



County of Fresno

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

October 27, 2017

State Clearinghouse
Office of Planning and Research
Attn: Sheila Brown, Administrative Assistant
1400 Tenth Street, Room 212
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Ms. Brown:

Subject: State Clearinghouse Review of Proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration for Initial Study Application No. 7275 (Complete Wireless Consulting)

Enclosed please find the following documents

1. Reviewing Agencies Checklist; and
2. Notice of Completion and Environmental Document Transmittal; and
3. Fifteen hard copies and one electronic copy of the proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration which is comprised of:
 - a. Notice of Intent to Adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration; and
 - b. Initial Study Checklist; and
 - c. Evaluation of Environmental Impacts.

We request that you distribute the documents to appropriate State Agencies for review as provided for in Section 15073 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, and that the review be completed within the normal 30-day review period. Please transmit any comments to my attention at the below listed address or to jshaw@co.fresno.ca.us

Sincerely,

Jeremy Shaw, Planner
Development Services Division

G:\4360Devs&PIn\PROJSEC\PROJDOCS\CUP\3500-3599\3572\IS-CEQA\CUP3572 SCH Ltr.docx

Enclosures



County of Fresno

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

DRAFT NOTICE OF DETERMINATION

To: Office of Planning and Research
1400 Tenth Street, Room 121
Sacramento, CA 95814

County Clerk, County of Fresno
2221 Kern Street
Fresno, CA 93721

From: Fresno County Department of Public Works and Planning, Development Services
2220 Tulare Street (corner of Tulare and "M") Suite "A", Fresno, CA 93721

Subject: Filing of Notice of Determination in compliance with Section 21152 of the Public Resource Code

Project: Initial Study Application No. 7275, Unclassified Conditional Use Permit
Application No. 3572

Location: The subject parcel is located on the south side of Garlock Lane, between Gooseberry Lane and Pennyroyal Lane (15899 Garlock Lane, Prather, CA 93651) (APN 138-371-45).

Description: Allow an unmanned wireless telecommunications facility consisting of the following equipment: A 70-foot tall monopole tower with 12 antennas and related ground equipment, including, a 10-foot wide access gate, an 11-foot five inch by 12-foot prefabricated equipment shelter and a propane backup generator with a 500 gallon propane storage tank, enclosed by a six-foot tall chain link fence topped with barbed wire, within a 50-foot-by 50-foot (2,500 square-foot) lease area portion of a 9.85-acre parcel in the AL-40 (Exclusive Agricultural, 40-acre minimum parcel size) Zone District.

This is to advise that the County of Fresno (Lead Agency Responsible Agency) has approved the above described project on December 14, 2017 and has made the following determination:

1. The project **will** **will not** have a significant effect on the environment.
2. An Environmental Impact Report (EIR) **was not** prepared for this project pursuant to the provisions of CEQA. / A Mitigated Negative Declaration **was** prepared for this project pursuant to the provisions of CEQA.
3. Mitigation Measures **were** **were not** made a condition of approval for the project.
4. A statement of Overriding Consideration **was** **was not** adopted for this project.

This is to certify that the Initial Study with comments and responses and record of project approval is available to the General Public at Fresno County Department of Public Works and Planning, 2220 Tulare Street, Suite A, Corner of Tulare and "M" Streets, Fresno, California.

Jeremy Shaw, Planner

Date

(559) 600-4207 / jshaw@co.fresno.ca.us

G:\4360Devs&Pin\PROJSEC\PROJDOCS\CUP\3500-3599\3572\IS-CEQA\CUP3572 NOD-Draft.docx

DRAFT

Notice of Completion & Environmental Document Transmittal

Mail to: State Clearinghouse, P.O. Box 3044, Sacramento, CA 95812-3044 (916) 445-0613
For Hand Delivery/Street Address: 1400 Tenth Street, Sacramento, CA 95814

SCH #

Project Title: Unclassified Conditional User Permit No. 3572 and Initial Study No. 7275

Lead Agency: County of Fresno Contact Person: Jeremy Shaw
Mailing Address: 2220 Tulare Street, 6th Floor Phone: 559-600-4207
City: Fresno Zip: 93721 County: Fresno

Project Location: County: Fresno City/Nearest Community: Unincorporated community of Prather

Cross Streets: South side of Garlock Lane between Gooseberry Lane and Pennyroyal Lane Zip Code: 93651

Longitude/Latitude (degrees, minutes and seconds): _____ ° _____ ' _____ " N / _____ ° _____ ' _____ " W Total Acres: 39.89

Assessor's Parcel No.: 138-371-45 Section: 3 Twp.: 11S Range: 22E Base: M.D.B & M

Within 2 Miles: State Hwy #: 168 Waterways: None

Airports: None Railways: None Schools: Foothill Elementary

Document Type:

- | | | | |
|---|--|------------------------------------|--|
| CEQA: <input type="checkbox"/> NOP | <input type="checkbox"/> Draft EIR | NEPA: <input type="checkbox"/> NOI | Other: <input type="checkbox"/> Joint Document |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Early Cons | <input type="checkbox"/> Supplement/Subsequent EIR | <input type="checkbox"/> EA | <input type="checkbox"/> Final Document |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Neg Dec | (Prior SCH No.) _____ | <input type="checkbox"/> Draft EIS | <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mit Neg Dec | Other: _____ | <input type="checkbox"/> FONSI | |

Local Action Type:

- | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> General Plan Update | <input type="checkbox"/> Specific Plan | <input type="checkbox"/> Rezone | <input type="checkbox"/> Annexation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> General Plan Amendment | <input type="checkbox"/> Master Plan | <input type="checkbox"/> Prezone | <input type="checkbox"/> Redevelopment |
| <input type="checkbox"/> General Plan Element | <input type="checkbox"/> Planned Unit Development | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Use Permit | <input type="checkbox"/> Coastal Permit |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Community Plan | <input type="checkbox"/> Site Plan | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Division (Subdivision, etc.) | <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Development Type:

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Residential: Units _____ Acres _____ | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation: Type _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Office: Sq.ft. _____ Acres _____ Employees _____ | <input type="checkbox"/> Mining: Mineral _____ |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Commercial: Sq.ft. <u>2,500</u> Acres _____ Employees _____ | <input type="checkbox"/> Power: Type _____ MW _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Industrial: Sq.ft. _____ Acres _____ Employees _____ | <input type="checkbox"/> Waste Treatment: Type _____ MGD _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Educational: _____ | <input type="checkbox"/> Hazardous Waste: Type _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Recreational: _____ | <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Water Facilities: Type _____ MGD _____ | |

Project Issues Discussed in Document:

- | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Aesthetic/Visual | <input type="checkbox"/> Fiscal | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Recreation/Parks | <input type="checkbox"/> Vegetation |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agricultural Land | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Flood Plain/Flooding | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Schools/Universities | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Water Quality |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Air Quality | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Forest Land/Fire Hazard | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Septic Systems | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Water Supply/Groundwater |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Archeological/Historical | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Geologic/Seismic | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sewer Capacity | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Wetland/Riparian |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minerals | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Soil Erosion/Compaction/Grading | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Growth Inducement |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Coastal Zone | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Noise | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Solid Waste | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Land Use |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Drainage/Absorption | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Population/Housing Balance | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Toxic/Hazardous | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cumulative Effects |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Economic/Jobs | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Public Services/Facilities | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Traffic/Circulation | <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Present Land Use/Zoning/General Plan Designation:

Rural Residential/ AL-40 (Limited-Agricultural, 40-acre minimum parcel size) / Agriculture

Project Description: (please use a separate page if necessary)

Allow an unmanned wireless telecommunications facility consisting of the following equipment: A 70-foot tall monopole tower with 12 antennas and related ground equipment, including, a 10-foot wide access gate, an 11-foot five inch by 12-foot prefabricated equipment shelter and a propane backup generator with a 500 gallon propane storage tank, enclosed by a six-foot tall chain link fence topped with barbed wire, within a 50-foot-by 50-foot (2,500 square-foot) lease area portion of a 9.85-acre parcel in the AL-40 (Exclusive Agricultural, 40-acre minimum parcel size) Zone District.

Reviewing Agencies Checklist

Lead Agencies may recommend State Clearinghouse distribution by marking agencies below with and "X". If you have already sent your document to the agency please denote that with an "S".


- | | |
|---|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Air Resources Board | <input type="checkbox"/> Office of Historic Preservation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Boating & Waterways, Department of | <input type="checkbox"/> Office of Public School Construction |
| <input type="checkbox"/> California Emergency Management Agency | <input type="checkbox"/> Parks & Recreation, Department of |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> California Highway Patrol | <input type="checkbox"/> Pesticide Regulation, Department of |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Caltrans District # _____ | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Utilities Commission |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Caltrans Division of Aeronautics | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Regional WQCB # _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Caltrans Planning | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resources Agency |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Central Valley Flood Protection Board | <input type="checkbox"/> Resources Recycling and Recovery, Department of |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Coachella Valley Mtns. Conservancy | <input type="checkbox"/> S.F. Bay Conservation & Development Comm. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Coastal Commission | <input type="checkbox"/> San Gabriel & Lower L.A. Rivers & Mtns. Conservancy |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Colorado River Board | <input type="checkbox"/> San Joaquin River Conservancy |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Conservation, Department of | <input type="checkbox"/> Santa Monica Mtns. Conservancy |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Corrections, Department of | <input type="checkbox"/> State Lands Commission |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Delta Protection Commission | <input type="checkbox"/> SWRCB: Clean Water Grants |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Education, Department of | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SWRCB: Water Quality |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Energy Commission | <input type="checkbox"/> SWRCB: Water Rights |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fish & Game Region # _____ | <input type="checkbox"/> Tahoe Regional Planning Agency |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Food & Agriculture, Department of | <input type="checkbox"/> Toxic Substances Control, Department of |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Forestry and Fire Protection, Department of | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Water Resources, Department of |
| <input type="checkbox"/> General Services, Department of | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other: <u>U.S. Fish and Wildlife</u> |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Health Services, Department of | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other: <u>S.J.V Air Pollution Control District</u> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Housing & Community Development | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Native American Heritage Commission | |

Local Public Review Period (to be filled in by lead agency)

Starting Date October 27, 2017 Ending Date November 27, 2017

Lead Agency (Complete if applicable):

Consulting Firm: <u>County of Fresno</u>	Applicant: <u>Complete Wireless Consulting</u>
Address: <u>2220 Tulare Street, 6th Floor</u>	Address: <u>2009 V Street</u>
City/State/Zip: <u>Fresno, A 93721</u>	City/State/Zip: <u>Sacramento, CA 95818</u>
Contact: <u>Jeremy Shaw</u>	Phone: <u>916-747-0624</u>
Phone: <u>559-600-4207</u>	

Signature of Lead Agency Representative:  Date: 10/23/2017

Authority cited: Section 21083, Public Resources Code. Reference: Section 21161, Public Resources Code.



E201710000296

County of Fresno

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

FILED

OCT 23 2017

TIME

1:12

FRESNO COUNTY CLERK
By *[Signature]*
DEPUTY

For County Clerk's Stamp

NOTICE OF INTENT TO ADOPT A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

Notice is hereby given that the County of Fresno has prepared Initial Study Application (IS) No. 7275 pursuant to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act for the following proposed project:

INITIAL STUDY APPLICATION NO. 7275 and **UNCLASSIFIED CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT APPLICATION NO. 3572** filed by **COMPLETE WIRELESS CONSULTING**, proposing to allow an unmanned telecommunications facility consisting of a 70-foot-tall monopole tower with 12 antennas and related ground equipment within a 2,500 square-foot lease area enclosed by a six-foot tall chain link fence topped with barbed wire, on a 39.89-acre parcel in the AL-40 (Limited Agricultural, 40-acre minimum parcel size) Zone District. The project site is located on the south side of Garlock Lane, between Gooseberry Lane and Pennyroyal Lane, approximately three and one-third miles south of the unincorporated community of Prather (15899 Garlock Lane) (APN 138-371-45) (SUP. DIST. 5). Adopt the Mitigated Negative Declaration prepared for Initial Study Application No. 7275 and take action on Unclassified Conditional Use Permit Application No. 3572.

(hereafter, the "Proposed Project")

The County of Fresno has determined that it is appropriate to adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Proposed Project. The purpose of this Notice is to (1) provide notice of the availability of IS Application No. 7275 and the draft Mitigated Negative Declaration, and request written comments thereon; and (2) provide notice of the public hearing regarding the Proposed Project.

Public Comment Period

The County of Fresno will receive written comments on the Proposed Project and Mitigated Negative Declaration from October 27, 2017, through November 27, 2017.

Email written comments to jshaw@co.fresno.ca.us, or mail comments to:

Fresno County Department of Public Works and Planning
Development Services Division
Attn: Jeremy Shaw
2220 Tulare Street, Suite A
Fresno, CA 93721

IS Application No. 7275 and the draft Mitigated Negative Declaration may be viewed at the above address Monday through Thursday, 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., and Friday, 8:30 a.m. to

12:30 p.m.(except holidays), or at <http://www.co.fresno.ca.us/departments/public-works-planning/divisions-of-public-works-and-planning/development-services-division/planning-and-land-use/initial-studies>. An electronic copy of the draft Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Proposed Project may be obtained from Jeremy Shaw at the addresses above.

Public Hearing

The Planning Commission will hold a public hearing to consider approving the Proposed Project and the Mitigated Negative Declaration on December 14, 2017 at 8:45 a.m., or as soon thereafter as possible, in Room 301, Hall of Records, 2281 Tulare Street, Fresno, California 93721.

Interested persons are invited to appear at the hearing and comment on the Proposed Project and draft Mitigated Negative Declaration.

For questions please call Jeremy Shaw (559) 600-4207.

Published: October 27, 2017



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. 7275, Unclassified Conditional Use Permit Application No. 3572
- 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:**
Jeremy Shaw, Planner, (559) 600-4207
- 4. Project location:**
The project site is located on the south side of Garlock Lane, between Gooseberry Lane and Pennyroyal Lane, approximately three and one-third miles south of the unincorporated community of Prather (APN 138-371-45) (15899 Garlock Lane) (SUP. DIST. 5).
- 5. Project Applicant's name and address:**
Maria Kim
Complete Wireless Consulting
2009 V Street
Sacramento, CA 95818
- 6. General Plan designation:**
Specific Plan Reserve Area in the County Adopted Sierra North Regional Plan
- 7. Zoning:**
AL-40 (Limited Agricultural, 40-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.)**
Allow an unmanned wireless telecommunications, facility consisting of the following equipment: A 70-foot tall monopole tower with 12 antennas and related ground equipment, including 11-foot five-inch by 12-foot prefabricated equipment shelter and a propane backup generator with a 500 gallon propane storage tank, enclosed by a six-foot tall chain link fence topped with barbed wire, within a 50-foot-by 50-foot (2,500 square-foot) lease area portion of a 9.85-acre parcel in the AL-40 (Limited Agricultural, 40-acre minimum parcel size) Zone District.
- 9. Surrounding land uses and setting: Briefly describe the project's surroundings:**
The surrounding area is primarily characterized by foothills, open space and residential land uses. The proposed tower site is approximately three and one-third miles south of the unincorporated community of Prather.

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:



Jeremy Shaw, Planner

Date: 9/19/2017

REVIEWED BY:



Marianne Mollring, Senior Planner

Date: 9-27-17

**INITIAL STUDY
ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM**
(Initial Study Application No. 7260 and
Unclassified Conditional Use Permit
Application No. 3566)

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:

- 2 a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?
- 2 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:

- 2 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?
- 2 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?
- 1 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:

- 1 a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable Air Quality Plan?
- 1 b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?
- 1 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 standards (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?
- 1 d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?
- 1 e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

- 2 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?
- 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 Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?
- 3 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?
- 3 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:

- 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?
- 3 e) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource as defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074?

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?
- 2 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:

- 1 a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?
- 1 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?
- 1 c) Create hazardous emissions or utilize 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) Result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area 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) Result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area for a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip?
- 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 or 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)?
- 2 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?
- 2 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?

- 2 e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?
- 2 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) Cause inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

X. 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:

- 1 a) Expose persons to or generate noise levels in excess of standards established in the local General Plan or Noise Ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?
- 1 b) Expose persons to or generate excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels?
- 1 c) Create a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?
- 1 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:

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 a) Fire protection?
1 b) Police protection?
1 c) Schools?
1 d) Parks?
1 e) 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?
1 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?
1 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?

XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Would the project:

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

XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Would the project:

- 3 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?
3 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 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
US EPA NEPAassist Tool: <https://nepassisttool.epa.gov/nepassist/nepamap.aspx>
Important Farmland 2014 Map, State Department of Conservation



County of Fresno

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

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

- APPLICANT: AT&T Mobility c/o Complete Wireless Consulting
- APPLICATION NOS.: Initial Study Application No. 7275 and Unclassified Conditional Use Permit Application No. 3572
- DESCRIPTION: Allow an unmanned wireless telecommunications facility consisting of the following equipment: A 70-foot tall monopole tower with 12 antennas and related ground equipment, including, a 10-foot wide access gate, an 11-foot five inch by 12-foot prefabricated equipment shelter and a propane backup generator with a 500 gallon propane storage tank, enclosed by a six-foot tall chain link fence topped with barbed wire, within a 50-foot-by 50-foot (2,500 square-foot) lease area portion of a 9.85-acre parcel in the AL-40 (Limited Agricultural, 40-acre minimum parcel size) Zone District.
- LOCATION: The project site is located on the south side of Garlock Lane, between Gooseberry Lane and Pennyroyal Lane (15899 Garlock Lane, Prather, CA 93651) (SUP. DIST. 5) (APN 138-371-45).

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The project site is located in a rural residential foothill area, on a 9.85-acre parcel with an existing single-family residence. There are existing trees and rock outcroppings on and surrounding the subject parcel, however the proposed lease area has been previously developed and graded, and the proposal does not entail the removal of any existing trees or rock outcroppings. Additionally, no historic buildings, scenic resources or scenic vistas were identified by any of the reviewing agencies during the project analysis. The subject parcel and proposed tower site are located in the vicinity of State

DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DIVISION

Route 168 which is designated a Scenic Highway per Figure OS-2 of the Fresno County General Plan. However, the proposed tower site would be located approximately three quarter-miles east of the highway, reducing potential adverse impacts to the Scenic Highway to a less than significant level.

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

One shielded motion sensor light adjacent to the door of the equipment shelter at the base of the proposed tower is indicated in the applicant's project support statement. No lights will be placed on the proposed tower unless required by the FAA. A Condition of Approval shall be included requiring that any lighting be hooded and downturned so as not to shine on adjacent properties, reducing any potential impacts to a less than significant level.

II. AGRICULTURAL AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

- A. Would the project convert prime or unique farmlands or farmland of statewide importance to non-agricultural use?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The subject parcel is located on lands classified by the 2014 Fresno County Important Farmland map as Rural Residential. The proposed tower site is on a residential parcel, surrounded by other residential parcels and open space in a foothill area. No prime or unique farmlands or farmland of statewide importance will be converted to non-agricultural use with this proposal.

- B. Would the project conflict with existing agricultural zoning or Williamson Act Contracts?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The subject parcel is not restricted under Williamson Act contract, nor is it zoned as forestland, timberland, or for timberland production. As the proposed lease area is limited in size to 2,500 square feet, and not located on farmland, the project will not result in conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses. The Fresno County Department of Agriculture reviewed the proposal and expressed no concerns.

- 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

- 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 forestland to non-forest use?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project site is not zoned for Timberland Production, or near any sites so zoned. The application does not propose any rezoning and proposes no changes to the environment that could result in the conversion of farmland or forestland to non-agricultural or non-forest use. The footprint of the project is a 50-foot by 50-foot lease area located on a rural residential parcel in a foothill area.

III. AIR QUALITY

- A. Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable Air Quality Plan; or
- B. Would the project violate 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: NO IMPACT:

The San Joaquin Air Pollution Control District (Air District) reviewed this proposal and expressed no concerns with the project. The project will not create objectionable odors affecting people on or near the subject property. The area consists of Rural Residential parcels and open space. The existing residence on the subject parcel is located approximately 327 feet +/- west of the proposed lease area. The nearest residence not on the subject parcel, is located approximately 344 feet +/- southwest of the proposed lease area on a neighboring parcel.

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?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED:

The subject parcel is located in an oak woodland and grassland area characterized by dispersed residential, open space and some limited commercial development and as such, has been previously disturbed, additionally the subject property and surrounding

property has been utilized for residential development and therefore, has also been previously disturbed. This proposal was referred to the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) for review and comments. The California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) commented that the project could potentially have a significant adverse effect upon the habitat of the state and federally threatened California Tiger Salamander (CTS).

* **Mitigation Measure(s)**

1. *Prior to the commencement of any ground-disturbing activities, the project site (50-foot by 50-foot proposed lease area) shall be assessed by a qualified biologist for the presence of potentially suitable California Tiger Salamander (CTS) habitat. If, as a result of the site assessment, it is determined that CTS are present, all ground-disturbing activity shall be halted and the applicant shall consult with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife to determine appropriate measures in order to avoid potential impacts to the CTS; which measures may require the applicant to obtain an incidental take permit from the California Department of Fish and Wildlife. The site assessment should follow the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) "Interim Guidance on Site Assessment and Field Surveys for Determining Presence or a Negative Finding of the California Tiger Salamander October 2003".*

- 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 Wildlife (CDFW) or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED:

* **Mitigation Measure(s)**

See recommended mitigation measures under subsection (A.) above.

- 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?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED:

There are no riparian habitats, sensitive natural communities, or wetlands within the project site. This project proposal was referred to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), which did not identify any concerns. This project proposal was also referred to the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW), which identified concerns

over potential impacts to the habitat of the state and federally threatened California Tiger Salamander (CTS), whose habitat could potentially occur in the vicinity of the project site depending on the occurrence of vernal pools and/or the existence of stock ponds in the vicinity. No other concerns were identified relating to; any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by CDFW or USFWS, or Federally-protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act; or the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or use of native wildlife nursery sites.

* **Mitigation Measure(s)**

See recommended mitigation measures under subsection (A.) above.

- 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: NO IMPACT:

There are no local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources in the area and there are no local, regional, or state habitat conservation plans in the area.

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 of 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; or
- E. Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource as defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED:

The subject property and surrounding area of moderate archaeological sensitivity, however the surrounding area has been developed with single-family residences and therefore contains areas in which the soil have been previously disturbed. The following

mitigation has been included to address the possibility of cultural resource finds during ground-disturbing activities:

* **Mitigation Measure(s)**

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

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; or
 2. Strong seismic ground shaking; or
 3. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction; or
 4. Landslides?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The subject parcel is not located along a known fault line according to the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act maps. The project site is not located in an area at risk of Seismic Hazard or Landslide Hazards per Figures 9-5 and 9-6 of the Fresno County General Plan Background Report.

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The project site is located in an area at risk of erosion according to Figure 7.3 of the Fresno County General Plan Background Report (FCGPBR). Grading activities could result in changes in topography and therefore potentially increase surface runoff at the project site; however, due to the limited size (2,500 square feet) of the project area, the proposal is not expected to result in substantial erosion or loss of topsoil. The Development Engineering Section of the Fresno County Department of Public Works and Planning indicated that a Grading Permit or Voucher shall be required for any grading proposed with this application.

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

The project is located in an area of steep slopes per Figure 7-2 (FCGPBR), the soil type in this region of Eastern Fresno County has been identified as exhibiting moderately high to high erosion potential, however the scope of the grading activities proposed with this project would be limited to the 2,500 square-foot lease area, per the discussion above. The project was reviewed by the Water/Geology/Natural Resources, and Development Engineering Sections, of the Fresno County Department of Public Works, which did not express any concerns with regard to the risk of landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse. According to U.S.G.S. Quad Maps, there are existing natural drainage channels adjacent to or traversing the subject parcel. As with all projects, any additional runoff generated by the proposed development must be retained on site or disposed of per County Standards.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project is not located in an area of expansive soils, per Figure 7-1 (FCGPBR).

- 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:

The proposal is for an unmanned cell-phone tower and no septic tanks or other sanitary facilities are proposed as part of this project.

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 any applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

No comments received from any of the reviewing agencies, expressed no concerns, supporting the determination that the project will not generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment.

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?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The proposed facility will utilize a propane standby generator with a 500-gallon fuel storage tank on site. Facilities proposing to use and/or store hazardous materials and/or hazardous wastes shall meet the requirements set forth in the California Health and Safety Code (HSC), Division 20, Chapter 6.95, and the California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 22, Division 4.5. Any business that handles a hazardous material or hazardous waste may be required to submit a Hazardous Materials Business Plan pursuant to the HSC, Division 20, Chapter 6.95.

- C. Would the project create hazardous emissions or utilize hazardous materials, substances or waste within one quarter-mile of a school?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

There are no schools located within one quarter-mile of the project site. The nearest school to the project site is Foothill Elementary, located approximately three and one half miles north of the proposed tower site.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

Per review of the project area using the United States Environmental Protection Agency's NEPAAssist, no hazardous materials sites are located within the boundaries of the subject parcel.

- E. Would a project 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?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project site is not located within an Airport Land Use Plan, and the project site is over four miles from the nearest public or private use airport.

- G. Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted Emergency Response Plan or Emergency Evacuation Plan; or
- H. Would the project 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 would not physically interfere with an adopted Emergency Response Plan; additionally the subject parcel is not near an urbanized area nor is it 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; or
- 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?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The subject application does not include provisions for the use of water on site, and no such use is anticipated. The site will be generally unmanned, excepting a monthly visit by a technician and no sanitary facilities are required. Project runoff will be retained on site or disposed of per County standards.

- 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 storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted run-off; or
- F. Would the project otherwise substantially degrade water quality?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The subject application does not include provisions for the use of water on site, and no such use is anticipated. According to U.S.G.S. Quad Maps, there are existing natural drainage channels adjacent to or traversing the subject parcel. As with all projects, any

additional runoff generated by the proposed development must be retained on site or disposed of per County Standards.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

No housing is proposed with this application.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

According to FEMA FIRM Panel 1060H, the parcel is not subject to flooding from the one-percent-chance storm event.

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

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project site is not located in an area at risk of dam failure flood inundation as defined by Figure 9-8 (FCGPBR), nor is the site prone to seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.

X. LAND USE AND PLANNING

A. Will the project physically divide an established community?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

There are approximately eight residences within a one-quarter mile radius of the project site including one located on the subject parcel. However, as the proposed lease area is limited to 2,500 square feet and a proposed 304-foot long by six-foot wide utility easement to connect to an existing utility pole, and no existing residences will be relocated or removed in conjunction with this proposal, the project will not physical divide an established community.

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 subject property is designated Specific Plan Reserve in the Fresno County Adopted Sierra North Regional Plan and is located in an area of open space and rural residential uses. The parcel is zoned AL-40 (Limited Agricultural, 40-acre minimum parcel size) and is not restricted under Williamson Act, Agricultural Land Conservation Contract. The

project will not conflict with any Land Use Plan, policy or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project site is not located in an area subject to a Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Community Conservation Plan.

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. The project site is not located in a mineral resources area identified in Figure 7-7 (FCGPBR).

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 levels; or
- C. Would the project cause a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity?
- D. Would the project result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

According to the applicants' operational statement, the only sources of noise associated with the proposed telecommunications facility will be air conditioners for cooling the equipment shelter, and the standby generator, which will be operated for an average of 30 minutes per month for maintenance purposes. The project will not generate severe noise levels or excessive vibration. There will be no permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity.

- 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 subject parcel is not located in the vicinity of a public airport or private airstrip, and is not impacted by airport noise. The nearest airport or airstrip, Westside Field Station, is located approximately four miles south of the proposed project site.

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:

No housing is proposed with this application. The project is an unmanned wireless telecommunications facility requiring no on-site employees. No housing or people will be displaced as a result of the project. The nearest residential dwellings are located on the subject parcel approximately 327 feet +/- west of, and on the neighboring parcel to the south, approximately 344 feet +/- southwest of the proposed tower site.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project will not result in additional need for additional public services. The subject application was specifically reviewed by the Fresno County Fire Protection District and the Fresno County Sheriff's Department, both of which had no concerns regarding impacts on public services. There are no parks within the project site vicinity and the

nearest school is Foothill Elementary, located approximately three and three-quarter miles north-northwest of the proposed tower site.

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 impacts on recreational resources 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:

After construction, the tower will be unmanned. Maintenance workers will access the site from a proposed 20-foot-wide joint access and utility easement (existing unimproved driveway accessing the subject property approximately once per month to perform routine maintenance. It will not conflict with any plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system or conflict with any congestion management program. The project will add one round trip per month, which is a less-than-significant increase to traffic on the roads.

- C. Would the project conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to, level of service standards and travel demands measures?
- D. Would the project result in a change in air traffic patterns?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project proposal is not in conflict with an applicable congestion management program. The project site is not within the review zone of any airport. There are no airports within five miles of the proposed project site.

- E. Would the project substantially increase traffic hazards due to design features; or
- F. Would the project result in inadequate emergency access; or

- G. 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:

The project will not interfere with emergency access or any adopted plans, policies or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities.

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

Once construction has been completed, the project will use no water, produce no liquid or solid waste, and will have no impact on existing utilities.

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 SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED:

Potential impacts on biological resources were identified in the analysis. With incorporation of the Mitigation Measure indicated in Section IV, any impacts on Biological Resources from the project will be reduced to a less than significant level.

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED:

The only cumulatively considerable impacts identified in the analysis were related to Cultural Resources, and Biological Resources. These impacts have been reduced to less than significant with the Mitigation Measures discussed in Sections IV and V.

- 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 impacts on human beings, either directly or indirectly, were identified in the project analysis.

CONCLUSION/SUMMARY

Based upon the Initial Study prepared for Unclassified Conditional Use Permit Application No. 3572, 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 Agriculture, Air Quality, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Hydrology and Water Quality, Mineral Resources, Population and Housing, Public Services, Recreation, or Utilities and Service Systems.

Potential impacts related to Aesthetics, Geology and Soils, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Land Use Planning, Noise, and Transportation/Traffic have been determined to be less than significant.

Potential impacts relating to Biological Resources and Cultural Resources and have determined to be less than significant with compliance with the Mitigation Measures.

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

JS

G:\4360Devs&Pln\PROJSEC\PROJDOCS\CUP\3500-3599\3572\IS-CEQA\CUP3572 IS wu.docx