



County of Fresno

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS AND PLANNING
ALAN WEAVER, DIRECTOR

INITIAL STUDY ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

1. Project title:

*Fresno Canal Bridge Replacement Project, Initial Study Application No. 6830
Bridge Project #: 42C0343
Fed # BRLO-5942 (225)*

2. Lead agency name and address:

*Fresno County Department of Public Works and Planning
Development Services Division
2220 Tulare Street, 6th Floor, Fresno CA 93721-2104*

3. Contact person and phone number:

Briza Sholars, (559) 600-4207

4. Project location:

The proposed bridge project is located on E. McKinley Avenue, 0.8 miles east of Academy Avenue, near the City of Sanger. The project is located in unincorporated eastern Fresno County. (SUP. DIST.: 5) (Assessor Parcel Numbers: 309-070-19 and 20, 309-100-09 and 10).

5. Project Applicant's name and address:

Fresno County Design Division

6. General Plan designation: Agriculture

7. Zoning: Exclusive Agriculture (AE) 20-acre district

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.) *The proposed federally funded project consists of replacing the Fresno Canal Bridge. The existing two lane timber bridge would be replaced with a new two lane concrete bridge that meets current standards. The existing structure is in poor condition and must be replaced due to its age and hydraulic deficiencies. The County has prepared an Area of Potential Effects (APE) drawing which establishes the maximum extent of the project and potential bridge designs, channel work, access road realignments, approach work, as well as possible permanent and temporary right of way needs and the contractor's access way to the channel would be accomplished within the proposed APE.*

9. Surrounding land uses and setting: *Briefly describe the project's surroundings: Presently orchards, roadside ruderal, and the roadway is surrounded by Agricultural. The nearest residence is over one quarter mile. This bridge on McKinley is over the Fresno Canal. The site is flat at approximately 390 msl elevation. The APE is approximately 3.57 acres which is comprised of 2.74 acres of non-urbanized land (agriculture) and 0.83 acres or urbanized (roadway) land.*

DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DIVISION

2220 Tulare Street, Suites A & B / Fresno, California 93721 / Phone (559) 600-4497 / 600-4022 / 600-4540 / FAX 600-4200
Equal Employment Opportunity • Affirmative Action • Disabled Employer

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"/> Geology/Soils |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards and 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/Traffic | <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities/Service Systems |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance | <input type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions |

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:

Briza Sholars, Planner

Chris Motta, Principal Planner

Date:

Briza Sholars 12-8-14

Date:

Chris Motta 12/8/14

G:\4360Devs&Pln\EnvPlan\Design\IS\Bridges\6830 Fresno Canal Bridge Replacement\Env Docs\Initial Study Checklist IS 6830.doc

INITIAL STUDY ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM (6830)

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

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?
- 2 c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?
- 2 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

Would the project:

- 3 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?
- 3 b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act Contract?
- 1 c) Conflict with existing zoning for forest land, timberland or timberland zoned Timberland Production?
- 1 d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?
- 3 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

Would the project:

- 2 a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable Air Quality Plan?
- 2 b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?
- 2 c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under applicable Federal or State ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?
- 2 d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?
- 2 e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

- 3 a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?
- 3 b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?
- 2 c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?
- 2 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?
- 2 e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?
- 2 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:

- 3 a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Public Resources Code Section 15064.5?
- 3 b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 15064.5?
- 3 c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site, or unique geologic feature?
- 3 d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Would the project:

- a) Expose people or structures to 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?
- 2 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 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?

VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Would the project:

- 2 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?

VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Would the project:

- 2 a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?
- 2 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?
- 2 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 for people residing or working in the project area?
- 1 f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?
- 1 g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted Emergency Response Plan or Emergency Evacuation Plan?
- 1 h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Would the project:

- 2 a) Violate any water quality standards of waste discharge requirements?
- 2 b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?
- 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, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?
- 1 d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?

- 1 e) 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?
- 1 f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?
- 1 g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a Federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?
- 1 h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?
- 1 i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?
- 1 j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING

Would the project:

- 1 a) Physically divide an established community?
- 2 b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the General Plan, Specific Plan, local coastal program, or Zoning Ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?
- 1 c) Conflict with any applicable Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Community Conservation Plan?

XI. 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?

XII. NOISE

Would the project:

- 2 a) Expose persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local General Plan or Noise Ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?
- 2 b) Expose persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?
- 2 c) Create a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?
- 2 d) Create a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?
- 1 e) Expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels 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?
- 1 f) Expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels for a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip?

XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING

Would the project:

- 1 a) Induce substantial 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 housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?
- 1 c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES

Would the project:

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

XV. 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?

XVI. TRANSPORTATION / TRAFFIC

Would the project:

- 2 a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?
- 2 b) Conflict with an applicable Congestion Management Program including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the County congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?
- 1 c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location which results in substantial safety risks?
- 2 d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?
- 1 e) Result in inadequate emergency access?
- 1 f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?

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 Division, 2220 Tulare Street, Suite A, Fresno, California (corner of M & Tulare Streets).

Final Archaeological Survey Report, Applied Earthworks, August 18, 2014

Farmland Conversion Assessment, LSA Associates, Inc. October 2014

Hazardous Waste Initial Site Assessment, Caltrans, August 21, 2014

Final Historic Property Survey report, DO, September 25, 2014

Final Location Hydraulic Study, Caltrans, March 3, 2014

Final Natural Environmental Study, Live Oak & Associates, September 2014

Final Water Quality Report, Caltrans, September 2014

XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Would the project:

- 2 a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?
- 2 b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?
- 1 c) Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?
- 2 d) Have sufficient water supplies available to service the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?
- 2 e) 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?
- 2 f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?
- 2 g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Would the project:

- 1 a) Have the potential to 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, 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?

Fresno County General Plan, Policy Document and Final EIR

Fresno County Zoning Ordinance

Fresno County Important Farmlands Map

FEMA Flood Maps

Soil Survey of Eastern Fresno Area, CA

Final National Priorities List (NPL) Sites website

Superfund Information Systems CERCLIS website

Alquist Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone Map



County of Fresno

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS AND PLANNING
ALAN WEAVER
DIRECTOR

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

APPLICANT: Fresno County Design Division

APPLICATION NO.: Fresno Canal Bridge Replacement Project, Initial Study Application No. 6830
(Bridge Project #: 42C0343, Fed#: BRLO-5942 (225))

DESCRIPTION: The proposed federally funded project consists of replacing the Fresno Canal Bridge. The existing two lane timber bridge would be replaced with a new two lane concrete bridge that meets current standards. The existing structure is in poor condition and should be replaced due to its age and hydraulic deficiencies. The County has prepared an Area of Potential Effects (APE) drawing which establishes the maximum extent of the project and potential bridge designs, channel work, access road realignments, approach work, as well as possible permanent and temporary right of way needs and the contractor's access way to the channel would be accomplished within the proposed APE.

LOCATION: The proposed bridge project is located on E. McKinley Avenue, 0.8 miles east of Academy Avenue, near the City of Sanger. The project is located in unincorporated eastern Fresno County. (SUP. DIST.: 5) (APN Nos.: 309-070-19 and 20, 309-100-09 and 10).

I. AESTHETICS

- A. Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista; or
- B. Would the project substantially damage scenic resources, including but not limited to trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway; or

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The site is currently used for the existing bridge, and a new bridge will be constructed in the same location. The area surrounding the project is roadside ruderal, orchards, and agriculture. The nearest residence is over ¼ mile away. The project site is not located along a designated Scenic Highway, and no scenic vistas or scenic resources were identified near the proposal.

- C. Would the project substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?

DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DIVISION

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

This proposal entails the replacement of an existing two lane timber bridge with a new two lane concrete bridge. The bridge will be lengthened and widened to meet current standards however the roadway alignment will not change. The land surrounding the bridge is in agriculture and zoned Agriculture Exclusive (AE) 20-acre District. Some trees on the eastern bank of the maintained canal could be removed however the proposal will not significantly damage any scenic resource or degrade the visual character of the site or its surroundings.

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

LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The project will be constructed during daylight hours and no additional lighting will be utilized at the site as a result of this proposal.

II. AGRICULTURAL AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

- A. Would the project convert prime or unique farmlands or farmland of statewide importance to non-agricultural use; or
- B. Would the project conflict with existing agricultural zoning or Williamson Act Contracts; or

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION:

The project is located in an area of Fresno County that is currently under agricultural production. This area includes Williamson Act contracted lands and soils classified as Important Farmlands as defined by National Resources Conservation Service (NRCS). The soil is classified as Ramona Loam (Rc and Re) and three parcels are designated as Prime Farmland by NCRS since they are irrigated and under Williamson Act Contracts. The orchards immediately adjacent to the project could be impacted and the trees on the eastern bank removed. A Farmland Conversion Assessment study was prepared by LSA Associates in October 2014.

The project applicant would be required to reimburse the land owner of each parcel for the permanent loss of active agricultural land through monetary reimbursement. Implementation of the following mitigation measures shall be incorporated to reduce potential adverse effects to the conversion of 1.6 acres of active Agricultural Land to urbanized uses.

Mitigation Measure:

Prior to construction, the project applicant (Fresno County Design Division) shall reimburse the land owners of parcels Assessor Parcel Number (APN) 309-070-19; APN 309-100-09; and APN 309-100-10 for the loss of active agricultural land that will occur due to project implementation per the Federal Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 (Act). Per the policies of the Act the Project applicant shall retain a real

property acquisition firm to evaluate the partial purchase of the above mentioned parcels and to determine a fair-market monetary value for the land being acquired in each parcel.

Form AD-1006 was provided to the NRCS Fresno Service Center for determination of potential farmland affected. No response was received within 30 days.

Mitigation Measure:

Prior to construction, the project applicant (Fresno County Design Division) shall notify the California Department of Conservation of the intent to acquire partial right-of-way land in APNs 309-070-19 (approximately 1.0 acre); APN 309-10-009 (approximately 0.90 acre); and APN 309-100-10 (approximately 0.30 acre), which are under Williamson Act Contracts. The notification shall follow the procedures set forth by the California Department of Conservation for Public Acquisitions of Williamson Act Contracted Land. The notice shall indicate the amount of land that would need to be acquired from each parcel to implement the proposed Project. The notice shall also indicate that the remaining land on the parcel is not required for Project implementation and that said land would continue to be under Williamson Act Contracts. Implementation of the mitigation measure recommended above would ensure that no adverse effects on Williamson Act Contracted land would occur with implementation of the proposed Project.

- C. Would the project conflict with existing zoning for or cause rezoning of forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production; or
- D. Would the project result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use; or

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project site is not located on forest land, timberland or timberland that is zoned Timberland Protection.

- E. Would the project involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural uses or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

III. AIR QUALITY

- A. Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable Air Quality Plan; or
- B. Would the project isolate any air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation; or
- C. 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; or
- D. Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations; or

E. Would the project create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

This proposal was reviewed by the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (Air District) which concluded that project specific criteria pollutant emissions would have no significant adverse impact on air quality. There may be temporary dust during construction however compliance with Air District Rules will reduce air quality impacts of the subject project to a less than significant level.

National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAP) notification is included for air quality compliance:

Note: In compliance with Standard Specifications, the Contractor must notify agencies as required by NESHAP. A copy of the notification forms and attachments shall be provided to the Engineer prior to submittal. Notification shall take place a minimum of 10 working days prior to starting demolition or renovation activities as defined in the NESHAP regulations.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

- A. Would the project have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any candidate, sensitive, or special-status species; or
- B. Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS); or

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION:

The proposed project is to replace an existing bridge on East McKinley, over the Fresno Canal, with a new bridge that meets current standards. The County and Caltrans conducted a field review at the project site on September 3, 2013. No elderberry shrubs were identified and impacts to wetlands are not anticipated. Construction will commence in September and continue through early Spring. A Natural Environmental Study was prepared by Live Oak Associates in September of 2014 and found that sensitive biological resources including special status species or evidence thereof were absent from the Biological Study Area (BSA). The BSA was located near trees and shrubs that could be utilized for nesting by raptors and migratory birds and colonial birds were observed nesting under the bridge. Various bat species may also use the bridge for roosting and/or breeding. Incorporation of the following avoidance and minimization measures would ensure that the project has low or negligible effects on sensitive biological resources.

Mitigation Measures:

a) Avoidance: In order to avoid impacts to nesting raptors, migratory birds, and colonial nesting birds, project activities shall occur, where possible, outside the nesting season, or between September 1st and January 31st. Cliff swallow exclusion methods may be used to prevent

nesting under the bridge if the exclusion device (i.e. netting, etc.) is installed outside of the nesting season or if during the nesting season a biologist has completed pre-construction surveys (see Mitigation Measure 5.2b below) and determined that there are no eggs or young present in nests under the bridge.

b) Pre-construction Surveys: If project activities must commence during the nesting season (February 1-August 31), a qualified biologist shall conduct pre-construction surveys for active raptor and migratory bird nests and colonial nesting birds within 30 days of the onset of these activities. The survey area will include the BSA and a 250-foot buffer area surrounding the BSA, where accessible. If no active nests are found within the survey area, no further mitigation is required.

c) Establish Buffers: Should any active nests be discovered during the pre-construction survey, the biologist shall determine appropriate construction setback distances based on site conditions and the biology of the affected species. Construction-free buffers shall be identified on the ground with flagging, fencing, or by other easily visible means, and shall be maintained until the biologist has determined that the young have fledged.

Mitigation Measures: The following measures have been adapted from recommendations in the California Bat Mitigation Techniques, Solutions, and Effectiveness (Johnston et al. 2004) and Bat and Bridges Technical Bulletin – Hitch Hikers Guide to Bat Roosts (Erickson, G.A. 2002):

a) Pre-construction Surveys: A pre-construction survey for roosting bats shall be conducted by a qualified biologist within 15 days of the onset of construction during dusk. The survey area will include the East McKinley Avenue bridge over the Fresno Canal.

b) Avoidance of Active Maternity Roosts: If pre-construction surveys and subsequent project activities are undertaken during the breeding (maternity roosting) season (April 1-August 31) and active roosting bats are located under the East McKinley Avenue and Fresno Canal bridge, a 100-foot construction setback shall be established around the bridge, or alternate avoidance measures will be implemented in consultation with CDFW. The buffer areas shall be identified on the ground with flagging, fencing, or by other easily visible means, to prevent construction equipment and workers from entering the setback area. Buffers will remain in place for the duration of the breeding season, unless otherwise arranged with CDFW. After the breeding season, passive relocation of any remaining bats may take place as described below.

c) Passive Relocation of Resident Bats: During the non-breeding season (September 1-March 31), resident bats occupying the East McKinley Avenue and Fresno Canal bridge may be passively relocated by a qualified biologist or professional pest control specialist. Passive relocation shall entail installing one-way doors on the bridge or utilizing other humane exclusion methods where the bats are located and leaving these devices in place for at least 48 hours to ensure bats have vacated the bridge. The areas where the bats were roosting can then be sealed to prevent reentry.

Implementation of the above measures will reduce potential project impacts to roosting bats to a low to negligible level and ensure that the project is in compliance with state laws protecting this species.

- C. Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption or other means; or
- D. Would the project 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; or
- E. Would the project conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a Tree Preservation Policy or Ordinance; or
- F. Would the project conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local regional, or state Habitat Conservation Plan?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The proposed project is to replace an existing bridge on East McKinley, over the Fresno Canal, with a new bridge that meets current standards. This project would not likely affect any potential waters of the United States however the project could require a 1602 Streambed Alteration Agreement from California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW), Section 404 Nationwide Permit from the Army Corps of Engineers, a Section 401 Water Quality Certification and an National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit from the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). The bridge could span the entire channel or require work in the channel. This proposal will not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources or any provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state Habitat Conservation Plan.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

- A. Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5; or
- B. Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5; or
- C. Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature; or
- D. Would the project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION:

An Archaeological Survey Report was prepared by Applied Earthworks Inc. August of 2014. No cultural resources have been previously recorded and no previous cultural studies have been performed within the Area of Potential Effect (APE). A pedestrian survey was completed in July of 2014 with no findings and the Fresno County Library had no concerns regarding historical resources. The project was determined not eligible for the National Register of Historical Places.

Mitigation Measure:

Although the subject parcel is located in an area of low archeological sensitivity and has been extensively disturbed, if previously unidentified cultural materials are unearthed during construction, all work shall be halted in that area until a qualified archaeologist can assess the significance of the find. Additional archaeological surveys shall be needed if project limits are extended beyond the present survey limits.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

- A. Would the project expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including risk of loss, injury or death involving:

1. Rupture of a known earthquake?

(a.) Strong seismic ground shaking?

(b.) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

(c.) Landslides?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project area is located in the Eastside Valley Alluvial Plains region. Soils within the Project area are categorized as well drained soils of low alluvial terraces. Soils within the project area are suited to cotton, grain sorghum, sugar beets, orchard crops, and vineyards. The project site is not located within a fault zone or area of known landslides.

- B. Would the project result in substantial erosion or loss of topsoil?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

This proposal entails the replacement of an existing two lane timber bridge with a new two lane concrete bridge. Further, the site is flat and over the Fresno Canal. As such, there will be no significant erosion impacts resultant of this proposal.

- C. Would the project result in on-site or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse; or

- D. Would the project be located on expansive soils creating substantial risks to life or property?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The subject parcel is not located within an area of known risk of landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, collapse, or within an area of known expansive soils.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

This proposal entails the replacement of an existing two lane timber bridge with a new two lane concrete bridge. Fresno County Department of Public Health, Environmental Health Division has reviewed the project with no concerns related to water or sewer.

VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (Air District) has reviewed this proposal and expressed no concerns related to greenhouse gas emissions. .

VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

- A. Would the project create a significant public hazard through routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials; or
- B. Would the project create a significant public hazard involving accidental release of hazardous materials into the environment; or
- C. Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous materials, substances or waste within one-quarter mile of a school?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

This proposal entails the replacement of an existing two lane timber bridge with a new two lane concrete bridge. According to the Geotracker database, there are two Leaking Underground Tank (LUST) Cleanup Sites at the intersection of McKinley and Academy Avenues. The Country Home Video Site (T0601900322) is identified as completed - case closed. The Sun Maid Grocery site (T0601986784) is identified as open - site assessment. The proposed

project is over three quarters of a mile away from the LUST sites and would have no impact on them. Additionally, there are no schools within one-quarter mile of the project site.

D. Would the project be located on a hazardous materials site?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

A Hazardous Waste Initial Site Assessment was prepared August 21, 2014 by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) Hazardous Waste and Paleontology/Environmental Enhancement Branch and did not identify any open LUST cleanup sites that would affect the project. Existing paint may consist of lead based paint. All debris disturbed or produced while working on the structure must be contained. For bridges over water the containment system must include a skimming boom consisting of a float with a skirt to collect floating debris. This will be included as specification in the construction contract and a Condition of Approval below:

The Environmental Health Division is in agreement with the Caltrans report that "All debris disturbed or produced while working on the structure must be contained" and concurs with the proposed containment system as specified in the report. Due to the age of the existing bridge there is a high potential for hazardous materials to be contained within the "timber stringer bridge with reinforced concrete deck and concrete piers and abutments founded on driven piles". The Hazardous Waste Initial Site Assessment identifies potential hazardous substances contained within the existing bridge structure: lead and asbestos being two of the substances. Other hazardous substances used in the preservation of wood (creosols, tars, etc.) may also have been used on the bridge.

Condition of Approval:

All 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. These substances must also be disposed of at an approved disposal facility as determined by the characteristics.

- E. Would a project be located within an Airport Land Use Plan or, absent such a Plan, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area; or
- F. Would a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area; or

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project site is not located within an Airport Land Use Plan or in the vicinity of a public or private use airport.

- G. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted Emergency Response Plan or Emergency Evacuation Plan?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

This proposal will not impair the implementation of, or physically interfere with an adopted Emergency Response Plan.

- H. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project site is not located within a wildland area.

IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

- A. Would the project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise degrade water quality?
- B. Would the project substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge so that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table?
- C. Would the project substantially alter existing drainage patterns, including alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on or off-site; or
- D. Would the project substantially alter existing drainage patterns, including alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in flooding on or off-site; or
- E. Would the project create or contribute run-off which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted run-off?
- F. Would the project otherwise substantially degrade water quality?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED:

The Fresno Canal Bridge at East McKinley Avenue was classified as "structurally deficient" by Caltrans and has recently been determined to be eligible for replacement. The purpose of the proposed project is to replace the bridge with a wider, longer, and potentially higher structure that meets current design and loading standards.

A Final Water Quality Report was prepared in September 2014 by Caltrans and determined that potential water quality effects from Project-related construction activities can be minimized and reduced through implementation of Best Management Practices (BMPs) and compliance with existing regulatory requirements. Based on this analysis and the implementation of mitigation measures and BMPs specified below, the proposed Project

would not significantly impact water quality within the Project vicinity.

Construction activities associated with the proposed Project would have the potential of impacting the water quality of the irrigation canal. The potential impacts to water quality can be attributed to suspended solids being introduced into surface waters from grading activities or movement of construction equipment. Minimization measures for construction and long-term impacts would focus on the control of sediment and suspended solids from entering waterways. Commonly used construction activity BMPs would be required to minimize any potential impacts to the maximum extent practicable (MEP).

Comments were received April 17, 2014 by Design and again May 5, 2014 by Development Services from Fresno Irrigation District (FID) who owns FID's Fresno Canal which the bridge on McKinley goes over. This facility is used to deliver water to agricultural users and to route storm waters. Design Engineering staff has reviewed FID's comments and has agreed to work with them to meet their guidelines and concerns (letter dated October 1, 2014).

With the implementation of the mitigation measures below, impacts to water quality would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures:

a) Preparation and implementation of construction site temporary BMPs would comply with the provisions of the Caltrans Statewide NPDES Permit and any subsequent permit as they relate to construction activities for the proposed Project. These BMPs will include submission of a Notice of Intention (NOI) to the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) at least 30 days before the start of construction and submission of a Notice of Termination (NOT) to the RWQCB upon completion of construction and stabilization of the project site. Prior to any construction operations, temporary BMP's shall be installed and in place for the duration of the contract. The removal of these BMPs would be the final operation, along with the project site cleanup.

b) As part of ongoing construction activities associated with the project, the County shall follow Design Pollution Prevention (DPP) and Treatment Control BMPs for the proposed Project in accordance with the procedures outlined in the Stormwater Quality Handbooks, Project Planning and Design Guide. Compliance with DPP and Treatment Control BMPs would include coordination with the RWQCB with respect to feasibility, maintenance, and monitoring of Treatment Control BMPs as set forth in Caltrans' Statewide Stormwater Management Plan (SWMP). Since the project will disturb less than one acre, a Water Pollution Control Program (WPCP) will need to be prepared by a Qualified SWPPP Practitioner (QSP).

c) To reduce temporary impacts to the existing canal, all refueling, maintenance, and staging of equipment and vehicles shall occur at least 18.3 meters (60 feet) from riparian habitat or water bodies and not in a location from where a spill would drain directly toward aquatic habitat. Regular monitoring would ensure contamination of habitat does not occur during such operations. Prior to the onset of work, the County shall provide Caltrans (on behalf of the FHWA) with a plan for prompt and effective response to any

accidental spills. All workers would be informed of the importance of preventing spills and of the appropriate measures to take should a spill occur.

d) To control sedimentation during and after project implementation, Caltrans and the County shall implement best management practices outlined in any authorizations or permits, issued under the authorities of the CWA that it receives for the Project. If best management practices are ineffective, the County will attempt to remedy the situation immediately, in consultation with the regulatory and resource agencies.

G. Would the project place housing within a 100-year floodplain?

H. Would the project place structures within a 100-year flood hazard area that would impede or redirect flood flows?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The proposed project is for the existing two lane timber bridge to be replaced with a new two lane concrete bridge that meets current standards. The project does not include any housing. The project is located within Flood Zone A according to FEMA FIRM Map No. 06019C1620H however the replacement of the bridge would not redirect the flow of water in the Fresno Canal. A Location Hydraulic Study (March 3, 2014) and a Summary Floodplain Encroachment Report have been prepared for the project and found the nearest residence is approximately 620 feet southeast of the bridge and is outside Zone A which is contained within the canal levees. No other buildings in the area or crops are within Zone A.

I. Would the project expose persons or structures to levee or dam failure; or

J. Would the project inundation by seiche, tsunami or mudflow?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

No such impacts were identified in the project analysis.

X. LAND USE AND PLANNING

A. Will the project physically divide an established community?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

This proposal will not physically divide a community. The subject project is for a bridge replacement located within unincorporated Fresno County.

B. Will the project conflict with any Land Use Plan, policy or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The project site is surrounded with an area designated Agriculture in the adopted Fresno County General Plan. The proposed project is for the replacement of an existing bridge over the Fresno Canal. Potential impacts to Agriculture have been addressed above under Section II. AGRICULTURAL AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

- C. Will the project conflict with any applicable Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Community Conservation Plan?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

This proposal will not conflict with any Land Use Plan or Habitat or Natural Community Conservation Plan. No such Plans were identified in the project analysis.

XI. MINERAL RESOURCES

- A. Would the project result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource; or
- B. Would the project result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site designated on a General Plan?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

No mineral resource impacts were identified in the project analysis.

XII. NOISE

- A. Would the project result in exposure of people to severe noise levels; or
- B. Would the project result in exposure of people to or generate excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise level; or
- C. Would the project cause a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity; or
- D. Would the project result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The subject project is for the replacement of an existing bridge replacement located within unincorporated Fresno County. Temporary noise may occur during construction however there will not be any long term significant impacts. Further, this proposal was reviewed by the Fresno County Department of Public Health, Environmental Health Division, which expressed no concerns in regard to noise.

- E. Would the project expose people to excessive noise levels associated with a location near an airport, or a private airstrip; or

- F. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project site is not located in the vicinity of an airport and is not impacted by airport noise.

XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING

- A. Would the project induce substantial population growth either directly or indirectly; or
- B. Would the project displace substantial numbers of existing housing; or
- C. Would the project displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of housing elsewhere?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

This proposal will not result in an increase of housing, nor will it otherwise induce population growth.

XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES

- A. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered public facilities in the following areas:

1. Fire protection?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

This proposal was reviewed by the Fresno County Fire Protection District, which did not express any significant concerns with the project. The subject project is for a bridge replacement located within unincorporated Fresno County.

2. Police protection?

3. Schools; or

4. Parks; or

5. Other public facilities?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

No impacts on the provision of other services were identified in the project analysis.

XV. RECREATION

- A. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks; or
- B. Would the project require the construction of or expansion of recreational facilities?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

No such impacts were identified in the project analysis.

XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

- A. Would the project conflict with any applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system taking into account all modes of transportation; or
- B. Would the project conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demands measures?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The existing two lane timber bridge would be replaced with a new two lane concrete bridge that meets current standards. The existing bridge was built in 1939 and widened in 1970. Potentially, all four access roads could be realigned to accommodate the widened structure and approach railing. It is anticipated that the road would be closed during construction. Public controversy is not anticipated due to the low Average Daily Traffic (ADT) of 400 on McKinley Avenue and readily available off-site detour routes. Access to the access roads along the canal could, at times, be temporarily disrupted or limited during construction activities. This proposal was reviewed by the Road Maintenance and Operations Division and Design Division of the Fresno County Department of Public Works and Planning and the California Department of Transportation (CALTRANS), neither of which expressed any traffic related concerns.

The project is included in the Federal Transportation Improvement Program adopted by Fresno County Council of Governments on June 26, 2014.

- C. Would the project result in a change in air traffic patterns?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

This proposal will not result in a change in air traffic patterns.

- D. Would the project substantially increase traffic hazards due to design features?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

This project was reviewed by Road Maintenance and Operations Division and in their comments dated April 15, 2014, stated that this project will benefit the road system and that they will be involved in the review of the design of the bridge replacement. The existing two lane timber bridge would be replaced with a new two lane concrete bridge that meets current

standards. The existing structure is in poor condition and should be replaced due to its age and hydraulic deficiencies. The project will improve the condition of the current bridge and the safety of the area.

- E. Would the project result in inadequate emergency access; or
- F. Would the project conflict with adopted plans, policies or programs regarding public transit, bicycle or pedestrian facilities or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

No such impacts were identified in the project analysis.

XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

- A. Would the project exceed wastewater treatment requirements; or
- B. Would the project require construction of or the expansion of a new water or wastewater treatment facilities?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project will not generate the need for utilities beyond those already existing. There are no existing utilities on the bridge. The replacement of a bridge will not utilize individual water and sewer systems and will not exceed wastewater treatment requirements or require construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities.

- C. Would the project require or result in the construction or expansion of new stormwater drainage facilities?
- D. Would the project have sufficient water supplies available from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?
- E. Would the project result in a determination of inadequate wastewater treatment capacity to serve project demand?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project will not require new or expanded water entitlements or result in a determination of inadequate wastewater treatment capacity to serve project demand.

- F. Would the project be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity; or
- G. Would the project comply with federal, state and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project was reviewed by the Resources Division with no indication of insufficient landfill capacity or significant solid waste related impacts. Disposal sites, if required, will be accomplished from existing commercial facilities.

XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

- A. Does the project have the potential to 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, 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 prehistory or history?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICATION IMPACT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED:

Although potential impacts to biological resources and cultural resources were identified, the impacts were reduced to a level of less than significant with the incorporation of mitigation measures.

- B. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

No cumulatively considerable impacts were identified in the project analysis.

The project is included in in the Federal Transportation Improvement Program adopted by Fresno County Council of Governments on June 26, 2014.

- C. Does the project have environmental impacts which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

No substantial adverse impacts on human beings were identified in the project analysis.

CONCLUSION/SUMMARY

Based upon the Initial Study 6830, staff has concluded that the project will not have a significant effect on the environment. It has been determined that there would be no impacts to mineral resources, and recreation.

Potential impacts related to aesthetics, air quality, agriculture, land use and planning, population and housing, public services, utilities and service systems, and transportation and traffic have been determined to be less than significant. Potential impacts relating to biology, cultural resources, geology and soils, hazards and hazardous materials, noise, and hydrology have been determined to be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

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