



# County of Fresno

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

## EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

APPLICANT: Daulat Sandhue

APPLICATION NOS.: Initial Study No. 7664 and Classified Conditional Use Permit Application No. 3655.

DESCRIPTION: Allow a Rural Commercial Center consisting of a convenience store/fast-food restaurant and a gasoline fueling facility (fuel island canopy with gasoline pumps) and related improvements on an approximately 1.78-acre portion of a 4.99-acre parcel in the RR (Rural Residential, two-acre minimum parcel size) Zone District.

LOCATION: The project site is located on the northwest corner of W. Belmont and N. Cornelia Avenues approximately 2,190 feet south of the nearest city limits of the City of Fresno (5064 W. Belmont Avenue) (APN 312-390-13) (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; or
- B. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project site is developed with a single-family residence and related improvements. The site borders with Belmont and Cornelia Avenues which are not identified as scenic drives in the County General Plan. No scenic vistas or scenic resources including trees, rock outcroppings, or historic buildings were identified on or near the site that could potentially be impacted by the project. No impact on scenic resources would occur.

- C. In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage points.) If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The proposed improvements include a 3,476 square-foot building to house a convenience store/fast-food restaurant, a 1,976 square foot gasoline fueling facility with fuel dispensing pumps, paved parking and circulation area with ingress/egress from Belmont and Cornelia Avenues, onsite well and septic system, and a ponding basin.

The project site is to the west of and near the City of Fresno urban development. Limited active farming exists in the vicinity of the proposal; otherwise the area is mostly developed with single-family homes and related improvements.

Upon development of the property, the most visible structure from the site to surrounding areas will be the proposed single story 33 foot-tall building accommodating a convenience store /fast-food restaurant and a 19-foot-tall fuel canopy located within approximately 1.78-acre portion of a 4.99-acre project site. The proposed development will be compatible in height, design and construction with the similar commercial development in the area. The project will have a less than significant impact on the visual character of the site or its surroundings.

- 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 WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED:

The project will require outdoor lighting around the building, underneath fuel canopy and within parking and circulation areas. To minimize any light and glare impact resulting from this proposal, the project will adhere to the following Mitigation Measure.

\* **Mitigation Measure**

1. *All outdoor lighting shall be hooded and directed downward as to not shine toward adjacent properties and public streets.*

II. AGRICULTURAL AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

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

- A. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance, as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use; or
- B. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act Contract?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project site is not prime farmland and is not enrolled in a Williamson Act Land Conservation Contract. The site is classified as Rural Residential Land on 2016 Fresno County Important Farmland Map. The subject proposal is not in conflict with Rural Residential zoning on the property and is an allowed use with discretionary land use approval and adherence to the applicable General Plan Policies.

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The project site is not farmland or forest land. The project is appropriately allowed for RR zone district with the approval of subject conditional use permit and will not bring any significant physical changes to the area.

Given the active farming south and northeast of the project site, the Fresno County Agricultural Commissioner's Office requires that a "Right-to-Farm notice shall be recorded informing the occupants of the project site to accept the inconveniences and discomfort associated with normal farm activities. This requirement will be included as a Condition of Approval.

### III. AIR QUALITY

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

- A. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable Air Quality Plan?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

An Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Analysis Report, was prepared for the project by Mitchell Air Quality Consulting, dated August 2, 2019 and was provided to the San

Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (District) for comments. No concerns were received from SJVAPCD.

Construction and operation of the project would contribute the following criteria pollutant emissions: reactive organic gases (ROG), carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>), sulfur dioxide (SO<sub>2</sub>), and particulate matter (PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub>).

As discussed in II. B below, emissions of ROG, NO<sub>x</sub>, PM<sub>10</sub>, and PM<sub>2.5</sub> associated with the construction and operation of the project would not exceed the District's significance thresholds. Furthermore, as discussed in III. C below, the project would not result in CO hotspot that would violate CO standards. The project is consistent with the current AQP (Air Quality Plan) and the impact would be less than significant.

According to the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District, the project specific annual emissions of criteria pollutants are not expected to exceed any of the following District significance thresholds: 100 tons per year of carbon monoxide (CO), 10 tons per year of oxides of nitrogen (NO<sub>x</sub>), 10 tons per year of reactive organic gases (ROG), 27 tons per year of oxides of sulfur (SO<sub>x</sub>), 15 tons per year of particulate matter of 10 microns or less in size (PM<sub>10</sub>), or 15 tons per year of particulate matter of 2.5 microns or less in size (PM<sub>2.5</sub>). The project will comply with all applicable rules and regulations (e.g. Regulation VIII Fugitive PM<sub>10</sub> Prohibitions, Rule 2010 (Permits Required), Rule 2201 (New and Modified Stationary Source Review) Rule 9510 (Indirect Source Review), Rule 4692 (Commercial Charbroiling, Rule 4002 (National emissions Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants), Rule 4102 (Nuisance), Rule 4601 (Architectural Coatings) and Rule 4641 (Cutback, Slow Cure, and Emulsified Asphalt, Paving and Maintenance Operations).

- 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 primary pollutants of concern during project construction and operation are ROG, NO<sub>x</sub>, CO, PM<sub>10</sub>, and PM<sub>2.5</sub>. The San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD) Guidance for Assessing, and Monitoring Air Quality Impacts (GAMAQI) adopted in 2015 contains threshold for CO, NO<sub>x</sub>, ROG, SO<sub>x</sub> PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub>. The SJVAPCD's annual emission significance thresholds used for the project define the substantial contribution for both operational and construction emissions are 10 tons per year ROG, 10 tons per year NO<sub>x</sub> 100 tons per year CO, 27 tons per year SO<sub>x</sub>, 15 tons per year PM<sub>10</sub> and 15 tons per year PM<sub>2.5</sub>. The project does not contain sources that would produce substantial quantities of SO<sub>2</sub> emissions during construction and operation.

Per the Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Analysis Report, the 2020 construction emissions (ton per year) associated with the project would be 0.03 for ROG, 0.19 for NO<sub>x</sub>, 0.15 for CO, and 0.01 for PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub> which are less than the threshold of significance. Likewise, the operational emission over the life of the project, primarily

from mobile sources, would be 0.35 for ROG, 0.66 for NO<sub>x</sub>, 2.00 for CO, 0.26 for PM<sub>10</sub> and 0.07 for PM<sub>2.5</sub> which are also less than the threshold of significance.

As discussed above, the regional analysis of the construction and operational emissions indicates that the project would not exceed the District's significance thresholds and is consistent with the applicable Air Quality Attainment Plan. Therefore, the project would not result in significant cumulative health impacts.

C. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

Sensitive receptors are defined as hospitals, residences, convalescent facilities, and schools. The closest sensitive receptor, a single-family residence, is located approximately 186 feet south of the proposed gasoline fueling facility across Belmont Avenue.

Per the Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Analysis Report, an analysis of maximum daily emissions during construction and operation of the project was conducted to determine if emissions would exceed 100 pounds per day for any pollutant of concern which include NO<sub>x</sub>, CO, PM<sub>10</sub> or PM<sub>2.5</sub>. The maximum daily construction emissions (pound per day) would be 23.42 for NO<sub>x</sub>, 8.56 for CO, 1.62 for PM<sub>10</sub> and 0.74 for PM<sub>2.5</sub> and would not exceed SJVAPCD screening thresholds for any pollutant.

Operational emissions are generated on-site by area sources such as consumer products, landscape maintenance, energy use, and onsite motor vehicle operation at the project site. Most motor vehicle emissions would occur distant from the site and would not contribute to a violation of ambient air quality standards, making the analysis highly conservative. Maximum daily air pollutant Emissions (pound per day) during operations (2020) would be 3.73 for NO<sub>x</sub>, 12.26 for CO, 1.47 for PM<sub>10</sub> and 0.41 for PM<sub>2.5</sub> and would not exceed SJVAPCD screening thresholds for any pollutant.

Localized high levels of CO are associated with traffic congestion and idling or slow-moving vehicles. Given the average daily project related trips generated, modeling to demonstrate that a CO hotspot is possible was not required for the project.

Project construction would involve the use of diesel-fueled vehicles and equipment that emit DPM (diesel particulate matter), which is considered a Toxic Air Contaminants (TAC). The SJVAPCD's latest threshold of significance for TAC emissions is an increase in cancer risk for the maximally exposed individual of 20 in a million.

The California Air Resources Board (ARB) recommends a 50-foot separation for typical gas dispensing facilities. The proposed fueling station (gas pumps) is located more than 96 feet from the nearest sensitive receptor (a residence). An analysis prepared using the SJVAPCD Health Risk Prioritization Screening Tool to determine if a health risk assessment would be required showed that the project cancer risk score result was 0.11 compared to the screening threshold of 10 and chronic and acute risk scores

were 0.0055 and 0.033 respectively compared to the screening threshold of 1. Health risk would be further minimized by the implementation of SJVAPCD Rule 4622 which limit emissions of gasoline vapors from storage tanks and from the transfer of gasoline into motor vehicle fuel tanks primarily through the installation of vapor recovery systems.

In conclusion, localized impacts from criteria pollutant emissions would not exceed SJVAPCD screening thresholds and that the project does not include substantial amounts of diesel equipment and truck trips that would result in a significant increase in cancer risk, chronic risk, and acute risk due to TAC emissions. The impacts would be less than significant.

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

Odor impacts on residential areas and other sensitive receptors, such as hospitals, day-care centers, and schools. The project is located near residences in an agricultural/ rural residential area where similar odors are common.

Per the SJVAPCD, gasoline fueling station is not a common land use type that is known to produce odors in the Air Basin. The common odor producing land uses are landfills, transfer stations, sewage treatment plants, wastewater pump stations, composting facilities, feed lots, coffee roasters, asphalt batch plants, and rendering plants. The project would not engage in any of these activities. Therefore, the project would not be considered a generator of objectionable odors during operations.

During construction, the various diesel-powered vehicles and equipment in use on-site would create localized odors. These odors would be temporary and would not likely be noticeable for extended periods of time beyond the project's site boundaries. The potential for diesel odor impacts would therefore 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; or
- B. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service; or
- C. Has a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project site is located on the outskirts of the City of Fresno and is surrounded by rural residential development. The site is fallow and disturbed with prior farming operations and improvements related to a single-family residence. The neighboring parcels are also pre-disturbed with residential development and farming, and as such do not provide habitat for state or federally listed species. Further, the site contains no riparian features or wetlands or waters under the jurisdiction of the United States.

The project was routed to the California Department of Fish and Wildlife and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service for review and comments. Neither agency commented on the project.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

No wildlife or fish movement features (e.g., waterways, arroyos, ridgelines) or any wildlife nursery sites are present on the property. No impact to these resources would occur.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project will not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources and is not subject to the County tree preservation policy or ordinance.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project site is within an area covered by the PG&E San Joaquin Valley Operation and Maintenance Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) which applies only to PG&E's activities and not the subject proposal.

## V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

- A. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to Section 15064.5; or

- B. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5; or
- C. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project site is not in an area determined to be highly or moderately sensitive to archeological resources. The Native Americans Heritage Commission conducted a Sacred Lands Search for the project site and reported negative results in its search for any sacred sites. However, given the discussion in TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES in Section XVIII of this report, in the unlikely event cultural resources are discovered during ground disturbance, the following Mitigation Measure, when implemented, will reduce the impacts on cultural resources to less than significant.

\* **Mitigation Measure**

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 Commission within 24 hours.*

## VI. ENERGY

Would the project:

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION  
INCORPORATED:

The project is unlikely to result in potentially significant environmental impacts due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources. To minimize the potential for wasteful or inefficient consumption of energy resources, the project will require adherence to the following Mitigation Measure.



\* **Mitigation Measure**

1. *The idling of on-site vehicles and equipment will be avoided to the most extent possible to avoid wasteful or inefficient energy consumption during project construction.*

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

Per Figure 9-5 of the Fresno County General Plan Background Report, the project site is in an area which has 10 percent probability of seismic hazard in 50 years with peak horizontal ground acceleration of zero to 20 percent. The project development would be subject to building standards, which include specific regulations to protect improvements against damage caused by earthquake and/or ground acceleration.

4. Landslides?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

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

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

Per Figure 7-3 of the Fresno County General Plan Background Report, the project site is not in an area of erosion hazards. Grading activities resulting from this proposal may result in loss of some topsoil due to compaction and overcovering of soil to prepare for the foundation for building and parking. However, the impact would be less than significant with Project Notes requiring approval of an Engineered Grading and Drainage Plan and securing a Grading Permit prior to the site grading.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

As noted above, the project site is flat with no topographical variations. The site bears no potential for on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse due to the project-related improvements. As a standard requirement, a soil compaction report may be required prior to the issuance of building permits to ensure the weight-bearing capacity of the soils for the proposed building and fueling facility.

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

Per Figure 7-1 of the Fresno County General Plan Background Report, the project site is not in an area of expansive soils. However, the project construction will implement all applicable requirements of the most recent California Building Standards Code and will consider hazards associated with shrinking and swelling of expansive soils.

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

According to the City of Fresno, Department of Public Utilities, the nearest sanitary sewer main to serve the proposed project is a 45-inch sewer trunk located approximately 2,640-feet to the west of the site at the intersection of N. Polk and West Belmont Avenues.

The City of Fresno did not express any concerns regarding the use of an individual septic system for the project. The project will utilize onsite sewage disposal system.

Per the comments provided by the Fresno County Department of Public Health, Environmental Health Division (Health Department), the project will be subject to the following requirements included as Project Notes: 1) the applicant shall submit a sewage feasibility analysis/engineered septic system for the Health Department for review and approval and install the system under permit and inspection by the Department of Public Works and Planning Building and Safety Section; 2) the location of the onsite sewage disposal area shall be identified and cordoned off to prevent vehicle traffic from driving over, causing damage and possible failure of the septic system; and 3) the sewage disposal system serving the abandoned residence shall be properly destroyed under permit and inspection.

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

See discussion in Section V. CULTURAL RESOURCES above.

## VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Would the project:

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

An Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Analysis Report completed by Mitchell Air Quality Consulting, dated August 2, 2019, estimated project GHG emissions for construction and operation using the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) version 2016.3.2 [California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA) 2017], which is the most current version of the model approved for use by SJVAPCD.

The total GHG emission generated during all phases of construction for 2020 is 26.24 metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub> per year. However, in order to account for the construction emissions, amortization of the total emission generated during construction based on 30-year life of the development amounts to 0.87 metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub> per year which is less than significant.

The total GHG emission generated during operation of the project would be approximately 373.94 metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e under Business As Usual (BAU) and 274.86 metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub> for year 2020. The project would achieve a reduction of 26.5 percent from BAU which is 4.8 percent beyond the 21.7 percent average reduction required by Assembly Bill (AB) 32 targets (AB 32 requires GHGs emitted in California be reduced to 1990 levels by the year 2020). Likewise, the total GHG emission generated during operation of the project would be approximately 373.94 metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e under Business As Usual (BAU) and 199.04 metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub> for year 2030. The project would achieve a reduction of 48.6 percent from BAU which is 21.5 percent beyond the 21.7 percent average reduction required by AB 32 targets. The project is consistent with the 2017 Scoping Plan and will contribute a reasonable fair-share contribution (through compliance of Title 24 and CALGreen; regulations on energy production, fuels, and voluntary actions to improve energy efficiency in existing development) to achieving 2030 target.

- 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:

Adopted in 2006, Assembly Bill (AB) 32 focuses on reducing Greenhouse Gases to 1990 levels by the year 2020. Pursuant to the requirements in AB 32, the Air Resources Board (ARB) adopted the Climate Change Scoping Plan in 2008, which outlines actions recommended to obtain that goal. The Scoping Plan calls for reduction in California's GHG emissions, cutting approximately 30 percent (currently 21.7 percent) from BAU emission levels projected for 2020 to achieve AB 32 targets. The Scoping Plan contains a variety of strategies to reduce the State's emissions. The project is consistent with most of the strategies contained in the Scoping Plan while others are not applicable to the project.

IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Would the project:

- A. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials; or
- B. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment; or
- C. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

As noted above, the project entails construction of a convenience store/fast-food restaurant and a gasoline fueling facility on an approximately 1.78-acre portion of a 4.99-acre parcel.

The Fresno County Department of Public Health, Environmental Health Division (Health Department) reviewed the proposal and requires the following as Project Notes: 1) Prior to the operation of the fuel facility, a spill prevention control and countermeasure plan (SPCC) shall be required for aboveground petroleum storage tanks with greater than or equal to 1320-gallons of storage capacity; 2) facilities proposing to use and/or store hazardous materials and/or hazardous wastes shall meet the requirements set forth in the California Health and Safety Code (HSC), Division 20, Chapter 6.95, and the California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 22, Division 4.5; 3) any business that handles a hazardous material or hazardous waste may be required to submit a Hazardous Materials Business Plan electronically pursuant to the HSC, Division 20, Chapter 6.95; 4) All hazardous waste shall be handled in accordance with requirements set forth in the California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 22, Division 4.5; and 5) Waste Tire Haulers may require to obtain a permit from the California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery.

Furthermore, demolition of existing residence and/or any other structures on the property shall be subject to the following requirements: 1) should the structure have an active rodent or insect infestation, the infestation shall be abated prior to remodel of the structure in order to prevent the spread of vectors to adjacent properties; 2) if asbestos-containing materials are encountered, the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District shall be contacted; 3) if a structure was constructed prior to 1979 or if lead-based paint is suspected to have been used in these structures, then prior to remodel work the California Department of Public Health, Childhood Lead Poisoning Prevention Branch, United States Environmental Protection Agency, Region 9, State of California, Industrial Relations Department, Division of Occupational Safety and Health, Consultation Service (CAL-OSHA) shall be contacted; and 4) any construction materials deemed hazardous as identified in the demolition process must be characterized and disposed of in accordance with current federal, state, and local requirements.

The project is not within one-quarter mile of an existing school. The nearest school, McKinley Elementary School, is approximately 0.9 miles northeast southeast of the project site.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

According to the search results of the U.S. EPA's NEPAAssist Tool, the project site is not listed as a hazardous materials site. The project will not create hazards to the public or the environment.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

Per the Fresno County *Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan Update* adopted by the Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) on December 3, 2018, the nearest public airport, Fresno Chandler Executive Airport, is approximately 3.1 miles southeast of the project site. At that distance, the airport will not result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people visiting the project site.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project site is in an area where existing emergency response times for fire protection, emergency medical services, and sheriff protection meet adopted standards. The project does not include any characteristics (e.g., permanent road closures) that

would physically impair or otherwise interfere with emergency response or evacuation in the project vicinity. These conditions preclude the possibility of the proposed project conflicting with an emergency response or evacuation plan. No impacts would occur.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

Per Figure 9-9 of the Fresno County General Plan Background Report, the project site is outside of the State Responsibility area for wildland fire protection. The project will not expose persons or structures to wildland fire hazards.

## X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Would the project:

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

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

The Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region reviewed the proposal and expressed no concerns related to 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:

According to the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB), Division of Drinking Water (DDW), the project will meet the definition of transient non-community public water system, shall comply with Senate Bill 1263 (SB 1263), and be permitted by SWRCB-DDW as a public water system. As part of SB 1263, the applicant has provided technical report to SWRCB-DDW satisfaction making the case that there is no nearby public water system the project could connect to. The project will require drilling of a new well on the property to provide 1200 gallons of water per day to meet the project demand and will also obtain a public water system permit form SWRCB-DDW to operate it.

According to the City of Fresno, Department of Public Utilities, Planning, and Engineering, the project is in Growth Area 2 of the City of Fresno formally named South East Growth Area (SEGA) service zone. According to the Ground Water Sustainability Act (GWSA) of 2014, SEGA was split in Growth Area 1 and Growth Area 2 to promote

inner city development and to limit the expansion growth in outer city limits thus reducing ground water pumping. The Growth Area 2, within which the project site is located, is not allowed new development until the year 2035. Furthermore, presently there are no water main line in the immediate area the project could connect to.

According to the Water and Natural Resources Division (WNRD) of the Fresno County Department of Public Works and Planning the project will use limited water, is not within an area of the County defined as being a water short area, and expressed no concerns with the availability/sustainability of water for the project. To conserve water, a Condition of Approval will require that all new landscaping for the property shall comply with MWELO (Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance) standards to conserve water.

- 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; or
  3. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or
  4. Impede or redirect flood flows?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

No natural drainage channels run through the project site. Fresno Irrigation District (FID) open canal (Houghton No. 78) runs westerly approximately 2,700 feet east of the project site and crosses the intersection of Belmont and Cornelia Avenues. Likewise, FID's Tracy No. 44 runs southerly traversing the east side of the subject property and crosses Belmont Avenue approximately 30 feet south of the subject property. A Project Note would require that; 1) any street and/or utility improvement plans along Blythe Avenue, Cornelia Avenue, Belmont Avenue, or in the vicinity of this pipeline/canal, shall require FID's review and approval; and 2) a Grading and Drainage Plan shall be provided to ensure that the proposed development will not endanger the structural integrity of the pipeline/canal.

As noted in Section VII. B. Geology and Soils above, any changes to the existing drainage pattern resulting from this proposal will require review and approval of an Engineered Grading and Drainage Plan by and a Grading Permit from the Development Engineering Section of the Development Services Division. Additionally, any run-off generated by the site development will be required to be retained on site per County Standards.

The project site lies within the Fresno Metropolitan Flood Control District (FMFCD) drainage area "CK" and shall be subject to the following requirements included as Project Notes: 1) the project shall pay drainage fees at the time of development based on the fee rates in effect at that time; 2) storm drainage patterns for the development shall conform to the District Master Plan; 3) all improvement plans for any proposed construction of curb and gutter or storm drainage facilities shall be reviewed and approved by FMFCD for conformance to the District Master Plan within the project area; 3) site development shall not interfere with the operation and maintenance of the existing canal/pipeline on the property; 4) temporary storm drainage facility be provided on the property until permanent service becomes available; and 5) construction activity shall secure a storm water discharge permit.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

According to the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FIRM) Panel 1545H, the project site is not subject to flooding from the 100-year storm.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

Reviewing agencies and departments did not express concern with the application to indicate that the project will conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable management plan.

## XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING

Would the project:

- A. Physically divide an established community?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project will not divide the established communities of Fresno. The project site is outside the City boundaries.

- 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 subject property is designated Rural Residential in the Fresno County General Plan and is within the City of Fresno Sphere of Influence (SOI). The project was referred to



the City for possible annexation, but the City elected to not pursue annexation at this time. The City of Fresno General Plan designates the site as Medium Density Residential planned land use and is not consistent with the County General Plan.

The Fresno County General Plan allows non-agricultural uses on Rural Residential land provided applicable General Plan policies are met.

General Plan Policy LU-E.1, criteria a. b. e. g. h. is met in that the project is a cluster of uses (convenience store with a and gasoline fueling facility; fast-food restaurant) at one location; will provide fueling and retail services for the surrounding area comprised of rural residential development; will have a combined frontage of the development on Belmont and Cornelia Avenues less than 660 feet (1/8 of a mile) and consist of two separate commercial uses (convenience store with fueling facility and a restaurant); is located at the intersection of one of the two streets (Belmont Avenue) classified as Arterial in the County General Plan. Criteria c. d. and f. of the Policy is not met in that the project is not within or adjacent to an existing commercial facility and is located one-mile (more than two miles required) west of an existing approved commercial center – a minimarket.

Policy LU-G. 14 is met in that the project site is in the City of Fresno Sphere of Influence, was referred to the city for consideration of possible annexation, the City elected to not annex the property and released it to be processed in the County of Fresno.

## XII. MINERAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

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

## XIII. NOISE

Would the project result in:

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The project has the potential to expose nearby residents to elevated noise levels during construction. A Project Note would require that all construction related noise shall adhere to the Fresno County Noise Ordinance.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

See discussion in Section IX, E. above.

XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING

Would the project:

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project will not induce population growth in the area. No housing is proposed by this application.

XV. PUBLIC SERVICES

Would the project:

- A. Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically-altered governmental facilities, or the need for new or physically-altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the following public services:
1. Fire protection?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

According to the North Central Fire Protection District (NCFPD), the project shall comply with California Code of Regulations Title 24 – Fire Code and California Code of Regulations Title 19 and construction plans shall be submitted to the County prior to

receiving NCFPD conditions of approval for the project. This requirement will be included as a Project Note.

1. Police protection?
3. Schools; or
4. Parks; or
5. Other public facilities?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project will not impact the existing public services or result in the need for additional public services related to police protection, schools, or parks.

#### XVI. RECREATION

Would the project:

- A. Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated; or
- B. Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The proposed project will not induce population growth which may require construction of new or expanded recreational facilities in the area.

#### XVII. TRANSPORTATION

Would the project:

- A. Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION  
INCORPORATED:

The project will not conflict with any policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities. The project area is rural in nature and is not planned for any transit, bikeways, or pedestrian facilities per the Transportation and Circulation Element of the Fresno County General Plan.

The Design Division of the Fresno County Department of Public Works and Planning reviewed the project and required that a Traffic Impact Study (TIS) shall be prepared to assess the project's potential impacts to County and State roadways.

Peters Engineering Group prepared a Traffic Impact Study (TIS), dated March 23, 2021 which determined the following:

The proposed project is a local-serving use and will not be a regional retail destination drawing trips from distant areas. The study intersections are currently operating at acceptable LOS (Level of Service) during the weekday peak hours with acceptable calculated 95th -percentile queues. With construction of the project and other pending projects, the study intersections are expected to continue to operate at acceptable LOS during the weekday peak hours with acceptable calculated 95th -percentile queues. Therefore, the project will not cause or contribute to the need for construction of improvements.

Furthermore, all four of the study intersections (included in the City of Fresno TSMI fee program) are expected to operate at LOS F during the weekday peak hours by the year 2040 (with or without the Project) and will require signalization to operate at acceptable LOS. The project may be required to contribute to the City of Fresno TSMI fee program or otherwise contribute a fair share of the cost of the future construction to account for its share of the cumulative traffic issue. A left-turn lane at the site access driveway on Cornelia Avenue is not warranted based on the year 2040 volumes; however, a left-turn lane at the site access driveway on Belmont Avenue is warranted based on the year 2040 volumes. Considering the Arterial designation of Belmont Avenue and the proximity of the driveway to Cornelia Avenue, it is likely that future construction of a median would not accommodate a left-turn lane from Belmont Avenue.

The Design Division and the Road Maintenance and Operations Division of the Fresno County Department of Public Works and Planning and the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) reviewed and identified no concerns with TIS. The project will pay its fair share as identified in the TIS for offsite improvements and has been included as Mitigation Measures below:

\* **Mitigation Measures:**

1. *At the time of application for a Site Plan Review for the proposed use, the applicant shall enter into an agreement with the County of Fresno to participate on a pro-rata basis per acreage developed in the funding of future off-site traffic improvement defined in items a, b, c, d below. The traffic improvement and the project's maximum pro-rata share is as follows:*
  - a. *Install a traffic signal (one) at Olive and Cornelia Avenues. The project's fair share construction cost is \$7,676.00 (or 1.9%) of a total construction cost estimate of \$404,000.*

- b. *Install a traffic signal (one) at Belmont and Hayes Avenues. The project's fair share construction cost is \$14,136.00 (or 3.8%) of a total construction cost of \$372,000.*
- c. *Install a traffic signal (one) at Belmont and Cornelia Avenues. The project's fair share construction cost is \$16,968.00 (or 4.2%) for a total construction cost of \$404,000.*
- d. *Install a traffic signal (one) at Belmont and Blythe Avenues. The project's fair share construction cost is \$10,100.00 (or 2.5%) for a total construction cost of \$404,000.*

*The County shall update cost estimates for the above specified improvements prior to execution of the agreement. The Board of Supervisors pursuant to Ordinance Code Section 17.88 shall annually adopt a Public Facilities Fee addressing the updated pro-rata costs. The Public Facilities Fee shall be related to off-site road improvements, plus costs required for inflation based on the Engineering News Record (ENR) 20 Cities Construction Cost Index.*

The subject proposal is within City of Fresno Sphere of Influence. The City of Fresno Public Works Department, Traffic Operations & Planning Division, also commented on the TIS with regards to traffic impact on City roadways/intersections and requires the following as a Conditions of Approval: 1) the project shall pay Traffic Signal Mitigation Impact (TSMI) Fee per the City's Master Plan Schedule, Fresno Major Street Impact (FMSI) Fee and Regional Transportation Mitigation Fee (RTMF) prior to issuance of building permits

Per the Development Engineering comments on the project, Belmont Avenue is classified as Arterial and Cornelia Avenue is classified as Collector in the County's General Plan and requires additional road right-of-way according to Precise Plan Line Serial No. 91. Currently, Belmont Avenue has an existing right-of-way of 30 feet north of section line and Cornelia Avenues has an existing right-of-way of 40 feet west of section line. A Condition of Approval would require that additional right-of-way shall be provided along parcel frontage to meet the ultimate right-of-way for these streets.

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

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

opportunities into the urban fabric and thereby improving retail destination proximity, local-serving retail development tends to shorten trips and reduce VMT.

The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) stated that the project is a locally serving retail business. Such business typically reduces vehicle travel by providing a more proximate retail destination and is presumed to have a less than significant impact on vehicle miles traveled. As such, the project would create a less than-significant transportation impact.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project site borders with Cornelia and Belmont Avenues. The design of the proposed facility includes no sharpe curves. The site sits at the corner of Belmont and Cornelia Avenues will gain access off these streets without creating any traffic hazards. As noted above, the project will be subject to providing additional right-of-way for Brawley Avenue.

- D. Result in inadequate emergency access?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project design provides for adequate number of access for general and emergency use. The proposed facility will sue access drives off Cornelia Avenue and off Belmont Avenue for ingress and egress.

The Fresno County Fire Protection District (District) expressed no concerns related to the site emergency access. The District will conduct additional review prior to the issuance of building permits.

## XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

- A. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:
1. Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k); or
  2. A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision

(c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1? (In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe)?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The project site is not in an area determined to be highly or moderately sensitive to archeological resources. Pursuant to Assembly Bill (AB) 52, project information was routed to the Picayune Rancheria of the Chukchansi Indians, Dumna Wo Wah Tribal Government, Table Mountain Rancheria and Santa Rosa Rancheria Tachi Yokut Tribe offering them an opportunity to consult under Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 21080.3(b) with a 30-day window to formally respond to the County letter. No tribe requested for consultation, resulting in no further action on the part of the County. However, Table Mountain Rancheria (TMR) requested that in the unlikely event that cultural resources are identified on the property, the Tribe should be informed. As such, the Mitigation Measure included in the CULTURAL ANALYSIS section of this report will reduce impact to tribal cultural resources to less than significant.

#### XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Would the project:

- A. Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

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

- B. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

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

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

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

- D. Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals:  
or
- E. Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The project development will not generate solid waste more than the capacity of local landfill sites.

All solid wastes produced by the proposed facility will be collected for the local landfill through regular trash collection service and will adhere to local and state standards for disposal of solid wastes.

## XX. WILDFIRE

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

- A. Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects; or
- B. Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire; or
- C. Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment; or
- D. Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project site is not in or near state responsibility area or land classified as very high fire hazard severity zones. The North Central Fire Protection District expressed no concerns related to fire hazard.

## XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Would the project:



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

**FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:**

The project will have no impact on biological resources. Impacts on cultural resources have been reduced to a less than significant level with the incorporation of a Mitigation Measure discussed in Section V. CULTURAL RESOURCES above.

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

**FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:**

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

The project will adhere to the permitting requirements and rules and regulations set forth by the Fresno County Grading and Drainage Ordinance, San Joaquin Air Pollution Control District, and California Code of Regulations Fire Code at the time development occurs on the property. No cumulatively considerable impacts relating to Agricultural and Forestry Resources, Air quality, Greenhouse Gas Emission or Transportation were identified in the project analysis. Impacts identified for Aesthetics, Cultural Resources, Energy and Transportation will be mitigated by compliance with the Mitigation Measures listed in Sections I., Section V, Section VI and Section XVII of this report.

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

**FINDING: NO IMPACT:**

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

## **CONCLUSION/SUMMARY**

Based upon Initial Study No. 7664 prepared for Classified Conditional Use Permit Application No. 3655, 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 biological resources, mineral resources, population and housing, recreation, or wildfire.

Potential impacts related to agriculture and forestry resources, air quality, geology and soils, greenhouse gas emissions, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use and planning, noise, public services, tribal cultural resources and utilities and service systems have been determined to be less than significant.

Potential impacts to aesthetics, cultural resources, energy, and transportation have been determined to be less than significant with the identified Mitigation Measures.

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.

EA:

G:\4360Devs&PIn\PROJSEC\PROJDOCS\CUP\3600-3699\3655\IS-CEQA\CUP 3655 IS wu.docx