

**DRAFT INITIAL STUDY
AND PROPOSED NEGATIVE DECLARATION**

Application No. 16-01 – Tentative Parcel Map, General Plan Amendment, and Rezone

Prepared by:
City of Mendota
Planning & Building Department

July 6, 2016

INITIAL STUDY

1. **Project Title: Application No. 16-01, Tentative Parcel Map, General Plan Amendment, and Rezone**
2. **Lead Agency & Address:** City of Mendota, 643 Quince Street, Mendota, CA 93640; Telephone: (559) 655-3291
3. **Lead Agency Contact Person:** Cristian Gonzalez, Director of Planning & Public Works; City of Mendota, 643 Quince Street, Mendota, CA 93640; Telephone: (559) 860-8882; Email: cristian@cityofmendota.com.
4. **Project Location:** The Project site consists of Fresno County Assessor's Parcel Number (APN) 012-200-26, located at the northeast corner of Sorensen and McCabe Avenues in Mendota, CA. The parcel consists of 7.79 acres, and contains one single-family dwelling addressed as 191 Sorensen Avenue.
5. **Project Sponsor & Address:** Alan and Eric Hansen, 837 Oller Street, Mendota, CA 93640
6. **Existing General Plan Designation:** Medium Density Residential
7. **Existing Zoning:** Most of the site (5.15 acres) is within the R-1 Single-Family/Medium Density Residential District. Other portions of the site are zoned R-3 High Density Multiple Family (2.00 acres) and C-3 Central Business and Shopping (0.64 acres).
8. **Project Description:**
The proposed Project includes amending the General Plan Land Use Designation of the site to High Density Residential, rezoning of the entirety of the site to R-3 High Density Multiple Family, and subdivision of the property into two parcels of 0.43 acres and 7.36 acres. The smaller parcel would contain the existing residence.
9. **Project Setting:** The site abuts an additional single-family residence and the Fresno County Fire Protection District Mendota Station 96. Across Sorensen Avenue to the west is extensive single-family development. To the east is limited commercial development and Derrick Avenue (State Route 33). McCabe Elementary School and the Mendota Unified School District offices are across McCabe Avenue to the south.
10. **Other Public Agencies Whose Approval is Required:** None.

11. **Other Documents Incorporated by Reference in this Review:** (i) City of Mendota General Plan Update 2005-2025, and (ii) Mendota Municipal Code Title 17, Zoning Ordinance.

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 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 & Hazardous	<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	

DETERMINATION BY CITY OF MENDOTA

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project **COULD NOT** have a significant effect on the environment, and 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 revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A **MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a significant effect on the environment, and an **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required.
- I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.


Signed

7/10/10
Date

Cristian Gonzalez
Printed Name

City of Mendota
For

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

- 1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (*e.g.* the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (*e.g.* the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- 2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- 4) “Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less Than Significant Impact.” The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from “Earlier Analyses,” as described in (5) below, may be cross-referenced).
- 5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a) *Earlier Analysis Used.* Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b) *Impacts Adequately Addressed.* Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c) *Mitigation Measures.* For effects that are “Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated,” describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.

- 6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (*e.g.*, general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
- 7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
- 8) This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
- 9) The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a) the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b) the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance.

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. AESTHETICS – Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?				√
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?				√
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?				√
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?				√
<p>Discussion</p> <p>Item a): The Project site is not located within a scenic vista. The surrounding area is characterized by existing residential, commercial, and public uses. No modifications to the site are proposed or contemplated. The proposed Project would have no impact.</p> <p>Item b): The Project site is not located in the vicinity of scenic resources or historic buildings within a state scenic highway. The proposed Project would have no impact.</p> <p>Item c): The Project site is not located in the vicinity of scenic resources. The surrounding area is characterized by existing residential, commercial, and public uses. No modifications to the site are proposed or contemplated. The proposed Project would have no impact.</p> <p>Item d): No modifications to the site are proposed or contemplated. The proposed Project would have no impact.</p>				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES: In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. .Would the project:</p>				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non- agricultural use?				√
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				√
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), or timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?				√
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				√
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of				√

Farmland, to non-agricultural use, or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				
<p>Discussion</p> <p>Item a): The proposed Project does not contemplate the conversion of any prime farmland, unique farmlands, or farmland of statewide importance to nonagricultural uses. The proposed Project would have no impact.</p> <p>Item b): The proposed Project does not propose to modify the zoning of any agriculturally-zoned property, or convert any prime farmlands, unique farmlands, or farmland of statewide importance to a nonagricultural use. The proposed Project would have no impact.</p> <p>Items c), d): The proposed Project does not contemplate the conversion of any forest land to non-forest use. The Proposed Project does not propose to modify the zoning of any forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)), or timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g)). The proposed Project would have no impact.</p> <p>Item e): The proposed Project does not contemplate the conversion of any prime farmland, unique farmlands, or farmland of statewide importance to nonagricultural uses. The proposed Project would have no impact.</p>				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
III. AIR QUALITY: Where Available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?				√
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?				√
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?				√
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?				√
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?				√
Discussion Items a) through d): <p>The proposed Project does not contemplate the construction of any new facilities or any land uses. As a result, the proposed Project would not result in any new construction-related emissions of pollutants, including criteria pollutants and greenhouse gases. The proposed Project would have no impact.</p> Item e): The proposed Project would not emit any odors, and thus would not create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. The proposed Project would have no impact .				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES: -- Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				√
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?				√
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?				√
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?				√
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?				√

f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?				√
--	--	--	--	---

Discussion

Items a), b):

The Project site is located within an urbanized area that is adjacent to other existing uses and State Route 33, and does not propose any development. Because of the developed nature of the area and lack of proposed construction, the proposed Project would not result in any habitat modifications, or affect 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, or any riparian species or habitat. Therefore, the proposed Project will have **no impact**.

Item c): There are no federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act on or within the vicinity of the Project site. The property contains no discernible drainage courses, inundated areas, wetland vegetation, hydric soils, and thus does not include any USACOE jurisdictional drainages or wetlands. The proposed Project will have **no impact**.

Item d): The Project site is located within an urbanized area that is adjacent to other existing uses and State Route 33, and does not propose any development. The proposed Project will not result in a barrier to 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. The proposed Project will have **no impact**.

Item e): The Project site does not contain any resources, such as trees, that would invoke any protection contemplated under any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance. The Proposed Project will have **no impact**.

Item f): The Project site is located within an urbanized area that is adjacent to other existing uses and State Route 33, and does not propose any development. The proposed Project does not implicate and thus will not impact an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. The proposed Project will have **no impact**.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES: Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in § 15064.5?				√
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?				√
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?				√
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?				√
<p>Discussion</p> <p>Items a) through d):</p> <p>The Project site is located within an urbanized area that is adjacent to other existing uses and State Route 33, and does not propose any development. No known historical or archaeological resource, unique paleontological resource, unique geologic feature, or human remains in or out of formal cemeteries will be impacted. The proposed Project would have no impact.</p>				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.				√
2) Strong seismic ground shaking?				√
3) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?				√
4) Landslides?				√
b) Results in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?				√
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?				√
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?				√
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?				
<p>Discussion</p> <p>Items a) through d):</p> <p>The Project site is located within an urbanized area that is adjacent to other existing uses and State Route 33, and does not propose any development. The proposed Project does not include any structures, ground disturbances, or other elements that could expose persons or property to geological hazards. There would be no risk of landslide or erosion of topsoil. The proposed Project would have no impact.</p> <p>Item e): The Project does not propose any construction. Any future structures located on the site would be served by the City water system. The proposed Project does not contemplate any action that would result in any soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater. The proposed Project would have no impact.</p>				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS: Would the project:				
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?				√
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing greenhouse gas emissions?				√
<p>Discussion</p> <p>Items a), b):</p> <p>The Project does not propose any development. As a result, it would not result in any new construction-related emissions of pollutants, including greenhouse gases. The proposed Project would have no impact.</p>				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS: Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?				√
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?				√
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				√
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?				√
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				√
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?				√
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency				√

response plan or emergency evacuation 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?				√
<p>Discussion</p> <p>Items a) through h):</p> <p>The Proposed Project does not contemplate the construction of any new facilities or any land uses. Compared to existing conditions, the proposed Project would not result in any significant hazards to the public. The proposed Project would have no impact.</p>				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY: Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements.				√
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)?			√	
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?				√
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?				√
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?			√	
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?				√

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?				√
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?				√
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?				√
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				√

Items a), e), f):

The Project site is located within an urbanized area that is adjacent to other existing uses and State Route 33, and does not propose any development. It is not adjacent to any body of water that could potentially result in violation of water quality standards or waste discharge requirements, or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff. The proposed Project would have **no impact**.

Item b): The Project site is located within an urbanized area that is adjacent to other existing uses and State Route 33, and does not propose any development. The parcel is within the City's service area, and the City in turn receives its water from several wells located in and around the City. The existing dwelling on the site is currently connected to City water and sewer. Since no development is proposed in the foreseeable future, implementation of the proposed Project would not create a substantial demand on groundwater sources and would not significantly change the amount of groundwater available and pumped from the City's wells. The proposed Project would have a **less-than-significant impact**.

Items c), d):

The proposed Project does not contemplate the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or any other alteration of an existing drainage pattern. The proposed Project would have **no impact**.

Item e): The Project site is located within an urbanized area that is adjacent to other existing uses and State Route 33, and does not propose any development. Runoff from the Project site is currently, and would continue to be, collected by the City's existing stormwater drainage system, which has sufficient capacity to serve the site. The

proposed Project would have a **less-than-significant impact**.

Item g): The proposed Project does not contemplate the construction of housing, or the modification of any 100-year flood hazard area, federal Flood Hazard Boundary, Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map. The proposed Project would have **no impact**.

Item h): The proposed Project does not contemplate the placement of any within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows. The proposed Project would have **no impact**.

Item j): The Project will not expose people, structures, or land to hazards such as seiches, tsunamis, or mudflows. The use of the existing structure could not contribute to the kinds of seismic activities that would cause tsunamis or contribute to mudflows. The proposed Project would have **no impact**.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
X. LAND USE AND PLANNING: Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?				√
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?			√	
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?				√
<p>Discussion</p> <p>Item a): The Project site is located within an urbanized area that is adjacent to other existing uses and State Route 33, does not propose any development, and would not result in any division of an established community. The proposed Project would have no impact.</p> <p>Item b): The Project site is located within an urbanized area that is adjacent to other existing uses and State Route 33, and does not propose any development. The Proposed Project contemplates a General Plan Amendment from Medium Density Residential to High Density Residential and a corresponding change of zone R-1 Single-Family/Medium Density Residential and C-3 Central Business and Shopping to R-3 High Density Multiple Family. The 2.00-acre portion of the site currently zoned R-3 would remain unchanged. The Project site is surrounded by existing urban uses. The existing dwelling on the site is consistent with both the existing and proposed land uses and zone districts. All present and future land uses are required to comply with both the criteria and development standards in the City's General Plan Update 2005-2025 and the Zoning Ordinance, which will ensure any future development resulting from the proposed Project would not have a detrimental impact on adjacent land uses, as required under Policy LU-1.5. Based on the above information, the proposed use would not result in significant adverse environmental impacts. The proposed Project would have a less-than-significant impact.</p> <p>Item c): Refer to Section 3.4, item f). The proposed Project would have no impact.</p>				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XI. MINERAL RESOURCES: Would the project:				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?				√
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally- important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?				√
<p>Discussion</p> <p>Item a) and b):</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">The Project site is not designated as being within a mineral zone by the Fresno County General Plan. The proposed Project would have no impact.</p>				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XII. NOISE: Would the project result in:				
a) Exposure of 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?			√	
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?			√	
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			√	
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			√	
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 expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?			√	
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?			√	

Discussion

Items a) through f):

The Project site is located within an urbanized area that is adjacent to other existing uses and State Route 33, and does not propose any development. The existing dwelling is not expected to generate noise that would exceed ambient levels, cause a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels, or cause groundbourne vibration. In addition, the City's restrictions on the generation of noise would apply to any noise generated by any land use authorized by the proposed Project. The proposed Project would have a **less than significant impact**.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING: Would the project:				
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)?				√
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				√
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				√
<p>Discussion</p> <p>Items a), b):</p> <p>The Project site is located within an urbanized area that is adjacent to other existing uses and State Route 33, and does not propose any development. Although there is an existing dwelling on the site, the proposed Project does not contemplate any new homes, roads, or other infrastructure. The proposed Project would have no impact.</p> <p>Item c): No person or housing will be displaced by the proposed Project. The proposed Project would have no impact.</p>				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES				
a) Would the project 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 rations, responses times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				√
Fire protection?				√
Police protection?				√
Schools?				√
Parks?				√
Other public facilities?				√
Discussion				
Item a): The project will not alter or require the construction of new schools, parks, or other public facilities, nor will it increase the need for police and fire services beyond existing conditions. The Proposed Project would have no impact .				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XV. RECREATION				
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?				√
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?				√
<p>Discussion</p> <p>Items a) and b):</p> <p>The Project site is located within an urbanized area that is adjacent to other existing uses and State Route 33, and does not propose any development. The proposed Project does not contemplate any new use that would result in the increase of use of existing neighborhood parks or other recreation facilities, or the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. The proposed Project would have no impact.</p>				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC: Would the project:				
a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing a measure 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?				√
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?				√
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that result in substantial safety risks?				√
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				√
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?				√
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?				√
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bikeways, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise substantially decrease the				√

performance or safety of such facilities?				
<p>Discussion</p> <p>Items a) , b), f):</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">The proposed Project does not contemplate the construction of any new facilities. As a result, the proposed Project does not contemplate any increase in vehicle trips, trip lengths, vehicle miles traveled, or parking compared to existing conditions. The proposed Project would have no impact.</p> <p>Item c): The proposed Project does not contemplate any improvements or modifications, including any improvements to land that could affect air traffic, including air traffic patterns and safety. The proposed Project would have no impact.</p> <p>Items d), e), g):</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">The proposed Project does not contemplate the modification of any roadway facilities or design features, nor does it contemplate any new structures or facilities different from existing land uses. As a result, the proposed Project would not result in any hazards relating to any design features or incompatible uses, inadequate emergency access, or decrease the performance of safety of existing public transit, bikeways, or pedestrian facility. The proposed Project would have no impact.</p>				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS: Would the project:				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?			√	
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?			√	
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?			√	
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?			√	
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?			√	
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?				√
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				√
Discussion				

Item a): The City's wastewater system complies with all Regional Water Quality Control Board requirements, and the City is aware of no facts to suggest the proposed Project would result in any new land uses that would cause the City to exceed those requirements. The proposed Project would have a **less than significant impact**.

Items b through e):

The Project site is located within an urbanized area that is adjacent to other existing uses and State Route 33, and does not propose any development. The proposed Project does not contemplate the construction or expansion of any water or wastewater treatment facilities or storm water facilities. Although the site contains an existing dwelling, that use has not impacted, and is not anticipated in the future to significantly impact, the need for additional facilities or water supplies. The proposed Project would have a **less than significant impact**.

Items f), g):

The Project site contains an existing single-family residence. This dwelling generates, and will continue to generate, small amounts of solid waste, and will continue to contribute fees associated with services associated with the collection of such wastes. The proposed Project would have **no impact**.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 history or prehistory?			√	
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?			√	
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? Note: Authority cited: Sections 21083 and 21087, Public Resources Code. Reference: Sections 21080(c), 21080.1, 21080.3, 21082.1, 21083, 21083.3, 21093, 21094, 21151, Public Resources Code; Sundstrom v. County of Mendocino, 202 Cal.App.3d 296 (1988); Leonoff v. Monterey Board of Supervisors, 222 Cal.App.3d 1337 (1990).			√	

Discussion

- Item a): The Project site is located within an urbanized area that is adjacent to other existing uses and State Route 33, and does not propose any development. The proposed Project contemplates changes to the General Plan Land Use designation and zoning of the site, with no proposal for development in the foreseeable future. Therefore, the proposed Project does not 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, and no impacts related to these topics would occur with project implementation.
- Item b): The Project site is located within an urbanized area that is adjacent to other existing uses and State Route 33, and does not propose any development. The proposed Project contemplates changes to the General Plan Land Use designation and zoning of the site, with no proposal for development in the foreseeable future. The proposed Project is not considered growth inducing and will not alter planned development patterns in the region. Also, no expansion of supporting infrastructure would be required to accommodate the proposed Project. Therefore, the proposed Project would not result in any impacts that are individually limited but cumulatively considerable.
- Item c): The Project site is located within an urbanized area that is adjacent to other existing uses and State Route 33, and does not propose any development. The proposed Project contemplates changes to the General Plan Land Use designation and zoning of the site, with no proposal for development in the foreseeable future. The limited activities contemplated by the Proposed Project would not result in substantial adverse impacts to humans.