvements and modest expansion of an existing RV resort, lodging, and event venue on a previously developed parcel. The Project would not introduce new roadways, barriers, or infrastructure that would divide or disrupt established neighborhoods or community connections. Existing access patterns and circulation within the surrounding area would remain unchanged. Therefore, the Project would not physically divide an established community, and no impact would occur.

(b) No Impact. The Project is consistent with the Madera County General Plan, the Oakhurst Area Plan, and applicable zoning regulations governing land use, development intensity, and environmental protection. The proposed use as an RV resort, lodging, and event venue is consistent with the site's existing land use designation and zoning, and the Project would comply with applicable development standards and permit requirements. Because the Project does not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted to avoid or mitigate an environmental effect, no significant environmental impact would occur.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Responses:

(a - b) No Impact. The Project site is not located within an area identified as having significant mineral resource value. The site is already developed and is not designated for mineral extraction or resource conservation. The Project would not preclude access to or extraction of known mineral resources of regional or statewide importance. Therefore, the Project would not result in the loss

of availability of a known mineral resource, and no impact would occur.

The Project site is not identified in the Madera County General Plan, the Oakhurst Area Plan, or any other applicable land use plan as a locally important mineral resource recovery site. The proposed Project would not interfere with mineral resource extraction activities. Accordingly, the Project would not result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site, and no impact would occur.

XIII. NOISE

Would the project result in:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 ordinances, or applicable standards of other agencies?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Responses:

(a) Less Than Significant Impact. A Noise Impact Study was prepared for the Project by Soar Environmental Consulting (December 2025) to evaluate construction and operational noise in accordance with the Madera County General Plan Noise Element and CEQA. The study analyzed four construction phases over an anticipated six-month period and assumed daytime-only construction activities from 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. on weekdays. Only one piece of heavy equipment would operate at any given time, and no pile driving, blasting, or other high-impact noise-generating activities are proposed.

Screening-level modeling using Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) methodologies determined that peak construction noise levels at the nearest residential receptors would range from approximately 58 to 68 dBA Leq, which is below the County's 70 dBA daytime threshold for non-transportation noise sources. Table 3 of the Noise Impact Study confirms that none of the modeled construction scenarios would exceed applicable County standards.

Operational noise associated with the expanded RV resort, glamping units, event center renovations, and amenities would primarily consist of vehicle trips, RV idling, and typical recreational activity. The Noise Impact Study concluded that operational noise would not create a substantial new or substantially increased noise source or exceed existing ambient conditions

influenced by traffic on State Route 41. Therefore, the Project would not result in a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels, and impacts would be less than significant. Operational noise analysis also accounts for the on-site restaurant and bar, including extended operating hours until 12:00 midnight on Fridays and Saturdays. Noise sources would include patrons, background music, and associated vehicle activity. These noise levels would remain consistent with existing commercial, and visitor-serving uses and would comply with Madera County noise standards.

Operation of the on-site restaurant and bar, including evening and late-night hours on Fridays and Saturdays, would generate noise from patrons, music, and vehicle activity. These noise sources would be intermittent and consistent with typical commercial recreation and dining uses. Compliance with Madera County noise regulations, event management practices, and any applicable permit conditions would ensure operational noise remains within acceptable levels.

(b) Less Than Significant Impact. The Noise Impact Study evaluated potential vibration impacts in accordance with the guidance of Caltrans and the Federal Transit Administration. The Project does not include pile driving, blasting, or other percussive construction activities known to generate substantial groundborne vibration. Construction equipment would consist primarily of rubber-tired loaders, backhoes, generators, welders, and air compressors, none of which are expected to generate vibration levels approaching structural damage or human annoyance thresholds.

The study concluded that groundborne vibration would not be noticeable to nearby receptors and would not cause cosmetic or structural damage. Operational activities would not generate groundborne vibrations. Accordingly, impacts related to vibration and groundborne noise would be less than significant.

(c) No Impact. The Noise Impact Study confirmed that no public or private airport or airstrip is located within approximately four miles of the Project site. As a result, aircraft-related noise does not affect the Project area, and no analysis of airport noise exposure is required. Therefore, the Project would not expose people residing or working in the Project area to excessive aircraft noise, and no impact would occur.

Appendix Reference: **Appendix B – Noise Impact Study**, Soar Environmental Consulting (December, 2025).

XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING

Would the project:

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
☐	☐	☐	☒

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and business) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?				
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Responses:

(a) No Impact. According to the Project Operational Statement, the Project would continue the existing RV resort, short-term lodging, and event venue uses and would not include permanent residential housing or long-term residential occupancy. The Project would operate year-round, with reduced capacity for recreation and overnight lodging uses from November through March. The Project is expected to serve an average of approximately 70 visitors per day, with a maximum capacity of 250 visitors, all of whom would be temporary guests or visitors. The Project would not create permanent housing units or result in a permanent resident population.

The Operational Statement indicates that the Project would employ approximately six employees at full operation, which would not represent a substantial increase in employment or induce secondary population growth. The Project would use existing access from State Route 41 and Golden Horse Drive and would not extend new roadways, utilities, or public infrastructure to facilitate additional development beyond the Project site. Therefore, the Project would not induce substantial unplanned population growth, either directly or indirectly.

(b) No Impact. The Project site is currently developed with an RV resort, short-term rentals, and event space, and does not contain permanent residential housing. Implementation of the Project would not require the removal of existing housing units or the displacement of residents. All improvements would occur within existing commercial and recreational use. As noted in the Operational Statement, no existing buildings used for residential purposes would be removed, and no residents would be displaced as a result of the Project.

Appendix C – Operational Statement, prepared by the Project Applicant (Josiah Maddock, 2025).

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

XV. PUBLIC SERVICES

a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, 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:

i) Fire protection?	☐	☐	☒	☐
ii) Police protection?	☐	☐	☒	☐
iii) Schools?	☐	☐	☐	☒
iv) Parks?	☐	☐	☐	☒
v) Other public facilities?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Responses:

(a-i) Less Than Significant Impact. Fire protection services will continue to be provided by the Madera County Fire Department. According to the Project Operational Statement, the project will operate as a short-term lodging facility, RV resort, and event venue, serving an average of 70 visitors per day, with a maximum capacity of 250. It will employ around six staff members.

The inclusion of a restaurant and bar may slightly increase the demand for fire protection; however, existing service providers have the capacity to accommodate this increase. The project does not involve any permanent residential development or a significant population increase that would necessitate new or expanded fire protection facilities.

The Project includes fire-safe design features, defensible space, improved emergency access, and enhanced onsite water storage for fire protection, all subject to Fire Marshal review and approval. These features would maintain acceptable fire response capabilities. As a result, the Project would not require construction of new or expanded fire protection facilities, and impacts would be less than significant.

The project was circulated to Madera County Fire; no concerns or comments were received.

(a-ii) Less Than Significant Impact. Police protection services will continue to be provided by the Madera County Sheriff's Office. While the restaurant and bar may slightly increase the demand for police protection, existing service providers have the capacity to accommodate this project. The project is expected to generate short-term visitor activity that aligns with the area's

existing recreational and lodging uses. With a limited number of employees and visitors, and no permanent residential population, the project will not significantly increase the demand for police services or necessitate new or expanded law enforcement facilities. Therefore, the impacts related to police protection will be deemed less than significant. Although the presence of an on-site restaurant and bar open to the public may result in a few additional calls for service during evening hours, the scale of operations and limited operating hours will not require new or expanded law enforcement resources.

The project was circulated to the Madera County Sheriff's Department; no concerns or comments were received.

(a-iii) No Impact. The Project does not include permanent residential housing and would not generate school-aged residents. Visitors to the site would be temporary, and employees would not reside on-site. As a result, the Project would not increase enrollment or demand for school facilities. No impact on school services would occur.

(a-iv) No Impact. The Project would not displace or affect existing public parks and would not require the construction or expansion of park facilities. Recreational activities associated with the Project would occur onsite within private facilities provided for guests. Therefore, the Project would not result in impacts to public parks.

(a-v) Less Than Significant Impact. Other public services and facilities, including emergency medical services, would continue to serve the Project area. The Project's limited staffing, short-term visitor orientation, and reliance on existing infrastructure would not require new or expanded public facilities. The Operational Statement indicates that the Project would utilize standard public services consistent with existing conditions. Accordingly, impacts related to other public facilities would be less than significant.

XVI. RECREATION

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Would the project 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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Responses:

(a) No Impact. The Project would operate as a private RV resort, short-term lodging, and event venue serving an average of approximately 70 visitors per day, with a maximum of 250 visitors per day. Visitors would use on-site, privately maintained recreational amenities and facilities

associated with the Project and would not rely on neighborhood or regional public parks to meet their recreational needs.

The Project does not include permanent residential development and would not generate a new resident population that would increase long-term demand for public recreational facilities. Therefore, the Project would not increase the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks in a manner that would result in substantial physical deterioration, and no impact would occur.

(b) Less Than Significant Impact. The Project includes the addition and improvement of on-site recreational amenities for guests, including outdoor gathering areas, landscaped spaces, and a proposed pool and spa facility. These amenities would be constructed within the site's existing developed footprint and would not involve the development of undisturbed land or environmentally sensitive areas.

All recreational improvements would be subject to County permitting and environmental review and would be designed in compliance with applicable building, health, and safety standards. As such, the construction and operation of on-site recreational facilities would not result in adverse physical effects on the environment. Impacts would be less than significant.

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?

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

☐	☐	☒	☐
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

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

☐	☐	☒	☐
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

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

☐	☐	☐	☒
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

d) Result in inadequate emergency access?

☐	☐	☐	☒
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Responses:

(a) Less Than Significant Impact. The Project would continue to utilize existing access from State Route 41 via Golden Horse Drive, consistent with current site operations. Based on the Oakstone Resort Yosemite Trip Generation Worksheet, the proposed project would generate approximately 107 average daily external vehicle trips under proposed conditions. After accounting for the existing entitled uses on the site (30 RV spaces, seven short term lodging rooms, and the existing event center), the project would result in approximately 19 net new

average daily external vehicle trips compared with existing entitled conditions. The Project does not require roadway widening, new signalization, or modification of the surrounding circulation system.

The Project would not conflict with applicable County circulation plans or policies and would maintain existing pedestrian and vehicular access patterns. Parking would be provided onsite (approximately 118 spaces) to accommodate employees, guests, and service vehicles, reducing the potential for spillover parking on public roadways. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with adopted circulation plans or policies, and impacts would be less than significant.

The restaurant and bar being open to the public may lead to additional vehicle trips, particularly during evening hours and on weekends. Trip generation would be modest and would not substantially increase traffic volumes on State Route 41 or surrounding roadways. Adequate on-site parking is provided to accommodate patrons and staff.

(b) Less Than Significant Impact. CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3(b) requires consideration of vehicle miles traveled (VMT) rather than level of service (LOS) in evaluating transportation impacts. The Project consists of improvements and a modest expansion of an existing visitor-serving facility and would not include permanent residential development or a substantial increase in employment.

The Project is estimated to generate approximately 107 average daily external vehicle trips under proposed conditions. After accounting for traffic associated with the existing entitled uses, including the existing RV spaces, short-term lodging rooms, and event center, the Project would result in approximately 19 net new average daily trips. The additional trips would primarily be associated with short-term visitors and approximately six employees.

Given the Project's limited scale, existing visitor-serving use, and relatively small increase in daily vehicle trips, the Project is not expected to result in a substantial increase in vehicle miles traveled or induce additional growth. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3(b), and impacts related to VMT would be less than significant.

(c) No Impact. The Project does not propose changes to roadway geometry, intersection configurations, or access locations that would introduce traffic hazards. Access to the site would remain at existing approved driveways, and no new incompatible land uses are proposed. Internal circulation improvements would enhance site safety for vehicles and pedestrians. As a result, the Project would not substantially increase traffic hazards, and no impact would occur.

(d) No Impact. The Project includes improvements to internal circulation and emergency access, and access to the site would continue to be provided from existing public roadways. Emergency access, fire lanes, and turnaround areas would be designed and maintained in accordance with Madera County Fire Department and Fire Marshal requirements. As a result, the Project would not result in inadequate emergency access, and no impact would occur.

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

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:

i) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k), or

☐	☒	☐	☐
--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

ii) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.

☐	☒	☐	☐
--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Responses:

Cultural resources can be defined as buildings, sites, structures, objects, or places of historical, architectural, archaeological, cultural, or scientific significance (including those associated with Native Americans or Native American activities). The preservation of the County's unique cultural heritage has been considered in planning for the area's future development.

The western area of the County was originally inhabited by the Northern Valley Yokuts. Ethnographic information about this group is sparse due to the early dissemination of the Aboriginal populations in the lower San Joaquin Valley.

The Northern Valley Yokuts territory is defined roughly by the crest of the Diablo Range on the west, and the foothills of the Sierra Nevada on the east. The southern boundary is approximately where the San Joaquin River bends northwards, and the northern boundary is roughly halfway between the Calaveras and Mokelumne Rivers.

Principal settlements were located on the tops of low mounds, on or near the banks of larger watercourses. Settlements were composed of single-family dwellings, sweat houses, and ceremonial assembly chambers. Dwellings were small, lightly constructed, semi-subterranean, and oval. The public structures were large and earth-covered.

With the development of Spanish Ranchos throughout California, cattle husbandry was prevalent, while dairy farms remained crude and sparse.

(a-i, a-ii) Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation. A Cultural Resources Assessment (CRA) was prepared for the Project by Soar Environmental Consulting (March 2026) in accordance with CEQA and the County completed the applicable AB 52 notification process. The CRA included a records search through the Southern San Joaquin Valley Information Center (SSJVIC), a Sacred Lands File search conducted by the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC), and an intensive pedestrian survey of the approximately 8-acre Project site.

The records search identified that the Project site partially overlaps the boundaries of CA-MAD-232/H (A'lau/Aplau), a large multicomponent prehistoric and historic site that has been formally determined eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places and is culturally sensitive to Native American communities. The NAHC Sacred Lands File search returned positive results for the Project vicinity.

Although the pedestrian survey did not identify any visible tribal cultural resources within the Project disturbance footprint, the CRA concluded that subsurface cultural materials associated with CA-MAD-232/H could be present and that ground-disturbing activities could affect tribal cultural resources if not properly managed. Therefore, without mitigation, the Project could result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource.

With implementation of the mitigation measures identified in Section V, including cultural resources awareness training, protection of identified archaeological resources, and procedures for the inadvertent discovery of cultural resources or human remains, potential impacts to tribal cultural resources would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

Refer to Section V, Cultural Resources, for mitigation measures.

XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment, or stormwater drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it had adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Responses:

(a) Less Than Significant Impact. The Project would utilize existing utility infrastructure serving the site, with limited on-site upgrades to support the proposed improvements. According to the Project Operational Statement, water would continue to be supplied by an existing on-site well, and wastewater would be managed through on-site treatment systems, subject to review and approval by Madera County Environmental Health. Stormwater drainage improvements would be designed to comply with County standards and would not require off-site infrastructure expansion. Electric power, telecommunications, and other utilities would continue to be provided through existing service connections, with no need for new or expanded off-site facilities. As a result, the Project would not require construction of new or expanded utility infrastructure that could cause significant environmental effects, and the impacts would be less than significant

(b) Less Than Significant Impact. The Project would continue to rely on the existing onsite well and water storage system. Based on the reported well production, estimated Project demand, and proposed storage improvements, the available water supply appears adequate to serve the Project under the assumptions evaluated in this Initial Study. However, final verification of well capacity, sustainable yield, storage requirements, and any additional demand associated with the proposed pool shall be completed through the County's applicable permitting and review

processes prior to operation. Based on the available information, the Project would not be expected to result in a significant impact related to water supply.

(c) Less Than Significant Impact. Wastewater generated by the Project would be treated onsite through existing and upgraded wastewater treatment facilities. The Operational Statement indicates that wastewater system improvements would be reviewed and approved by Madera County Environmental Health to ensure adequate treatment capacity for the Project's projected demand. With regulatory review and compliance, the onsite wastewater system would have adequate capacity to serve the Project in addition to existing commitments. Therefore, impacts related to wastewater treatment capacity would be less than significant.

(d) Less Than Significant Impact. The Project would generate solid waste associated with short-term lodging, RV use, and food and beverage service. Solid waste generation would be typical of similar hospitality and recreational uses and would not exceed the capacity of existing waste collection and disposal infrastructure. The Project would provide on-site waste and recycling facilities consistent with County requirements. Therefore, solid waste impacts would be less than significant.

(e) No Impact. The Project would comply with all applicable federal, state, and local solid waste regulations, including the requirements of Senate Bill 1383 (SB 1383) for organic waste reduction, recycling, and waste diversion. Compliance with these regulations would ensure that the Project does not impair solid waste management goals. Therefore, no impact would occur.

XX. WILDFIRE

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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) 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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c)	☐	☐	☒	☐

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?				

Responses:

The Project site is located within a State Responsibility Area (SRA) classified by CAL FIRE as a High Fire Hazard Severity Zone. The following analysis considers site conditions, project design features, and required compliance with applicable fire safety regulations.

(a) Less Than Significant. The Project would not impair implementation of adopted emergency response or evacuation plans. Access to the site would continue to be provided via existing public roadways, and the Project includes improvements to internal circulation, emergency access, and fire lanes. The Project would comply with Madera County Fire Department and Fire Marshal requirements, including emergency access standards and fire apparatus turning radii. These measures would ensure that emergency response and evacuation capabilities are maintained. Therefore, the Project would not substantially impair emergency response or evacuation plans.

(b) Less Than Significant. The Project site is in a wildfire-prone region; however, the Project incorporates fire-safe design and wildfire resilience measures required for development within an SRA. These measures include defensible space, fuel reduction, fire-resistant building materials, and compliance with CAL FIRE and County Wildland–Urban Interface (WUI) standards. The Project does not propose development on steep slopes or in topographic conditions that would exacerbate wildfire behavior. With the implementation of required fire safety measures, the Project would not exacerbate wildfire risks or expose occupants to increased wildfire-related hazards beyond existing regional conditions.

(c) Less Than Significant. The Project would include installation and maintenance of onsite infrastructure improvements, such as emergency access routes, water storage tanks, and fire protection infrastructure. These improvements are intended to reduce wildfire risk and improve emergency response capability and would be designed and installed in accordance with County and CAL FIRE requirements. The Project does not require off-site infrastructure expansion that would exacerbate wildfire risk. Any temporary environmental impacts associated with the installation would be minimized by complying with County standards. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

(d) Less Than Significant. The Project would not substantially alter existing drainage patterns or slopes. Stormwater and drainage improvements would be designed to comply with County standards and would not increase runoff or erosion potential. The Project site is not located in a mapped landslide hazard area, and development would occur primarily within previously disturbed areas. With compliance with grading, drainage, and erosion control requirements, the

Project would not expose people or structures to significant risks related to post-fire flooding or slope instability.

Madera County developed an Emergency Operations Plan and a Multi-Hazard Functional Plan, which establishes the emergency management organization required to mitigate emergencies or disasters affecting Madera County. Both documents identify policies, responsibilities, and procedures required to protect the health and safety of Madera County communities, public and private property, and the environment from the environmental effects of natural and technological emergencies and disasters. And establish the operational concepts and procedures associated with Initial Response Operations (field response) to emergencies, the Extended Response Operations County Emergency Operations Center (EOC) activities, and the recovery process. Madera County also developed a Local Hazard Mitigation Plan (LHMP), which outlines evacuation procedures. The LHMP states the Sheriff's Department uses a system known as "MCALERT".

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE				
a) Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are significant when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Responses:

CEQA defines three types of impacts or effects:

- Direct impacts are caused by a project and occur at the same time and place (CEQA §15358(a)(1)).
- Indirect or secondary impacts are reasonably foreseeable and are caused by a project but occur at a different time or place. They may include growth-inducing effects and other effects related to changes in the pattern of land use, population density, or growth rate and related effects on air,

water, and other natural systems, including ecosystems (CEQA §15358(a)(2)).

- Cumulative impacts refer to two or more individual effects which, when considered together, are considerable or which compound or increase other environmental impacts (CEQA §15355(b)). Impacts from individual projects may be considered minor, but when considered retroactively alongside other projects over time, those impacts could be significant, especially where listed or sensitive species are involved.

This Initial Study has evaluated the potential environmental effects of the proposed Project pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The analysis determined that the Project could result in significant impacts on aesthetic, cultural, and tribal resources. However, mitigation measures have been incorporated into the Project to reduce these impacts to a less-than-significant level.

All other environmental issue areas were found to result in less-than-significant impacts or no impacts. With implementation of the identified mitigation measures and compliance with applicable federal, state, and local regulations, the Project would not result in any significant environmental impacts. Therefore, preparation of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is not required, and a Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) is appropriate.

(a) Less Than Significant Impact. This Initial Study has evaluated the potential environmental effects of the proposed Project pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The Project consists of improvements and a modest expansion of an existing RV resort, lodging, and event venue located within a previously developed site. The environmental analysis identified the potential for impacts related to aesthetics and cultural and tribal resources; however, mitigation measures have been incorporated into the Project to reduce these impacts to a less-than-significant level.

A biological resources assessment prepared for the Project determined that no special-status plant or wildlife species, sensitive natural communities, or jurisdictional wetlands would be substantially affected by the proposed development. The cultural resources analysis identified the potential for impacts to historical, archaeological, and tribal cultural resources; however, implementation of the identified mitigation measures, including cultural resources awareness training, resource protection and avoidance measures, and inadvertent discovery procedures, would reduce these potential impacts to a less-than-significant level. With implementation of the required mitigation measures, compliance with conditions of approval, and adherence to applicable federal, State, and County regulations, the Project would not substantially degrade environmental quality, eliminate important examples of California history or prehistory, or otherwise result in significant adverse environmental effects.

(b) Less Than Significant Impact. The Project's individual impacts were evaluated across all environmental issue areas and found to be less than significant or no impact, with or without mitigation. The Project would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to regional impacts related to air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, transportation, biological resources, water supply, wildfire risk, public services, or utilities. The Project does not introduce new land uses, extend infrastructure, or induce growth in a manner that would intensify development beyond existing patterns. Therefore, the Project's incremental effects would not be cumulatively considerable when viewed in combination with past, present, or reasonably foreseeable future projects.

(c) Less Than Significant Impact. The Project would not cause environmental effects that would result in substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly. Potential impacts related to air quality, noise, wildfire, hazards, traffic, hydrology, and water quality were evaluated and found to be less than significant with the implementation of applicable design features, regulatory compliance measures, conditions of approval and mitigation measures where required. The Project incorporates fire-safe design, defensible space, emergency access improvements, water and wastewater system upgrades, and compliance with County, State, and CAL FIRE standards. Accordingly, the Project would not expose people to substantial environmental hazards or result in significant adverse effects on human health or safety.

Works Cited

- California Department of Fish and Wildlife . (2026, January 30). *BIOS*. Retrieved from <https://apps.wildlife.ca.gov/bios/?bookmark=326>
- Madera County. (1995). *Madera County General Plan*. Madera. Retrieved from [Planning Forms and Documents | Madera County](#)
- United States Environmental Protection Agency . (2026, January 30). *Wetlands*. Retrieved from What is a Wetland : <https://www.epa.gov/wetlands/what-wetland>
- Project Description and Operational Statement, prepared by the Project Applicant (Josiah Maddock, 2025).
- Biological Resources Assessment, prepared by Soar Environmental Consulting (March 27, 2026).
- Noise Impact Study, prepared by Soar Environmental Consulting (December 2025).
- Cultural Resources Assessment, prepared by Soar Environmental Consulting (March, 2026).
- Agency Review Correspondence, including memoranda from the Madera County Environmental Health Division (August 5, 2025) and Madera County Public Works (September 11, 2025).