EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

APPLICANT: Maki Kaplinsky, Eaglefield Airport LLC

APPLICATION NOS.: Initial Study No. 8803 and Unclassified Conditional Use Permit No. 3834

DESCRIPTION: Allow the expansion of an existing airfield previously authorized under CUP No. 1947 to accommodate aircraft maintenance, assembly, and reconditioning, with incidental manufacturing and associated facilities. The proposed improvements include construction of a new 210,000-square-foot aircraft hangar, reconstruction of the historic airport tower at its original location and within its original footprint, and a 288-foot extension of the existing 2,300-foot paved runway to the northwest, resulting in a total paved runway length of 2,588 feet. The existing use and proposed expansion would occur on seven parcels totaling approximately 271.73 acres in the AE-20 (Exclusive Agricultural, 20-acre minimum parcel size) Zone District.

LOCATION: The subject parcels are generally located between 1st Lift Canal and the Delta Mendota Canal to the north and south, and between W. Cambria Ave. and N. Russel Ave., approximately 11.8-miles west of the nearest city boundaries of the City of Firebaugh (APNs: 004-080-05S, 004-080-21, 004-080-22S, 004-080-24S, 004-080-58, 004-080-59, and 004-090-35) (Sup. Dist. 1).

I. AESTHETICS

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

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 points.) 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?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

The project site is in a rural agricultural area and contains an established airport, paved and unpaved runway areas, hangars, offices, barracks, a museum, and related airport facilities. The site is not identified in County mapping as a scenic vista or scenic highway corridor. The proposed 210,000-square-foot hangar would be limited to 35 feet in height and would be located within the airport operational area near existing structures. The reconstructed tower would retain its historic location, footprint, and architectural character. Outdoor lighting would be limited to that needed for safety and visibility and would be subject to County standards. Although the project would add visible development, it would remain compatible with the existing airport and surrounding agricultural setting. Impacts would be less than significant.

II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland.

In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment Project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:

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?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

The subject property is designated Agriculture by the Fresno County General Plan and is zoned AE-20. Surrounding lands are predominantly agricultural. Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program information identifies agricultural land around the airport, while the developed airport is predominantly mapped as Other Land or Urban and Built-Up Land.

The current site plan places the 288-foot runway extension, 210,000-square-foot hangar, and reconstructed tower within existing airport property and areas previously developed or disturbed by airport operations. No active crop production is shown within the proposed improvement footprints. The project does not propose a subdivision or rezoning and would continue as an airport use. The subject site is not under a Williamson Act contract. Therefore, impacts to agricultural resources would be less than significant.

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?

FINDING: NO IMPACT

The project site does not contain forest land or timberland and is not zoned for timberland production. Proposed development would remain within the existing airport property and would not extend urban public services into surrounding agricultural lands. Water and wastewater service would continue to be provided through on-site facilities. The project would not result in the loss or conversion of forest land or induce the conversion of surrounding farmland. Impacts would be less than significant.

III. AIR QUALITY

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

A. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

An Air Quality Memorandum was prepared by JK Consulting Group, LLC, dated August 11, 2026, to evaluate potential air quality impacts associated with the proposed project. The analysis determined that construction and operational emissions would remain below the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District's (District) applicable significance thresholds and would not increase the frequency or severity of an air quality standards violation or cause a new violation. Based on the analysis, the project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plans.

The District reviewed the Air Quality Memorandum and confirmed the project's significance determination presented in the analysis and had no further concerns. Therefore impacts would be less than significant.

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

The Air Quality Memorandum prepared by JK Consulting Group, dated August 11, 2026, evaluated short-term construction emissions and long-term operational

emissions associated with the project. Operational sources evaluated included vehicle trips, area sources, energy use, and aircraft operations.

As summarized in Tables 2 and 3 of the memorandum, construction and operational emissions would remain below the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District's applicable significance thresholds for reactive organic gases, nitrogen oxides, particulate matter (PM10 and PM2.5), carbon monoxide, and sulfur oxides. The project would also be required to comply with applicable fugitive dust control requirements under District Regulation VIII.

Based on the analysis, the project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the region is designated nonattainment under applicable federal or state ambient air quality standards. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

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?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

The August 11, 2026 Air Quality Memorandum prepared by JK Consulting Group evaluated construction and operation of the current project using CalEEMod and San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD) criteria. Estimated construction emissions were 0.645 ton per year of ROG, 1.101 tons per year of NOx, 0.125 ton per year of PM10, 0.070 ton per year of PM2.5, 1.669 tons per year of CO, and 0.00279 ton per year of SOx, all below applicable SJVAPCD thresholds. Operational emissions, including aircraft activity, were also below thresholds. The SJVAPCD prioritization screening produced a maximum score of 4.32, below the score of 10 requiring additional health-risk modeling. The project is not expected to create objectionable odors. Compliance with SJVAPCD Regulation VIII and other applicable rules is required. Impacts would be less than significant.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

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

B. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

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

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

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

F. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

The proposed improvements would occur within an established airport and areas that have been graded, paved, cultivated, or routinely disturbed. The current site plan does not identify riparian habitat, wetlands, native vegetation communities, or wildlife movement corridors within the hangar, tower, or runway-extension footprints. The adjacent Delta-Mendota Canal, on-site water pond, and associated water facilities would not be altered by the project. No removal of mature native trees is proposed. Construction and operation would remain subject to applicable federal and state wildlife protection requirements. Based on the disturbed condition and limited footprint of the improvements, impacts to biological resources would be less than significant.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

A. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5?

B. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5?

C. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED

The project was routed for comment to local Tribal governments under the provisions of AB 52. However, in the unlikely event that cultural resources are unearthed during future construction activities on the site, the following action shall be required to ensure that impacts to such cultural resources remain less than significant.

* ***Mitigation Measure(s)***

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

VI. ENERGY

Would the project:

A. Result in a potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources during project construction or operation?

B. Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

Construction would temporarily consume fuel and electricity for equipment, worker travel, material delivery, and building construction. Operational energy use would include aircraft and vehicle fuel, electricity for the hangar and equipment, and limited standby generator use. The project would use closed-loop water systems for CNC equipment, primary electrical service from PG&E. New construction would comply with applicable California Building Energy Efficiency Standards and CALGreen requirements. The project would not result in wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary energy consumption or conflict with an applicable renewable-energy or energy-efficiency plan. Impacts would be less than significant.

VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Would the project:

A. Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

1. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.
2. Strong seismic ground shaking?
3. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?
4. Landslides?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

The site is on the generally level floor of the San Joaquin Valley and is not within an known Earthquake Fault Zone or an area susceptible to landslides. The proposed hangar, tower, runway extension, and related improvements would be designed in accordance with the California Building Code, County requirements, and recommendations of a project-specific geotechnical investigation. These requirements would address seismic shaking and any potential liquefaction or settlement conditions. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

Construction of the hangar, tower, runway extension, and utilities would temporarily expose soil. Grading and building permits would require erosion-control measures, and projects disturbing one acre or more would be subject to applicable construction stormwater requirements. SJVAPCD Regulation VIII would also require control of fugitive dust from disturbed areas. Following construction, developed and landscaped areas would be stabilized. Therefore, soil erosion and loss of topsoil would be less than significant.

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

The project site is generally flat and is not subject to landslide hazards. Grading and construction associated with the proposed improvements would be required to comply with applicable County grading standards and California Building Code requirements. These requirements address site preparation, soil compaction, drainage, and foundation design to minimize the potential for soil instability and settlement. Impacts associated with unstable soils would be less than significant.

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

The submitted materials do not identify expansive soils as a constraint to the proposed development. Compliance with the California Building Code would reduce potential risks from expansive soils to a less-than-significant level.

E. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

The current site plan identifies an existing on-site sewage disposal plant and sewer lines. The Applicant’s Operational Statement estimates a maximum wastewater flow of approximately 800 gallons per day at full operation. Wastewater disposal would remain subject to applicable County requirements, including review of any improvements necessary to accommodate the proposed use. Impacts associated with onsite wastewater disposal would be less than significant.

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

The proposed improvements would occur within an existing airfield developed with a runway, buildings, and associated facilities. The site is not located designated as moderate or moderately sensitive to archaeological or paleontological finds, the

project is not anticipated to adversely affect these resources. Impacts would be less than significant.

VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Would the project:

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

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

The August 11, 2026 Air Quality Memorandum estimated total project greenhouse gas emissions of approximately 1,321 tons of carbon dioxide equivalent per year, including amortized construction emissions. The memorandum determined that the project would represent no more than 18 percent of the comparison thresholds evaluated and would not conflict with the California Air Resources Board 2022 Scoping Plan or other applicable greenhouse gas reduction measures. Based on the emissions estimates and comparison benchmarks discussed in the memorandum, the analysis concluded that the project would not generate greenhouse gas emissions that would result in a significant environmental impact and is not anticipated to conflict with an applicable greenhouse gas reduction plan, policy, or regulation. Greenhouse gas impacts would be less than significant.

IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Would the project:

A. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

Project operations would use aviation fuel, diesel, gasoline, batteries, welding materials, and customary maintenance products. The Applicant’s Operational Statement identifies three certified 500-gallon aboveground fuel tanks supplied by qualified vendors and a portable diesel generator used only for standby or emergency operations. Storage, dispensing, and handling would be subject to applicable fire code, hazardous-materials business plan, spill-prevention, and County Environmental Health requirements. With required containment, inspection, and operational controls, routine use or an accidental release would not create a significant hazard. Impacts would be less than significant.

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, create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

No existing or proposed school is identified within one-quarter mile of the project site. The nearest school is 12.6 miles east of the project site, Arthur E. Mills Intermediate School.The project would continue regulated fuel and maintenance activities at an existing airport, and all such activities would remain subject to applicable hazardous-materials requirements. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

The project is the continued and expanded operation of the existing Eagle Field Airport and would not introduce residential or other noise-sensitive land uses into an airport safety area. The current runway proposal would extend the paved runway by 288 feet to provide a total paved length of 2,588 feet and maintain approximately 700 feet of clearance from the existing overhead electrical line. Airport improvements and operations would remain subject to Federal Aviation Administration, Caltrans Division of Aeronautics, and applicable airport safety requirements. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

The site would continue to be accessed from N. Prince Avenue and existing private airport roads. The project would not close a public road, alter an adopted evacuation route, or obstruct emergency access to surrounding properties. Final site plans would be reviewed and approved through the County’s Site Plan Review process for emergency vehicle access and fire-code compliance. Therefore, the project would not impair an adopted emergency response or evacuation plan, and impacts would be less than significant.

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

The property consists of an existing airport surrounded by level agricultural land and does not contain dense wildland vegetation or steep terrain. The climate-risk output included with the Air Quality Memorandum identifies no material wildfire exposure at the project location. New construction and fuel storage would be subject to applicable fire code, access, clearance, and fire-protection requirements. The project would not expose people or structures to a significant wildland-fire risk. Impacts would be less than significant.

X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Would the project:

A. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality?

B. Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

Construction of the proposed improvements could temporarily increase sediment and other pollutants in stormwater runoff. The project would be subject to applicable County grading requirements and State construction stormwater requirements, including preparation and implementation of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan addressing erosion, sediment control, and construction-related pollutant discharges. Onsite wastewater disposal would also remain subject to applicable requirements intended to protect surface water and groundwater quality.

The Applicant's Operational Statement identifies an estimated water demand of approximately 800 gallons per day at full operation, with water supplied through an existing canal connection and drinking water purchased separately. The identified water supply does not involve new onsite groundwater extraction. Although the proposed improvements would increase impervious surfaces, they would occupy a limited portion of the airfield, with substantial unpaved areas remaining. Based on the identified water source, extent of the proposed improvements, and compliance with applicable water quality requirements, substantial groundwater depletion, interference with groundwater recharge, or degradation of water quality is not anticipated. Impacts would be less than significant

.C. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:

1. Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;
2. Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site;
3. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or
4. 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?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

The proposed improvements could alter localized drainage patterns and increase stormwater runoff. County grading and drainage requirements would address erosion, siltation, runoff conveyance, drainage capacity, and protection of adjoining properties. Required drainage improvements and stormwater controls would be designed to accommodate project-related runoff without creating adverse flooding conditions, obstructing drainage flows, or contributing substantial polluted runoff. The identified water supply does not involve new onsite groundwater extraction, and the project would remain subject to applicable stormwater and wastewater requirements. Based on these considerations, the project is not anticipated to conflict with or obstruct implementation of an applicable water quality control plan or groundwater sustainability plan.

XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING

Would the project:

A. Physically divide an established community?

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

The project would remain within an existing airport property in a rural area and would not divide an established community. The site is designated Agriculture and zoned AE-20. Under the Fresno County Zoning Ordinance, airport or aircraft landing facilities, including runways, hangars, control towers, aircraft operations, and facilities for aircraft manufacturing, maintenance, repair, and reconditioning, may be considered through an Unclassified Conditional Use Permit. The project does not require a General Plan amendment or rezoning. Compliance with applicable General Plan policies and permit conditions would be addressed through the County approval process. Impacts would be less than significant.

XII. MINERAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

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

B. Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?

FINDING: NO IMPACT

The project site is developed with an airport and agricultural uses and is not identified in County mineral-resource mapping as a locally important mineral resource recovery site. The project would not involve mineral extraction or preclude access to a known mineral resource. No impact would occur.

XIII. NOISE

Would the project result in:

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

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?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

The primary project noise sources would be aircraft takeoffs and landings, ground operations, maintenance equipment, employee and delivery vehicles, and temporary construction. The site is an existing airport, and the proposed increase to approximately 20 takeoffs and landings per day would remain intermittent. Operations would occur primarily during daytime hours, with rotating employee shifts ending at approximately 9:00 p.m. No outdoor sound amplification is proposed, and most maintenance, assembly, and manufacturing activities would occur within hangars or other buildings. Construction would be temporary and subject to applicable County noise requirements. The project would not introduce new noise-sensitive land uses. Impacts would be less than significant.

XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING

Would the project:

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

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT

The project would not construct housing, extend urban infrastructure, or remove an existing residence. Employment is projected to increase to approximately 40 on-site employees by 2030, which would not represent substantial unplanned population growth in the County. No people or housing would be displaced, and replacement housing would not be required. No impact would occur.

XV. PUBLIC SERVICES

Would the project:

A. Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, or the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant

environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the following public services:

1. Fire protection?
2. Police protection?
3. Schools?
4. Parks?
5. Other public facilities?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

The project would increase airport activity and employment but would not add residents or create a substantial demand for schools, parks, libraries, or other population-serving facilities. Fire protection, law enforcement, and emergency response would continue to be provided by the agencies serving the area. The new hangar, tower, fuel storage, and related improvements would be subject to fire-department review, fire-flow and suppression requirements, and emergency-access standards. The project would not require construction of a new governmental facility that could cause a significant environmental impact. Impacts would be less than significant.

XVI. RECREATION

Would the project:

A. Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?

B. Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

FINDING: NO IMPACT

The project would not add housing or materially increase the use of neighborhood or regional parks. Continued museum activities would remain passive and incidental, with no special events or increase in museum visitors proposed. The project does not include a recreational facility or require construction or expansion of an off-site recreational facility. No impact would occur.

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?

B. Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

At full operation, the project would employ up to 40 people, receive no more than five visitors per day, and generate limited service and delivery trips. Using a conservative

estimate of 80 daily one-way employee trips, 10 visitor trips, and 10 truck trips, the project would generate approximately 100 daily one-way vehicle trips before accounting for vanpool, rideshare, shuttle, or air arrivals. This is below the County General Plan small-project screening criterion of 110 daily vehicle trips and would not conflict with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3. The rural airport use would not conflict with an adopted transit, bicycle, or pedestrian program. Impacts would be less than significant.

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?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

At full operation, the project would employ up to 40 people, receive no more than five visitors per day, and generate limited service and delivery trips. Using a conservative estimate of 80 daily one-way employee trips, 10 visitor trips, and an allowance of 10 service and delivery trips, the project would generate approximately 100 daily one-way vehicle trips before accounting for vanpool, rideshare, shuttle, or air arrivals.

The project proposes a coordinated employee transportation program that would include vanpool, shuttle, and/or ridesharing options connecting key locations with the airfield. The applicant's Operational Statement identifies potential coordination with the Fresno County Rural Transit Agency and participation in Measure C Vanpool Programs. These options are intended to consolidate employee travel and reduce reliance on single-occupant vehicles, with implementation dependent on service availability, provider coordination, and employee participation. A potential air shuttle service is also identified. No reductions associated with these transportation options have been applied to the estimated 100 daily vehicle trips; therefore, the analysis does not rely on their implementation to reduce trip generation below the screening criterion.

The estimated trip generation is below the 110-daily-trip small-project screening criterion identified in the State's Technical Advisory on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA. Based on application of this screening criterion, and absent substantial evidence indicating significant vehicle miles traveled impacts or inconsistency with applicable transportation plans, the project is anticipated to have a less than significant impact. The proposed improvements would retain existing site access and would not remove or obstruct transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities. Accordingly, the project is not anticipated to conflict with an applicable program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system. Impacts would be less than significant.

XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

A. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the

landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:

1. Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k); or
2. A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED

Under the provisions of Assembly Bill 52 (AB 52), participating California Native American Tribes were notified of the project proposal and given the opportunity to enter into consultation with the County on addressing potential tribal cultural resources. No concerns were expressed by notified California Native American Tribes and no consultation request was received. However, mitigation will be implemented to address tribal cultural resources in the unlikely event they are unearthed during ground-disturbing activities related to the project.

* ***Mitigation Measure(s)***

1. *See Mitigation Measure under Section V Cultural Resources.*

XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Would the project:

A. Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or 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 has 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?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

The current site plan identifies an existing water inlet and pump, water piping and treatment facilities, an on-site water pond, sewer piping, a sewage disposal plant, and

PG&E electrical service. Full operation is estimated to require approximately 800 gallons per day of water and generate a similar quantity of sanitary wastewater. Before occupancy, the applicant would be required to demonstrate a legal and adequate water supply and County approval of wastewater-system capacity. Primary power would be supplied by PG&E. Solid waste would be collected by a contracted service, and scrap and aluminum would be recycled. Impacts would be less than significant.

XX. WILDFIRE

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

A. Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

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?

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

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT

The project site is a developed airport on level agricultural land and is not located in or near a State Responsibility Area or land classified as a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone. The Air Quality Memorandum climate-risk screening also identifies no material wildfire exposure at the project location. The project would not require wildfire-related roads, fuel breaks, or other infrastructure and would not be subject to post-fire slope instability. No impact would occur.

XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Would the project:

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

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

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED

The project would be developed within an existing airport and previously disturbed areas and would not substantially reduce wildlife habitat or eliminate a plant or animal community. Potential impacts to previously unknown cultural and tribal cultural resources would be reduced to less than significant through the noted Mitigation Measure. Air quality, greenhouse gas, traffic, noise, hazardous-materials, water-quality, and other project effects would remain below applicable significance thresholds and would not be cumulatively considerable or cause substantial adverse effects on human beings. With mitigation incorporated, mandatory findings of significance would be less than significant.

CONCLUSION/SUMMARY

Based upon the Initial Study prepared for Unclassified Conditional Use Permit Application No. 3834, staff has concluded that the project will not have a significant effect on the environment.

It has been determined that there would be no impacts to Mineral Resources, Population and Housing, Recreation, and Wildfire.

Potential impacts related to Aesthetics, Agriculture and Forestry Resources, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Energy, Geology and Soils, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Hydrology and Water Quality, Land Use and Planning, Noise, Public Services, Transportation, and Utilities and Service Systems have been determined to be less than significant.

Potential impacts related to Cultural Resources, Tribal Cultural Resources, and Mandatory Findings of Significance have been determined to be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

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