


ATTACHMENT A



LOCATION MAP


RLCC 1017




ATTACHMENT B

EXISTING ZONING MAP

RLCC 1017
STR 17-11/13



ATTACHMENT D





County of Fresno

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

Agricultural Land Conservation Committee Staff Report Agenda Item No. 3 April 7, 2021

SUBJECT: Review and make recommendation to the Board of Supervisors regarding petition for **PARTIAL CANCELLATION OF AGRICULTURAL LAND CONSERVATION CONTRACT NO. 2592 (RLCC NO. 1017)** to remove a 1.50-acre portion of a 32.96-acre parcel from the Williamson Act program to allow the 1.50 acres to be created as a separate homesite parcel.

LOCATION: The subject parcel is located on the north side of Shain Avenue between Evans Avenue and Fairfax Avenue, approximately two and a half miles southeast of the nearest city limits of the City of Dos Palos (15976 Evans Avenue) (Sup. Dist. 1) (APN 001-280-14).

OWNER/APPLICANT: David Morrison Brinkley and Kelly Lynn Harman

REPRESENTATIVE: Precision Civil Engineering

STAFF CONTACT: Derek Chambers, Planner
(559) 600-4205

Mohammad Khorsand, Senior Planner
(559) 600-4230

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff does not believe that Findings No. 2 and 3 under Government Code Section 51282(b) can be made, and therefore recommends that the Agricultural Land Conservation Committee recommend that the Board of Supervisors deny the petition for partial cancellation of Agricultural Land Conservation Contract No. 2592.

BACKGROUND:

The Agricultural Land Conservation Committee reviews petitions for cancellation of Agricultural Land Conservation Contracts for consistency of the petition with the purposes of the Williamson Act, pursuant to Section 51282 of the Government Code, and makes a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors to approve or deny the petition.

The existing parcel is located on the north side of Shain Avenue between Evans Avenue and Fairfax Avenue, approximately two and a half miles southeast of the nearest city limits of the City of Dos Palos [see Location Map (Exhibit "A"), Existing Zoning Map (Exhibit "B"), Existing Land Use Map (Exhibit "C"), and Aerial Photograph (Exhibit "D")].

This Petition for Partial Cancellation was filed in conjunction with Pre-Application for Certificate of Compliance (PCOC) Application No. 3529, which proposes to allow the creation of the 1.50-acre homesite parcel from an existing 32.96-acre parcel located in the AE-20 (Exclusive Agricultural, 20-acre minimum parcel size) Zone District.

The Williamson Act Program limits land uses on contracted parcels to commercial agricultural operations, compatible uses adopted by the Board of Supervisors, and certain qualified open space uses. Further, on May 25, 2004, the Board of Supervisors revised the County's Williamson Act Guidelines to require parcels to have at least 20 acres of prime soil and an active agricultural operation or at least 40 acres of non-prime soil and an active agricultural operation to be eligible for enrollment in the Williamson Act Program. The proposed 1.50-acre parcel does not meet the 20-acre minimum parcel size to be eligible to be enrolled in the Williamson Act Program and therefore, the applicants have submitted a petition to remove the proposed homesite parcel from the Williamson Act Program through the cancellation process.

DISCUSSION:

The Williamson Act program is a voluntary program whereby private landowners enter into contract with local governments for the purpose of restricting the use of specific parcels of land to commercial agricultural uses for production of food or fiber. Certain land uses may be determined compatible on land enrolled in the Williamson Act program by the local government having jurisdiction over contracted land. In return, landowners receive property tax assessments that are lower than normal because the assessments are based on farming or qualified open space uses rather than the full unrestricted market value of land. The purpose of the Williamson Act is to provide an incentive to preserve agricultural land for production of food or fiber, at least for the duration of the contract, which is 10 or 20 years depending on the type of contract.

A Williamson Act Contract is an enforceable restriction pursuant to Article 13, Section 8 of the California Constitution and §51252. Williamson Act Contracts are not intended to be cancelled, and in fact, cancellation is reserved for unusual "emergency" situations. Therefore, the nine-year nonrenewal process has been identified as the legally preferred method for terminating a Williamson Act Contract. The Supreme Court of California has stated that cancellation is not appropriate where the objectives served by cancellation could be served by nonrenewal [*Sierra Club v. City of Hayward* (1981) 28 Cal.3d 840, 852-853]. The State Attorney General's Office has opined that cancellation is impermissible "except upon extremely stringent conditions" [62 Ops. Cal. Atty. Gen. 233, 240 (1979)]. The Attorney General has also opined that nonrenewal is the preferred contract termination method, as stated: "If a landowner desires to change the use of his land under contract to uses other than agricultural production and compatible uses, the proper procedure is to give notices of nonrenewal pursuant to Section 51245" [54 Ops. Cal. Atty. Gen 90, 92 (1971)].

Landowners or local governments may exit the contract by filing a Notice of Nonrenewal of the contract. Under this process, the remaining contract term (nine years in the case of an original term of ten years) is allowed to lapse, with the contract expiring at the end of the term. During the Nonrenewal process, the subject land will still be subject to contract restrictions, and the annual tax assessment increases incrementally each year until it is equivalent to unrestricted market value of the land at the end of the Nonrenewal period. This would allow lands that have

been placed under contract to continue to be used for production of food and fiber for the nine-year remainder of the contract term and the landowner to benefit from lower property tax assessments.

As was mentioned above, cancellation of a contract is reserved for unusual "emergency" situations and the nine-year nonrenewal process has been identified as the legally preferred method for terminating a Williamson Act Contract. To address those unusual "emergency" circumstances, the Statute has provided provisions under which petitions for removal of a contract can be considered by the governing body having jurisdiction over the land. Processing a cancellation petition involves a comprehensive review of the petition to determine if a contract should be cancelled to allow establishment of a proposed alternative use, or if the land should remain in agricultural use for the duration of the contract. Approval of a cancellation petition is discretionary and requires the payment of a fee by the landowner equal to 12.5 percent of the full market value of the property in question.

The proposed petition is being processed under the provisions of Government Code Section 51282(a)(1), which allows the Board of Supervisors to grant tentative approval for cancellation of a contract if the Board can make all of the findings listed under Government Code Section 51282(b).

Per Government Code Section 51282(b), cancellation of a contract is consistent with the provisions of the Land Conservation Act of 1965 if the Board can make all of the findings listed under said Government Code Section. Staff's evaluation of the proposed petition against the required findings are discussed below:

1. *That the cancellation is for land on which a Notice of Nonrenewal has been served pursuant to Section 51245 of the Government Code.*

An executed Notice of Partial Nonrenewal for Williamson Act Contract No. 2592 was accepted by the County Recorder on January 26, 2021 and was assigned Document No. 2021-0011919. Said Nonrenewal is for the proposed 1.50-acre parcel associated with this Petition for Partial Cancellation.

Based on the fact stated above, Department staff believes that Finding No. 1 can be made.

2. *That the cancellation is not likely to result in the removal of adjacent lands from agricultural use.*

The existing 32.96-acre parcel contains soils classified as Prime Farmland and Farmland of Statewide Importance on the California Department of Conservation Important Farmland Map. The current property owners acquired the existing 32.96-acre parcel in 2019 and have utilized the parcel as a vineyard. Additionally, neighboring parcels are designated as Agricultural in the County General Plan, are zoned AE-20 (Exclusive Agricultural, 20-acre minimum parcel size), and are actively farmed.

With respect to Finding No. 2, substandard parcels that are created for residential uses will eventually be occupied by persons who are not involved with agricultural operations. As such, non-farmers who will reside on such parcels are not tolerant of the

inconveniences that are associated with agricultural uses that are allowed in areas of the County that are zoned and designated for active agricultural uses such as dust, application of pesticides and herbicides, odor and flies generated by animal confinement facilities such as dairies, feedlots, poultry operations, and other similar uses that by the nature of the operation require a location in a sparsely populated area found in agricultural areas of the County.

The proposed residential parcel may result in the removal of adjacent lands from agricultural operations due to restrictions placed on agricultural uses resulting from incompatibility between agricultural and residential uses.

Moreover, allowing cancellation of Williamson Act contract to allow creation of the proposed residential parcel may set a precedent for other landowners to create similar residential parcels in the area, which will compound the incompatibility between the agricultural and residential use of lands in an area of the County designated and used for agricultural operations.

Based on the above discussion, Department staff believes the cancellation may result in the removal of adjacent lands from agricultural use, and therefore Finding No. 2 cannot be made.

3. *That the cancellation is for an alternative use that is consistent with the provisions of the County General Plan.*

The existing 32.96-acre parcel is designated as Agricultural in the County General Plan and is zoned AE-20 (Exclusive Agricultural, 20-acre minimum parcel size). The Agriculture and Land Use Element of the General Plan sets goals and policies promoting long-term conservation of productive agricultural lands. General Plan Policy LU-A.1 states that the County shall maintain agriculturally designated areas for agricultural use and shall direct urban growth to cities and unincorporated communities. General Plan Policy LU-A.6 states that the County shall maintain twenty (20) acres as the minimum permitted parcel size in areas designated Agriculture. General Plan Policy LU-A.7 states that the County shall generally deny requests to create parcels less than the minimum size specified in Policy LU-A.6 based on concerns that such parcels would be less viable economic farming units and the resultant increase in residential density would increase the potential for conflict with normal agricultural practices on adjacent parcels. General Plan Policy LU-A.12 requires protection of agricultural activities from encroachment of incompatible uses. General Plan Policy LU-A.13 states that the County shall protect agricultural operations from conflicts with non-agricultural uses.

This project entails creation of a 1.50-acre parcel to be used exclusively as a homesite parcel. Staff believes the proposed alternative use is a residential use of a parcel not associated with an agricultural operation in an area of the County designated and zoned for production of food and fiber. The County includes unincorporated communities that are planned for residential, commercial, industrial and institutional uses which are most suitable locations for those who wish to live in the unincorporated County areas without negatively impacting farming and other uses that are allowed in agricultural areas of the County. Further, as discussed under Finding No. 2, neighboring parcels are designated as Agricultural in the County General Plan, are zoned AE-20 (Exclusive Agricultural, 20-

acre minimum parcel size), and are actively farmed. It should be noted that allowing creation of the proposed parcel as a separate homesite would likely result in a new residential unit on the 31.46-acre balance of the original parcel. Establishing a residential homesite in an agricultural area of the County may potentially have significant impacts on surrounding farming operations.

Based on the above discussion, Department staff believes that the proposed alternative use is not consistent with the County General Plan, and therefore believes Finding No. 3 cannot be made.

4. *That the cancellation will not result in discontinuous patterns of urban development.*

With respect to this finding, considering that the proposal entails creation of a single residential parcel in conjunction with the subject property being located approximately two and a half miles southeast of the nearest city limits of the City of Dos Palos, staff believes this proposal does not represent a discontinuous pattern of urban development.

Based on the above discussion, Department staff believes Finding No. 4 can be made.

5. *That there is no proximate non-contracted land that is both available and suitable for the use to which it is proposed that the contracted land be put, or that development of the contracted land would provide more contiguous patterns of urban development than development of proximate non-contracted land.*

Department staff generated a map and list of non-contracted parcels approximately 1.50 acres in size located within a 5-mile radius of the existing parcel and sent letters to the owners of these non-contracted parcels requesting that said owners notify Department staff if their parcels are for sale. Policy Planning Unit staff was not contacted by any of the landowners within the five-mile radius about the availability of their parcels for the proposed use.

Based on staff's inquiry, none of the owners of non-contracted parcels of similar size were interested in selling their parcel to be used for the alternative use, and therefore Finding No. 5 can be made.

OTHER REVIEWING AGENCIES:

As of January 1, 2001, Government Code Section 51284.1(a) requires notification to be provided by the County to the Director of the State Department of Conservation (the Director) once a cancellation petition has been accepted as complete. Under Government Code Section 51284.1(c), the Director's comments, if provided, are required to be considered by the Board of Supervisors before acting on the proposed cancellation.

The petition was forwarded to the California Department of Conservation (DOC) on November 25, 2020. Staff allows at least 30 days for the DOC to provide comments. In this case, the DOC has not provided comments regarding the petition.

CONCLUSION:

Based upon staff's analysis of the proposed alternative use against the consistency Findings listed under Government Code Section 51282(b), staff does not believe that Findings No. 2 and 3 can be made, and therefore recommends that the Agricultural Land Conservation Committee recommend that the Board of Supervisors deny the petition for partial cancellation of Agricultural Land Conservation Contract No. 2592.

However, if the Committee believes that the required Findings can be made, the Committee needs to articulate how each of the Findings can be made and may recommend that the Board of Supervisors approve the partial cancellation of Agricultural Land Conservation Contract No. 2592, subject to the following conditions:

1. The landowners shall obtain the necessary land use approval (PCOC) to create the proposed 1.50-acre parcel.
2. The applicant shall pay the Cancellation Fee in the amount of \$6,250.00 as determined by the County Assessor and certified by the Board of Supervisors for issuance of a Certificate of Cancellation by the Board. The Cancellation Fee shall be paid and a Certificate of Cancellation issued prior to recording the PCOC Map to create the proposed 1.50-acre parcel.

DC:


G:\4360Devs&PIn\PLANNING\AG\RLCC - Apps\Active Cancellation\RLCC 1017 Brinkley Trust-Harman Trust\ALCC\RLCC 1017 ALCC Staff Report (R2).docx

EXHIBIT A




LOCATION MAP

RLCC 1017



EXISTING ZONING MAP


EXHIBIT B



Legend

- Subject Property
- AE20
- Merced County

EXHIBIT D



**32.96-acre
Subject Parcel
AP-2592**

Legend
📍 15976 Evans Ave

**1.50-acre
Cancellation Area
AP-2592**

Google Earth
© 2021 Google

1000 ft



County of Fresno

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

INITIAL STUDY ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

1. **Project title:**
Initial Study Application No. 7940 and Pre-Application for Certificate of Compliance No. 3529
2. **Lead agency name and address:**
County of Fresno, Department of Public Works and Planning
2220 Tulare Street, 6th Floor
Fresno, CA 93721
3. **Contact person and phone number:**
Ethan Davis, Planner
(559) 600-9669
4. **Project location:**
The subject property is located at the northeast corner of Shain Avenue and Evans Avenue, approximately eight miles northwest of the nearest city limits of the City of Firebaugh (Sup. Dist.: 1) (APN: 001-280-14).
5. **Project sponsor's name and address:**
David Brinkley
41871 Shain Avenue
Dos Palos, CA 93620
6. **General Plan designation:**
Agricultural
7. **Zoning:**
AE-20 (Exclusive Agricultural, 20-acre minimum parcel size)
8. **Description of project: (Describe the whole action involved, including, but not limited to, later phases of the project, and any secondary, support, or off-site features necessary for its implementation. Attach additional sheets if necessary.)**
To create a 1.5-acre gift-deed parcel from an existing 32.96-acre parcel located in the AE-20 (Exclusive Agricultural, 20-acre minimum parcel size) Zone District.
9. **Surrounding land uses and setting: Briefly describe the project's surroundings:**
The project site is located in a mainly agricultural setting.
10. **Other public agencies whose approval is required (g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement.)**
Fresno County Department of Public Works and Planning
11. **Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1? If so, is there a plan for consultation that includes, for example, the determination of significance of impacts to tribal cultural resources, procedures regarding confidentiality, etc.?**
Participating California Native American tribes were notified of the subject application under the provisions of Assembly Bill 52 (AB 52) and were given the opportunity to enter into consultation with the County. No

participating California Native American tribe expressed concerns with the application to indicate the presence of cultural resources.

NOTE: Conducting consultation early in the CEQA process allows tribal governments, lead agencies, and project proponents to discuss the level of environmental review, identify and address potential adverse impacts to tribal cultural resources, and reduce the potential for delay and conflict in the environmental review process. (See Public Resources Code section 21080.3.2.) Information may also be available from the California Native American Heritage Commission's Sacred Lands File per Public Resources Code section 5097.96 and the California Historical Resources Information System administered by the California Office of Historic Preservation. Please also note that Public Resources Code section 21082.3(c) contains provisions specific to confidentiality.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

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

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture and Forestry Resources |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Energy |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Geology/Soils | <input type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology/Water Quality |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use/Planning | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Noise | <input type="checkbox"/> Population/Housing |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation | <input type="checkbox"/> Tribal Cultural Resources |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities/Service Systems | <input type="checkbox"/> Wildfire |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance | |


DETERMINATION OF REQUIRED ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT:

On the basis of this initial evaluation:


- I find that the proposed project **COULD NOT** have a significant effect on the environment. **A NEGATIVE DECLARATION WILL BE PREPARED.**
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because the Mitigation Measures described on the attached sheet have been added to the project. **A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION WILL BE PREPARED.**
- I find the proposed project **MAY** have a significant effect on the environment, and an **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required
- I find that as a result of the proposed project, no new effects could occur, or new Mitigation Measures would be required that have not been addressed within the scope of a previous Environmental Impact Report.

PERFORMED BY:

REVIEWED BY:



Ethan Davis, Planner
Date: 6/3/21



Chris Motta, Principal Planner
Date: 6/3/2021

ETD:CM:cwm
G:\4360Dev_Eng\PCOC\3500-3599\3529 Brinkley\IS-CEQA\PCOC 3529 IS Checklist.docx

**INITIAL STUDY
ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM
(Initial Study Application No. 7940 and
Pre-Application for Certificate of Compliance No.
3529)**

The following checklist is used to determine if the proposed project could potentially have a significant effect on the environment. Explanations and information regarding each question follow the checklist.

1 = No Impact

2 = Less Than Significant Impact

3 = Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated

4 = Potentially Significant Impact

I. AESTHETICS

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

- 1 a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?
- 1 b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?
- 1 c) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?
- 1 d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

II. AGRICULTURAL AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

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

- 1 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?
- 1 b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act Contract?
- 1 c) Conflict with existing zoning for forest land or timberland zoned Timberland Production?
- 1 d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?
- 2 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?

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:

- 1 a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable Air Quality Plan?
- 1 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?
- 1 c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?
- 1 d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

- 1 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?
- 1 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?
- 2 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?
- 1 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?
- 1 e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?
- 1 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?

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

- 1 a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?
- 1 b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?
- 1 c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

VI. ENERGY

Would the project:

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

VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Would the project:

- a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:
 - 1 i) 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?
 - 1 ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?
 - 1 iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?
 - 1 iv) Landslides?
- 1 b) Result in substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil?
- 1 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?
- 1 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?
- 1 e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?
- 1 f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Would the project:

- 1 a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?
- 2 b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Would the project:

- 1 a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?
- 1 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?
- 1 c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?
- 1 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?
- 1 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?
- 1 f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?
- 1 g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?

X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Would the project:

- 1 a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?
- 1 b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?
- 1 c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on or off site?
 - 1 i) Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;
 - 1 ii) Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite;
 - 1 iii) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or
 - 1 iv) Impede or redirect flood flows?
- 1 d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?
- 1 e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?

XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING

Would the project:

- 1 a) Physically divide an established community?
- 1 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?

XII. MINERAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

- 1 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?
- 1 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?

XIII. NOISE

Would the project result in:

- 1 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?
- 1 b) Generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels?
- 1 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?

XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING

Would the project:

- 1 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)?

- 1 b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

XV. PUBLIC SERVICES

Would the project:

- 1 a) Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically-altered governmental facilities, or the need for new or physically-altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:
- 1 i) Fire protection?
- 1 ii) Police protection?
- 1 iii) Schools?
- 1 iv) Parks?
- 1 v) Other public facilities?

XVI. RECREATION

Would the project:

- 1 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?
- 1 b) Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

XVII. TRANSPORTATION

Would the project:

- 1 a) Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?
- 1 b) Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?
- 1 c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?
- 1 d) Result in inadequate emergency access?

XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

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

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

XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Would the project:

- 1 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?
- 1 b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?
- 1 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?
- 1 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?
- 1 e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

XX. WILDFIRE

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

- 1 a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?
- 1 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?
- 1 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?
- 1 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?

XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Would the project:

- 1 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?
- 1 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)
- 1 c) Have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

Documents Referenced:

This Initial Study is referenced by the documents listed below. These documents are available for public review at the County of Fresno, Department of Public Works and Planning, Development Services and Capital Projects Division, 2220 Tulare Street, Suite A, Fresno, California (corner of M & Tulare Streets).

Fresno County General Plan, Policy Document and Final EIR
Fresno County Zoning Ordinance
Important Farmland 2016 Map, State Department of Conservation
Fire Hazard Severity Zones in LRA 2007 Map, State Department of Forestry and Fire Protection

ETD:CM:cwm
G:\4360Dev_Engn\PCOC\3500-3599\3529 Brinkley\IS-CEQA\PCOC 3529 IS Checklist.docx



County of Fresno

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

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

APPLICANT: Precision Engineering / David Brinkley – Kelly Harman

APPLICATION NOS.: Initial Study Application No. 7940 and Pre-Application for Certificate of Compliance No. 3529

DESCRIPTION: To create a 1.5-acre gift-deed parcel from an existing 32.96-acre parcel located in the AE-20 (Exclusive Agricultural, 20-acre minimum parcel size) Zone District.

LOCATION: The subject property is located at the northeast corner of Shain Avenue and Evans Avenue, approximately eight miles northwest of the nearest city limits of the City of Firebaugh (Sup. Dist.: 1) (APN: 001-280-14) (15976 Evans Avenue)

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:

No scenic vista or scenic resource has been identified on or near the project site. According to Figure OS-2 of the Fresno County General Plan, there are no scenic roadways fronting the project site.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The subject parcel is located in an agricultural setting and no new development is being proposed. The purpose of the project is to create a homesite parcel for the applicant's daughter to live on while also contributing to the existing farming operation. The

applicant's daughter will live in the existing single-family residence. Therefore, based on the proposal, there will be no impact.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The subject application will not directly create a new source of light or glare. There is no development being proposed. The proposed homesite parcel already has an existing single-family residence that will remain, and the remainder parcel contains existing vineyards.

II. AGRICULTURAL AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

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

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The existing parcel is enrolled in the Williamson Act Program under Contract No. 2592. Pursuant to the Fresno County Williamson Act Program Guidelines, parcels that are enrolled in the Program are required to have at least 20 acres of Prime Soil and an active agricultural operation, or at least 40 acres of Non-Prime Soil and an active agricultural operation to be eligible to remain in the Williamson Act Program. The proposed 1.5-acre parcel does not qualify to remain in the Program and must be removed from the Program through the contract cancellation process. The Partial Cancellation Petition of the 1.5-acre parcel is currently in process and is known as Revision of Land Conservation Contract (RLCC) No. 1017. This Initial Study is required for Cancellation Petitions. Once RLCC No. 1017 is approved and complete, there will be no conflict with Williamson Act Contract No. 2592.

According to Section 816.5-A.2.a.b.(2) of the Fresno County Zoning Ordinance, the creation of homesites less than the minimum acreage indicated by the District acreage

designation (Exclusive Agricultural, 20-acre minimum parcel size Zone District), may be permitted if a condition listed can be made. In this case, the following condition can be made:

The lot or lots to be created are intended as a conveyance or devise exclusively for use by a person related to the owner by adoption, blood, or marriage within the second degree of consanguinity and only for persons involved in the farming operation; the existing lot before division contains a minimum of twenty (20) gross acres; there is only one (1) lot per related person, or per related married couple, and there is no more than one lot per each twenty (20) gross acres. As stated previously, this proposal is to create a 1.5-acre gift deed from a 32.95-acre parcel.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project site is not located in forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production. The project will not 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: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The proposed parcel split will not involve changes to the existing environment that could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use. There will be no change to the land after the recording of the gift deed. The applicant would just like to split off the existing home from the farm so that the applicant's daughter can reside in the existing single-family residence while also working on the existing farm on the proposed remainder parcel. The remainder of the proposed parcel would still be utilized for agricultural production and would not substantially change the nature of the use or affect surrounding parcels.

III. AIR QUALITY

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

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

- B. Would the project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under a Federal or State ambient air quality standard?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project is to allow creation of a 1.5-acre homesite parcel for the landowner's daughter to live and help work on the farm, no additional construction activity will occur. The project will not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable Air Quality Plan and will not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant.

- C. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations; or
- D. Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project site is currently utilized as an agricultural operation with the property improved with vineyards. Both the agricultural operation and the existing single-family residence are not uses that are associated with substantial pollutant generation and will not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. The project will not result in other emissions adversely affecting a substantial number of people.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

According to the California Natural Diversity Database, the project site is not located within any reported occurrence areas of a special status species. The proposal is to create a new parcel from an existing parcel. The subject parcel is actively being farmed. Based on current conditions, the parcel experiences disturbance that would deter special status species from inhabiting the subject parcel. In considering current conditions, the project proposal, and potential future development, the project will not substantially adversely affect any special status species directly or through habitat modification.

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

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

According to the National Wetlands Inventory, the subject parcel is located along the boundaries of identified wetlands. Although the subject parcel is located near the identified wetlands, the proposed parcel will not have an adverse effect on the wetland as the parcel is separated by a grade differential. Also, it appears that the identified wetland occurs on the adjacent parcel, Fresno County requires that drainage of a parcel be confined so as not to drain on neighboring properties. Based on these factors, the project is not expected to adversely affect any identified wetlands. There are no riparian or other sensitive natural community identified on or near the subject parcel.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project will not interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species. No native resident or migratory wildlife corridor or native wildlife nursery site has been identified on the subject parcel. The subject parcel is currently being utilized for agricultural purposes and disturbance of the site has deterred wildlife species from inhabiting the site.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project will not conflict with any local, state, or federal policies or ordinances protecting biological resources. The project also will not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state Habitat Conservation Plan.

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 proposes to create a gift-deed parcel from an existing 32.95-acre parcel. The property is currently utilized for agricultural and has experienced ground disturbance from the agricultural use. As no historical or archaeological resources has been identified on or near the project and considering past ground disturbing activities related to the existing agricultural use, no impact is seen on Cultural Resources.

VI. ENERGY

Would the project:

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project proposes to create a gift-deed parcel from an existing parcel. The project will not result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resource as there is not project construction or operation proposed. Therefore, the project will not conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency.

VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Would the project:

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

According to the Earthquake Zone Application administered by the California Department of Conservation, the proposed parcels are not located within a rupture of a known earthquake fault. Additionally, per Figure 9-3 of the Fresno County General Plan

Background Report (FCGPBR), the parcel is not located near any other identified Earthquake Hazard Zones.

2. Strong seismic ground shaking?

3. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

According to Figure 9-5 of the FCGPBR, the subject parcel is not located in an area identified as being in a likely seismic hazard area. Based on this, the project site not likely to be subject to strong seismic ground shaking or seismic-related ground failure due to the strong seismic shaking.

4. Landslides?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

According to Figure 9-6 of the FCGPBR, the project site is not located in identified Landslide Hazard areas.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project proposal requests creation of a gift-deed parcel with not proposed construction or grading activity. The existing parcel is actively farmed and contains a single-family residence. The project will not result in substantial soil erosion.

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:

The proposal is not located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

Per Figure 7-1 of the Fresno County General Plan Background Report (FCGPBR), the subject parcel is not located in identified Expansive Soil areas.

- 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: NO IMPACT:

Due to the size of the proposed gift-deed parcel to be under two acres in size, a Nitrogen Loading Analysis was conducted during the week of June 1, 2021 to determine if the existing on-site septic system could adequately serve the existing residence with a reduced parcel configuration. Based on the analysis conducted by Public Works and Planning staff at the request of the project applicant, it was determined that the existing septic system could continue to serve the existing residence with a reduced parcel size configuration.

The project proposal is specifically to create a parcel with no development being included with this proposal. The Applicant has indicated that the subject proposal would stay the same and be utilized for the existing agricultural operation and for the landowner's daughter to reside in the existing single-family residence to help assist in the active farming operation. If the proposed parcel were to be developed, the project site would be subject to building permits including for any proposed septic system or alternative wastewater disposal system. No other reviewing agencies and departments indicated that the subject site would not be able to adequately support the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

There are no identified unique paleontological resource or unique geologic feature identified on the project site.

VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Would the project:

- A. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment; or
- B. Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The project proposal will allow creation of a gift-deed parcel and a remainder parcel. The Applicant has indicated that the proposed parcel's use will be utilized as a home site for the daughter. There is an existing single-family residence and no development is

proposed. The project proposal will not directly generate greenhouse gas emissions, but if further development of the parcel were to occur, by-right uses under the Exclusive Agricultural (AE) Zone District are not expected to generate greenhouse gas emissions that would have a significant impact on the environment. Additional uses subject to land-use permits would address impacts related to the proposed use. The San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD) has been given the opportunity to review and provide comments on the project. There were no expressed concerns from SJVAPCD to indicate that the project proposal would conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gas emissions.

VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Would the project:

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project is to allow creation of a homesite parcel from an existing 32.96-acre parcel. The existing parcel is actively farmed. The proposal will not create a significant hazard to the public through the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials, nor will it create a significant hazard to the public or environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project site does not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous materials and is not located within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school 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:

Per a NEPAssist report generated for the project site, there are no hazardous material sites located on or near the project site.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project site is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

Reviewing agencies and departments did not express concerns to indicate that the project would impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. The project will not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires.

X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Would the project:

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The Water and Natural Resources Division and the State Water Resources Control Board did not express concerns that the project would violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements, nor were concerns expressed to indicate that the project would substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge. The proposal to create a gift-deed parcel from an existing 32.96-acre parcel. There is no additional site development being proposed that is directly linked to the PCOC Application. Any development that would occur if the PCOC Application is approved would be subject to permits and review that will address water usage.

- C. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on or off site?

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The proposal is to create a gift-deed parcel from the existing 32.96-acre parcel. There is no development being proposed directly with the PCOC Application. The project will not result in the altering of drainage patterns of the site or alter any course of a stream or river. The project will not result in substantial erosion or siltation. The rate or amount of surface runoff will not increase from the project proposal. Per Fresno County standards, stormwater runoff should not be drained across property lines and be kept onsite. There are no planned stormwater drainage systems that service the project area. The project will not create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems and will not provide additional sources of polluted runoff. Per FEMA FIRM Panel 0975H, the project site is not subject to flooding from the 100-year storm, therefore the project will not impede or redirect flood flow.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

Per FEMA FIRM Panel 0975H, the project site is not subject to flooding from the 100-year storm. There are no bodies of water near the project site that would indicate the site is at increased risk from tsunami or seiche zones.

- 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 project to indicate that the proposal would 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 proposal will not physically divide an established community.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

Development in Fresno County is required to be consistent with the Fresno County General Plan. Goal LU-A reads “To promote the long-term conservation of productive and potentially productive agricultural lands and to accommodate agricultural-support services and agriculturally-related activities that support the viability of agriculture and further the County’s economic development goals.” This goal relates to the environmental impacts of the loss of farmland and is supported by the following policies:

- LU-A.6: The County shall maintain twenty acres as the minimum permitted parcel size in areas designated Agriculture, except as provided in Policies LU-A.9, LU-A.10, and LU-A.11. The County may require parcel sizes larger than twenty (20) acres, based on zoning, local agricultural conditions, and to help ensure the viability of agricultural operations.
- LU-A.7: The County shall generally deny requests to create parcels less than the minimum size specified in Policy LU-A.6 based on concerns that these parcels are less viable economic farming units and that the resultant increase in residential density increases the potential for conflict with normal agricultural practices on adjacent parcels...the decision-making body shall consider the negative incremental and cumulative effects such land divisions have on the agricultural community.
- LU-A.9: The County may allow creation of home site parcels smaller than the minimum parcel size required by Policy LU-A.6, if the parcel involved in the division is at least twenty (20) acres in size, subject to the following criteria:
 - a. The minimum lot size shall be sixty thousand (60,000) square feet of gross area, except that a lesser area shall be permitted when the owner submits evidence satisfactory to the Health Officer that the soils meet the Water Quality Control Board Guidelines for liquid waste disposal, but in no event shall the lot be less than one (1) gross acre; and
 - b. One of the following conditions exist:
 - 1. A lot less than twenty (20) acres is required for financing construction of a residence to be owned and occupied by the owner of abutting property; or

2. The lot or lots to be created are intended for use by persons involved in the farming operation and related to the owner by adoption, blood, or marriage within the second degree of consanguinity, there is only one (1) lot per related person, and there is no more than one (1) gift lot per twenty (20) acres; or

3. The present owner owned the property prior to the date these policies were implemented and wishes to retain his/her home site and sell the remaining acreage for agricultural purposes.

The above-mentioned policies are consistent with the proposal and therefore are consistent with the General Plan.

XII. MINERAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

According to Figure 7-7 of the Fresno County General Plan Background Report (FCGPBR) the project site is not located on or near any identified mineral resource locations. Additionally, the project proposal does not directly indicate development of the project site that would result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource or resource recovery site.

XIII. NOISE

Would the project result in:

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

No physical or noise generating on-site changes are associated with this proposal to create a 1.5-acre gift-deed parcel from an existing 32.96-acre parcel. There is no development or proposed use involved with this project that would result in generation of substantial noise levels, ground-borne vibrations, or ground-borne noise levels. Existing land uses for the surrounding area are agricultural or residential in nature. The

subject parcel is utilized for vineyard cultivation and does not produce noise in excess of the standard noise generation associated with agricultural uses.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project site is not located within two miles of a private airstrip, airport land use plan, public airport or public use airport.

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 proposal will not result in substantial population growth, nor does it propose any development that would induce substantial population growth. The project site is utilized for agricultural cultivation with an existing onsite. The project proposes to split the subject parcel into two parcels and will not displace people or housing.

XV. PUBLIC SERVICES

Would the project:

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

- 1. Fire protection;

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The Fresno County Fire Protection District (FCFPD) reviewed the subject application and did not express concerns to indicate that the proposal would result in adverse impacts on service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

Reviewing agencies did not express concerns to indicate that the project would result in impacts on service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives to the listed services.

XVI. RECREATION

Would the project:

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project will not result in an increase use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities and will not require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities.

XVI. TRANSPORTATION

Would the project:

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

Reviewing agencies and departments did not express concern to indicate that the proposal conflicts with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

There is no increase in traffic trip generation or vehicle miles traveled associated with the project proposal. The project site is currently utilized for agricultural cultivation with traffic generation associated with the agricultural operation. There is no direct development proposed with the project. Potential development of the site associated with by-right uses of the underlying zone district are not expected to conflict with or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

Reviewing agencies and departments did not express concerns regarding the design features of the project or regarding emergency access to indicate that the project will result in hazards or inadequate emergency access.

XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

- A. Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:
 - 1. Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or
 - 2. A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

Per Assembly Bill 52 (AB 52) participating California Native American Tribes were notified of the subject application and given the opportunity to enter into consultation with the County on discussing the presence of tribal cultural resources on or near the project site. One Tribe, the Santa Rosa Rancheria Tachi Yokut Tribe, requested notification if there are discoveries during ground disturbance. Staff notes that the proposal does not involve any ground disturbance. California Native American Tribe

expressed concern with the project proposal. Additionally, the subject parcel has historically been in agricultural use and has experienced ground disturbance resulting from the use. There is no development directly associated with the subject application. Therefore, it can be seen that the project does not have an impact on tribal 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 storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects; or
- B. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years; or
- 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; or
- D. Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals; or
- E. Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project proposes to create a 1.5-acre gift-deed parcel from an existing 32.96-acre parcel. There is no development proposed with this project. Any future development would be subject to all applicable federal, state, and local standards. As there is no development directly involved with the subject application, the project will not require the relocation or construction of water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities. The subject site has been historically utilized for agricultural purposes. There is no direct development proposed with this application, therefore no change in water usage will occur. The project will not produce wastewater; therefore, no impact will occur on capacity. Solid waste generation will not increase as a result of the project; therefore, the project will comply with federal, state and local management and reduction statutes and regulation.

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:

According to the 2007 Fresno County Fire Hazard Severity Zones in LRA Map by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (Cal Fire), the project site is located in Local Responsibility Area. According to the map, the project site is located not located in a very high, high, or moderated area fire hazard. If future development of the site were to occur, development would be subject to applicable fire and building code standards. The project will not result in adverse impacts associated with wildfires.

XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Would the project:

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

Based on the project scope, no proposal for new development associated with the application, and current agricultural use, the project does not have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment or reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

There are no cumulatively considerable impacts identified from the analysis of the subject proposal.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

There were no identified environmental effects that could substantially cause adverse effects on human beings.

CONCLUSION/SUMMARY

Based upon the Initial Study prepared for Pre-Application for Certificate of Compliance No. 3529, 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 Aesthetics, Agricultural and Forestry Resources, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Energy, Geology and Soils, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Hydrology and Water Quality, Land Use Planning, Mineral Resources, Noise, Population and Housing, Public Services, Recreation, Transportation, Tribal Cultural Resources, Utilities and Service Systems, and Wildfire.

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

ED:CM:CWM
G:\4360Dev_Engr\PCOC\3500-3599\3529 Brinkley\IS-CEQA\PCOC 3529 IS Writeup.docx

ATTACHMENT G

File original and one copy with: Fresno County Clerk 2221 Kern Street Fresno, California 93721		Space Below For County Clerk Only. CLK-2046.00 E04-73 R00-00		
Agency File No: IS 7940		LOCAL AGENCY NEGATIVE DECLARATION		County Clerk File No: E-
Responsible Agency (Name): Fresno County	Address (Street and P.O. Box): 2220 Tulare St. Sixth Floor		City: Fresno	Zip Code: 93721
Agency Contact Person (Name and Title): Ethan Davis Planner		Area Code: 559	Telephone Number: 600-9669	Extension: N/A
Project Applicant/Sponsor (Name): Davd Brinkley		Project Title: Pre-Application for Certificate of Compliance No. 3529		
Project Description: To create a 1.5-acre gift-deed parcel from an existing 32.96-acre parcel located in the AE-20 (Exclusive Agricultural, 20-acre minimum parcel size) Zone District.				
Justification for Negative Declaration: Based upon the Initial Study prepared for Pre-Application for Certificate of Compliance No. 3529, 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 Aesthetics, Agricultural and Forestry Resources, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Energy, Geology and Soils, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Hydrology and Water Quality, Land Use Planning, Mineral Resources, Noise, Population and Housing, Public Services, Recreation, Transportation, Tribal Cultural Resources, Utilities and Service Systems, and Wildfire. A Negative Declaration is recommended and is subject to approval by the decision-making body. The Initial Study is available for review at 2220 Tulare Street, Suite A, street level, located on the southwest corner of Tulare and "M" Street, Fresno, California.				
FINDING: The proposed project will not have a significant impact on the environment.				
Newspaper and Date of Publication: Fresno Business Journal – June 4, 2021			Review Date Deadline: Board of Supervisors	
Date:	Type or Print Signature: Chris Motta Principal Planner		Submitted by (Signature): Ethan Davis Planner	

State 15083, 15085

County Clerk File No.: _____

LOCAL AGENCY MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION