



County of Fresno

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS AND PLANNING
STEVEN E. WHITE
DIRECTOR

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

APPLICANT: Jim Anderson/Rain, LLC

APPLICATION NOS.: Initial Study Application No. 7616 and Tentative Parcel Map Application No. 8195-R

DESCRIPTION: Allow the creation of three (3) parcels and a remainder from an existing 3.33-acre parcel located in the R-2 m (Low Density Multiple-Family Residential, Mountain Overlay, 6,000 square-foot minimum parcel size required) and C-4 m (Central Trading) Zone Districts.

LOCATION: The subject property is located on the southeast corner of Dalton Avenue and State Highway 168 and is approximately 2.5 miles northeast of the unincorporated community of Shaver Lake (APN 120-301-22) (44185 State Highway 168) (Sup. Dist. 5)

I. AESTHETICS

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

- A. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista; or
- B. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway; or
- C. In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage points.) If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

The project is located on State Highway 168 (Shaver Lake Road), which is a designated State scenic highway; however, the site is currently developed with 26 rental cabins, storage, restaurant, store, overhead utility lines, on-site septic system, access drive and parking areas. The project will not impact scenic vistas or resources as the project only divides land, and it does not create structures or features that have a reasonable potential for visual impacts. Other more intensive uses would require a discretionary

DEVELOPMENT SERVICES AND CAPITAL PROJECTS DIVISION

2220 Tulare Street, Sixth Floor / Fresno, California 93721 / Phone (559) 600-4497 / 600-4022 / 600-4540 / FAX 262-4893
Equal Employment Opportunity • Affirmative Action • Disabled Employer

land-use permit. Therefore, based on the limited scope of the proposed development, the proposal is seen as having a less than significant impact.

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

The proposal would allow the creation of new parcels from an existing parcel. Any future development would require any outdoor lighting that might have the potential of generating glare in the area would be limited by Zoning Ordinance section 820.3.020 which requires it to be “directed downward and shielded so that all direct light and glare is confined within the boundaries of the subject parcel, thereby minimizing off-site glare” and that “light sources shall be shielded to direct light rays onto the subject parcel only. The light source, whether bulb or tube, shall not be directly visible from an abutting property or public street rights-of-way.” Therefore, the project is seen as having a less than significant impact.

II. AGRICULTURAL AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

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

- A. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance, as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?

FINDING: NO IMPACT

There are no farming operations on this site. The proposed project will create three parcels and a remainder parcel and will not convert prime or unique farmlands or farmland of statewide importance to non-agricultural use. The project site is not designated as prime or unique farmland is developed with residential and commercial uses.

- B. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act Contract; or

FINDING: NO IMPACT

The project is not zoned for agriculture and there is not a Williamson Act Contract on the parcel. The project will not be in conflict with existing agricultural zoning nor would result in conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use as there are no farming operations on this site.

- C. Conflict with existing zoning for forest land, timberland or timberland zoned Timberland Production; or
- D. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use; or
- E. Involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

The project will not result in the loss of forest land or convert forest land to a non-forest use or result in the conversion of farmland to a non-agricultural use. The project is zoned R-2 m (Low-Density Multiple-Family Residential, Mountain Overlay) Zone District and C-4 (Central Trading) Zone District and located in the unincorporated community of Shaver Lake. There is no forest land or timberland on-site. The site is currently developed with 26 rental cabins, storage, restaurant, store, overhead utility lines, onsite septic system, access drive and parking areas. There is no development proposed with this parcel split. Therefore, it can be seen as having a less than significant impact.

III. AIR QUALITY

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

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

The San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District did not have any additional comments on the project but they did review the original application (TPM 7921) to create four parcels and a remainder from the same parcel at the Shaver Lake Point on April 14, 2004.

Future development resulting from this project may be subject to the following Air District rules: Indirect Source Review (Rule 9510), Regulation VIII (PM 10), Nuisance (Rule 4102), Architectural Coatings (Rule 4601), and Cutback, Slow Cure, and Emulsified Asphalt Paving and Maintenance Operations (Rule 4641).

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

The 3.33-acre site is currently developed with 26 cabins, a restaurant, store and associated infrastructure. The proposed project is to create three parcels and a remainder, and the project site is currently significantly developed. Contact was made with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and neither responded regarding any concern with any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community. However, there is no development proposed with this parcel split. Any future development on the newly created parcels may require clearance from CDFW.

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

According to the Wetlands Mapper of U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, a wetland may be present nearby the subject property. However, there is no development proposed with this parcel split. Any future development may require clearance from CDFW and other appropriate agencies regarding any requirements they may have.

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

The proposed project will not significantly impact wildlife in the area. The 3.33-acre site is currently developed with 26 cabins, a restaurant, store, and associated infrastructure. The application is only to subdivide the subject parcel. Any future development may require clearance from CDFW and other appropriate agencies.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT

The project will not conflict with any local, state, or federal policies or ordinances protecting biological resources. The project also will not conflict with the provisions of an adopted

Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state Habitat Conservation Plan.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED

The scope of this parcel map is to create three parcels and a remainder from an existing 3.33-acre parcel of land. The subject parcel is located within an area designated to be medium to highly sensitive for archeological resources. In the event that such resources are unearthed during grading or construction, all work shall be halted in the area of the find, and an Archeologist shall be called to evaluate the findings and make any necessary mitigation recommendations. If human remains are unearthed during grading or construction, no further disturbance is to occur until the Fresno County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition of the remains. If such remains are determined to be Native American, the Coroner must notify the Native American Commission within 24 hours. This requirement will be included in the following Mitigation Measure, which will reduce potential impacts to cultural resources to a level of insignificance:

* **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 shall be called to evaluate the findings and make any necessary mitigation recommendations. If human remains are unearthed during ground disturbing activities, no further disturbance is to occur until the Fresno County Sheriff-Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition. All normal evidence procedures shall be followed by photos, reports, video, and etc. If such remains are determined to be Native American, the Sheriff-Coroner must notify the Native American Commission within 24 hours.*

VI. ENERGY

Would the project:

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT

The project proposes to create three parcels and a remainder from an existing 3.33-acre parcel. The project will not result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources as there is no project construction or operation proposed. Therefore, the project will not conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency.

VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Would the project:

A. Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

- 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?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

According to the Earthquake Zone Application administered by the California Department of Conservation, the proposed parcels are not located within a rupture of a known earthquake fault. Additionally, per Figure 9-3 of the Fresno County General Plan Background Report (FCGPBR), the parcel is not located near any other identified Earthquake Hazard Zones.

- ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?

- iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

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

- iv. Landslides?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

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

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The proposal would result in creation of three parcels and a remainder from an existing 3.33-acre parcel. In considering the Applicant's intent, development of the proposed parcels could result in loss of topsoil. However, the potential for loss of topsoil is not considered

significant due to the development standards in place including being subject to grading permits and standards as well as the most current building code, which will mitigate significant impacts to topsoil loss.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

Potential future construction and paving activities could result in a change to the topography or ground surface relief features of the project site. Consequently, a minimal increase in soil erosion could result from the project. Potential effects related to topsoil runoff are not expected to be significant and will be addressed by mandatory adherence to standard construction practices contained in the Building and Grading Sections of the Fresno County Ordinance Code and Fresno County building permit requirements. Per Figure 7-1 of the FCGPBR, the subject parcel is not located in identified Expansive Soil areas.

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The project proposal is specifically to create three parcels and a remainder with no development being included in the proposal. If the proposed parcels were to be developed, the project site would be subject to building permits including for any proposed septic system or alternative waste water disposal system. The Environmental Health Division of the County of Fresno verified that the site could be able to adequately support the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems. With the pending implementation of the Fresno County Local Area Management Plan (LAMP), onsite waste water treatment systems shall comply with all Local Ordinances and State regulations, reducing the impact to less than significant.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

There is no known unique paleontological resource, site, or geologic feature. The project is for the subdivision of land and subsequent residential development will unlikely increase the risk of disturbing any unknown paleontological or geologic resource or features.

VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Would the project:

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

The San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (Air District) received the project application and did not provide any comments. The Air District provided comments for TPM 7921, the original application to create four parcels and a remainder from the subject parcel to which they did not express any concerns. The Air District's lack of specific project-related concerns supports the determination that the project will not generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment. The entire San Joaquin Valley Air Basin is designated non-attainment for ozone and particulate matter (PM 10 and PM 2.5). The project is subject to District Rule 4901 (Wood Burning Fireplaces and Wood Burning Heaters) and District Rule 4902 (Residential Water Heaters). The proposed project may be subject to Regulation VII (Fugitive PM 10 Prohibitions).

IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Would the project:

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT

The project proposes to legally create the subject parcels. There is no specific development or operation involved with the project that would create a significant hazard to the public or environment through the transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials or a hazard through upset or accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT

The project will not directly or indirectly emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within on-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school site.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT

Per the NEPAAssist database mainlined by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, the subject site is not located on a listed hazardous materials site nor would it result in creation of a significant hazard to the public or environment.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT

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

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT

Reviewing agencies and departments did not express concern to indicate that the project will result in impairing implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation nor were there expressed concerns that the project would expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires. The subject parcels are located within the State Responsibility Area (SRA) boundary. As such, any future development shall be in accordance with applicable SRA Fire Safe Regulations. Additionally, any future development shall also comply with the California Code of Regulations Title 24 – Fire Code. These requirements will be included as a Project Notes. Further, this proposal was reviewed by the Fresno County Fire Protection District, which did not express any concerns with the project.

X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Would the project:

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

The Water and Natural Resources Division of Fresno County Public Works and Planning provided comments for TPM 7921 on May 12, 2010, the original application to create four parcels and a remainder from the subject parcel to which they stated the following:

The proposed project is in a Low Water Area and that water from the existing well drilled on the proposed remainder parcel can only supply the proposed remainder parcel.

The California Department of Public Health, Drinking Water Division, provided comments dated June 23, 2010, regarding requirements for potential usage of the well:

Proposed Parcel Nos. one through three will be served by Shaver Lake Point No. 2 Mutual Water Company and a Can and Will Serve letter to that effect dated April 27, 2010 is on file.

Comments were received from the Water and Natural Resources Division and State Water Resources Control Board during the re-routing of the project, and both concur that the project will be served by The Point at Shaver Lake public water system. When future development should occur, the owner(s) of the new created parcels will be required to obtain a will serve letter from the system operator confirming the availability of an adequate supply of water. Therefore, the impacts to groundwater supplies can be seen as less than significant.

- C. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:
- i. Result in substantial erosion or siltation on or off site?
 - ii. Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on or off site?
 - iii. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or
 - iv. Impede or redirect flood flows?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

Potential runoff, flooding, erosion and siltation effects are not considered significant because any future development will be required to adhere to mandatory construction practices contained in the Building, Grading and Drainage sections of the County Ordinance Code. All storm water runoff resulting from any new development is required to be retained on-site.

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

There are no bodies of water near the project site that would indicate the site is at increased risk from tsunami or seiche zones. According to FEMA FIRM Panel 0450H, the southeastern portion of the subject property is within Flood Zone A, subject to flooding from the 100-year storm. Any future development within the flood hazard area shall conform to provisions established in Fresno County Ordinance Code Title 15, Chapter 15.48 Flood Hazard Areas. Floodplain information will be included on the recorded map.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT

Reviewing agencies including the California Department of Water Quality Control and other County departments did not express concern with the project to indicate that the proposal would conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable management plan.

XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING

Would the project:

- A. Physically divide an established community?

FINDING: NO IMPACT

This proposal will not physically divide a community.

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

According to the Policy Planning Section of the Fresno County Department of Public Works and Planning, Development Services and Capital Projects Division, the proposed division of land is compatible with the Shaver Lake Community Plan and Residential Reserve in the Shave Lake Forest Specific Plan. This is supported by the following policies:

The Shaver Lake Community Plan Policy relevant to the proposal is as follows:

Policy 609-01:1.00.d: Mountain residential is primarily intended for single family development. Multi-family uses within mountain residential shall be allowed only with Planned Developments and shall be subject to the criteria in Section 609-01:4.01k.

Policy 609-01:4.01(k): Multi-family residential development shall be allowed within areas designated mountain commercial subject to the compatible integration with commercial and other uses. The following criteria shall apply:

1. Multi-family units should be located on lots compatible with surrounding uses and of sufficient size to allow adequate setbacks, space between buildings, parking space, and internal circulation.
2. Multi-family uses should be located on a major street, close to public open space, and within convenient distance of shopping and community facilities.
3. Multi-family densities should not exceed ten units per net acre or increment thereof.
4. Residential and commercial uses within the same structure should be subject to minimum development standards of the commercial use with considerations made for parking and public facility needs of the residential use.

The County General Plan policy relevant to the proposal is as follows:

Policy PF-C.17: The County shall, prior to consideration of any discretionary project related to land use, undertake a water supply evaluation. The evaluation shall include the following:

- a. A determination that the water supply is adequate to meet the highest demand that could be permitted on the lands in question. If surface water is proposed, it must come from a reliable source and the supply must be made “firm” by water banking or other suitable arrangement. If groundwater is proposed, a hydrogeologic investigation may be required to confirm the availability of water in the amounts necessary to meet project demand. If the lands in question lie in an area of limited groundwater, a hydrogeologic investigation shall be required.
- b. A determination of the impact that use of the proposed water supply will have on other water users in Fresno County. If use of surface water is proposed, its use must not have a significant negative impact on agriculture or other users within Fresno County. If use of groundwater is proposed, a hydrogeologic investigation shall be required. Should the investigation determine that significant pumping-related physical impacts will extend beyond the boundary of the property in question, those impacts shall be mitigated.
- c. A determination that the proposed water supply is sustainable or that there is an acceptable plan to achieve sustainability. The plan must be structured such that it is economically, environmentally, and technically feasible. In addition, its implementation must occur prior to long-term and/or irreversible physical impacts, or significant economic hardship, to surrounding water users.

XII. MINERAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT

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

XIII. NOISE

Would the project result in:

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

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT

This proposal is to divide the subject parcel only, and there is no development included. Any use allowed under the Fresno County Zoning Ordinance is regulated by the Fresno County Noise Ordinance and any more intensive use requiring a land-use permit would be reviewed further for noise impacts. The project site is not located within two miles of a public airport or public use airport that would expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels.

XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING

Would the project:

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

Impacts related to population growth are not expected to be significant. There are no residential houses proposed with this application. Any future development will adhere to the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance and density and will not displace existing housing or people. Development rights would allow the resulting parcels to have a density of one single family residence per parcel. Future division or development of more than one home per parcel will require further land use and environmental analysis.

XV. PUBLIC SERVICES

Would the project:

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

- 4. Parks; or
- 5. Other public facilities?

FINDING: NO IMPACT

Reviewing Agencies and Departments did not express concern with the project proposal to indicate that provision of new or physically-altered governmental facilities are needed to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives. The proposed division of land does not pose any increase in demands for services or impede delivery of services.

XVI. RECREATION

Would the project:

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT

The project site is located within the community of Shaver Lake. Shaver Lake provides recreational resources to the public. The project will not result in an increase or expansion of recreational resources or facilities.

XVII. TRANSPORTATION

Would the project:

- A. Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities; or
- B. Be in conflict or be inconsistent with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b); or
- C. Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment); or
- D. Result in inadequate emergency access?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

The proposed project is to create three parcels and a remainder, and the project will not significantly increase capacity or generate significant traffic. Reviewing agencies and departments did not express concern with the application in terms of trip generation. Any intensive use requiring a land-use permit would be further reviewed for impacts to transportation impacts. The project would not conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or

policy addressing the circulation system, and is not in conflict with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3. There were no hazards due to design features or incompatible uses identified and no indication by reviewing Agencies and Departments that the project would result in inadequate emergency access.

XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION:

Per Assembly Bill 52 (AB 52) participating California Native American Tribes were notified March 23, 2026 of the subject application and given the opportunity to enter into consultation with the County on discussing the presence of tribal cultural resources on or near the project site. No participating California Native American Tribe expressed concern with the project proposal.

The subject parcel is located within an area designated to be highly sensitive for archeological resources, in the event that such resources are unearthed during grading or construction, all work shall be halted in the area of the find, and an Archeologist shall be called to evaluate the findings and make any necessary mitigation recommendations. If human remains are unearthed during grading or construction, no further disturbance is to occur until the Fresno County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition of the remains. If such remains are determined to be Native American, the Coroner must notify the Native American Commission within 24 hours. This requirement will be included in the following Mitigation Measure, which will reduce potential impacts to tribal cultural resources to a level of insignificance.

* **Mitigation Measure(s)**

1. *In the event that tribal cultural resources are unearthed during ground-disturbing activities, all work shall be halted in the area of the find. An Archeologist shall be called to evaluate the findings and make any necessary mitigation recommendations. If human remains are unearthed during ground disturbing activities, no further disturbance is to occur until the Fresno County Sheriff-*

Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition. All normal evidence procedures shall be followed by photos, reports, video, and etc. If such remains are determined to be Native American, the Sheriff-Coroner must notify the Native American Commission within 24 hours.

XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Would the project:

- A. Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects; or
- B. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years; or
- C. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments; or
- D. Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals; or
- E. Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

The project proposes to create three parcels and a remainder parcel from an existing 3.33-acre parcel. There is no development proposed with this project, although the Applicant indicates that future residential development may occur. Future residential development would be subject to all applicable federal, state, and local standards. The proposal will not require the relocation or construction of water, wastewater treatment or storm water draining, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities.

XX. WILDFIRE

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

- A. Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects; or
- B. Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire; or

- C. Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment; or
- D. Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

According to the 2023 Fresno County Fire Hazard Severity Zones in SRA Map by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (Cal Fire), the project site is located in or near a state responsibility area or land classified as a high fire hazard severity zone. There is no development with this proposal, but if future development of the site were to occur, development would be subject to applicable fire and building code standards. The project will not result in adverse impacts associated with wildfires.

XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Would the project:

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

Based on the limited project scope which does not include any construction or earth disturbance, the project does not have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment or reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

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

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

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

CONCLUSION/SUMMARY

Based upon the Initial Study prepared for Tentative Parcel Map Application No. 8195-R, 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 Energy, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Mineral Resources, Noise, Public Services and Recreation.

Potential impacts related to Aesthetics, Agricultural and Forestry Resources, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Geology and Soils, Hydrology and Water Quality, Land Use and Planning, Population and Housing, Transportation, Utilities and Services Systems and Wildfire have been determined to be less than significant.

Potential impacts relating to Cultural Resources and Tribal Cultural Resources have been determined to be less than significant with the identified Mitigation Measures.

A Mitigated Negative Declaration is recommended and is subject to approval by the decision-making body. The Initial Study is available for review at 2220 Tulare Street, Suite B, Street Level, located on the southwest corner of Tulare and M Street, Fresno, California, 93721.

G:\4360Dev_Engr\TPM\8100-8199\8195-R Rain LLC - Anderson\Initial Study\TPM 8195-R IS 7616 Write-Up.doc



County of Fresno

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS AND PLANNING

STEVEN E. WHITE, DIRECTOR

INITIAL STUDY ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

1. **Project title:**
Initial Study No. 7616 and Tentative Parcel Map Application No. 8195-R: Jim Anderson
2. **Lead agency name and address:**
Fresno County Department of Public Works and Planning
Development Services and Capital Projects Division
2220 Tulare Street, 6th Floor
Fresno, CA 93721-2104
3. **Contact person and phone number:**
Dana Dominguez-Rogge, Planner (559) 600-4232
4. **Project location:**
The project site is located on the southeast corner of Dalton Avenue and State Highway 168 and is approximately 2.5 miles northeast of the unincorporated community of Shaver Lake (APN 120-301-22) (44185 State Highway 168) (Sup. Dist. 5).
5. **Project sponsor's name and address:**
Jim Anderson
35244 Oil City Rd.
Coalinga, CA 93210
6. **General Plan designation:**
Sierra North Regional Plan
7. **Zoning:** R-2 m (Low Density Multiple-Family Residential, Mountain Overlay, 6,000 square-foot minimum parcel size required) and C-4 m (Central Trading)
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 the creation of three (3) parcels and a remainder from one (1) existing parcel.
9. **Surrounding land uses and setting: Briefly describe the project's surroundings:**
The subject parcels are located in an area of recreational, grazing and mixed residential land uses.
10. **Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement.)**
None
11. **Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1? If so, is there a plan**

for consultation that includes, for example, the determination of significance of impacts to tribal cultural resources, procedures regarding confidentiality, etc.?

Per Assembly Bill 52 (AB52), participating California Native American Tribes were notified of the project and given the opportunity to enter into consultation with the County regarding the proposal.

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

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

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

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

DETERMINATION OF REQUIRED ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT:

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

PERFORMED BY:

REVIEWED BY:


Dana Dominguez-Rogge, Planner


Tawanda Mtunga, Principal Planner

Date: 10/5/2020

Date: 6-5-2020

**INITIAL STUDY
ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM
(Initial Study Application No. 7616 and
Tentative Parcel Map
Application No. 8195-R)**

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

1 = No Impact

2 = Less Than Significant Impact

3 = Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated

4 = Potentially Significant Impact

I. AESTHETICS

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

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

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

- 1 a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance, as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?
- 1 b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act Contract?
- 2 c) Conflict with existing zoning for forest land, timberland or timberland zoned Timberland Production?
- 2 d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?
- 2 e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

III. AIR QUALITY

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

- 2 a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable Air Quality Plan?
- 2 b) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?
- 2 c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?
- 2 d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely 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?
- 2 b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?
- 2 c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally-protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?
- 2 d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?
- 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 pursuant to Section 15064.5?
- 3 b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?
- 3 c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

VI. ENERGY

Would the project:

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

VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Would the project:

- a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:
 - 1 i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault?
 - 1 ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?
 - 1 iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?
 - 1 iv) Landslides?
- 2 b) Result in substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil?
- 1 c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?
- 1 d) Be located on expansive soil as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?
- 2 e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?
- 1 f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Would the project:

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

IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Would the project:

- 1 a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?
- 1 b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?
- 1 c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?
- 1 d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?
- 1 e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?
- 1 f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?
- 1 g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?

X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Would the project:

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

XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING

Would the project:

- 1 a) Physically divide an established community?
- 2 b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

XII. MINERAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

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

XIII. NOISE

Would the project result in:

- 1 a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?
- 1 b) Generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels?
- 1 c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING

Would the project:

- 2 a) Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and

businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

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

XV. PUBLIC SERVICES

Would the project:

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

XVI. RECREATION

Would the project:

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

XVII. TRANSPORTATION

Would the project:

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

XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

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

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

XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Would the project:

- 2 a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?
- 2 b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?
- 2 c) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?
- 2 d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?
- 2 e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

XX. WILDFIRE

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

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

XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Would the project:

- 1 a) Have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?
- 1 b) Have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)
- 1 c) Have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

Documents Referenced:

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

Fresno County General Plan
Fresno County Zoning Ordinance
Important Farmland 2018 Map, State Department of Conservation
Fire Hazard Severity Zones in SRA 2023 Map, State Department of Forestry and Fire Protection

DDR

G:\4360Dev_Engr\TPM\8100-8199\8195-R Rain LLC - Anderson\Initial Study\TPM 8195-R IS 7616 Checklist.docx

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 # 2026060510

Project Title: Initial Study No. 7616 and Tentative Parcel Map No. 8195-R

Lead Agency: County of Fresno Contact Person: Dana Dominguez-Rogge
Mailing Address: 2220 Tulare Street Phone: 559-600-4232
City: Fresno Zip: 93721 County: Fresno

Project Location: County: Fresno City/Nearest Community: Shaver Lake

Cross Streets: Dalton Avenue and State Highway 168 Zip Code: 93664

Longitude/Latitude (degrees, minutes and seconds): 37 08 18.6 N / 119 18 30.1 W Total Acres: 3.33

Assessor's Parcel No.: 120-301-22 Section: 24 Twp.: 9S Range: 24E Base: MDBM

Within 2 Miles: State Hwy #: 168 Waterways: Shaver Lake

Airports: N/A Railways: N/A Schools: N/A

Document Type:

- CEQA: [] NOP [] Draft EIR NEPA: [] NOI Other: [] Joint Document
[] Early Cons [] Supplement/Subsequent EIR [] EA [] Final Document
[] Neg Dec (Prior SCH No.) [] Draft EIS [] Other:
[X] Mit Neg Dec Other: [X] FONSI

Local Action Type:

- [] General Plan Update [] Specific Plan [] Rezone [] Annexation
[] General Plan Amendment [] Master Plan [] Prezone [] Redevelopment
[] General Plan Element [] Planned Unit Development [] Use Permit [] Coastal Permit
[] Community Plan [] Site Plan [X] Land Division (Subdivision, etc.) [] Other:

Development Type:

- [X] Residential: Units 3 Acres
[] Office: Sq.ft. Acres Employees [] Transportation: Type
[] Commercial: Sq.ft. Acres Employees [] Mining: Mineral
[] Industrial: Sq.ft. Acres Employees [] Power: Type MW
[] Educational: [] Waste Treatment: Type MGD
[] Recreational: [] Hazardous Waste: Type
[] Water Facilities: Type MGD [] Other:

Project Issues Discussed in Document:

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

Present Land Use/Zoning/General Plan Designation:

Low Density Multiple-Family Residential and Central Trading/R-2 m and C-4/Sierra North Regional Plan

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

Application proposing to allow creation of three (3) parcels and a remainder from an existing 3.33-acre parcel located in the R-2 m (Low Density Multiple-Family Residential, Mountain Overlay, 6,000 square-foot minimum parcel size required) and C-4 m (Central Trading) Zone Districts. The subject property is located on the southeast corner of Dalton Avenue and State Highway 168 and is approximately 2.5 miles northeast of the unincorporated community of Shaver Lake.

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 type="checkbox"/> California Highway Patrol | <input type="checkbox"/> Pesticide Regulation, Department of |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Caltrans District # <u>6</u> | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Utilities Commission |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Caltrans Division of Aeronautics | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Regional WQCB # <u>5</u> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Caltrans Planning | <input type="checkbox"/> Resources Agency |
| <input 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 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 type="checkbox"/> Energy Commission | <input type="checkbox"/> SWRCB: Water Rights |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fish & Game Region # <u>4</u> | <input type="checkbox"/> Tahoe Regional Planning Agency |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Food & Agriculture, Department of | <input type="checkbox"/> Toxic Substances Control, Department of |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Forestry and Fire Protection, Department of | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Water Resources, Department of |
| <input type="checkbox"/> General Services, Department of | <input type="checkbox"/> Other: <u>U.S Fish and Wildlife Service</u> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Health Services, Department of | <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Housing & Community Development | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Native American Heritage Commission | |

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

Starting Date 6/10/2026 Ending Date 7/9/2026

Lead Agency (Complete if applicable):

Consulting Firm: <u>County of Fresno</u>	Applicant: <u>Jim Anderson/Rain LLC</u>
Address: <u>2220 Tulare Street, 6th Floor</u>	Address: <u>35244 Oil City Rd.</u>
City/State/Zip: <u>Fresno, CA 93721</u>	City/State/Zip: <u>Coalinga, CA 93210</u>
Contact: <u>Dana Dominguez-Rogge</u>	Phone: <u>(559) 935-1681</u>
Phone: <u>(559) 600-4232</u>	

Signature of Lead Agency Representative: *Dana Dominguez-Rogge* Date: 6/10/2026

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



State of California - Department of Fish and Wildlife
2026 ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT FILING FEE CASH RECEIPT
 DFW 753.5a (REV. 01/01/26) Previously DFG 753.5a

RECEIPT NUMBER:
E202610000159
 STATE CLEARINGHOUSE NUMBER (if applicable)

SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON REVERSE. TYPE OR PRINT CLEARLY.

LEAD AGENCY PUBLIC WORKS AND PLANNING	LEAD AGENCY EMAIL	DATE 06/08/2026
COUNTY/STATE AGENCY OF FILING FRESNO COUNTY	DOCUMENT NUMBER E202610000159	

PROJECT TITLE
 INITIAL STUDY APPLICATION NO. 7616 & TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP APP NO. 8195-R

PROJECT APPLICANT NAME COUNTY OF FRESNO	PROJECT APPLICANT EMAIL	PHONE NUMBER (559) 600-4232
PROJECT APPLICANT ADDRESS 2220 TULARE ST, STE B	CITY FRESNO	STATE CA
		ZIP CODE 93721

PROJECT APPLICANT (Check appropriate box)


Local Public Agency School District Other Special District State Agency Private Entity

CHECK APPLICABLE FEES:

<input type="checkbox"/> Environmental Impact Report (EIR)	\$4,227.50	\$	<u>0.00</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> Mitigated/Negative Declaration (MND)(ND)	\$3,043.75	\$	<u>0.00</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> Certified Regulatory Program (CRP) document - payment due directly to CDFW	\$1,437.25	\$	<u>0.00</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> Exempt from fee			
<input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Exemption (attach)			
<input type="checkbox"/> CDFW No Effect Determination (attach)			
<input type="checkbox"/> Fee previously paid (attach previously issued cash receipt copy)			
<hr/>			
<input type="checkbox"/> Water Right Application or Petition Fee (State Water Resources Control Board only)	\$850.00	\$	<u>0.00</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> County documentary handling fee	\$50.00	\$	<u>0.00</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> Other		\$	<u>0.00</u>

PAYMENT METHOD:

Cash Credit Check Other NOI TOTAL RECEIVED \$ 0.00

SIGNATURE X 	AGENCY OF FILING PRINTED NAME AND TITLE Pricilla Gonzalez Deputy Clerk
---	--

E202610000159



County of Fresno

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

FILED

JUN 08 2026

TIME 1:15pm

FRESNO COUNTY CLERK
BY _____ DEPUTY

For County Clerk's Stamp

NOTICE OF INTENT TO ADOPT A NEGATIVE DECLARATION

Notice is hereby given that the County of Fresno has prepared Initial Study Application (IS) No. 7616 pursuant to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act for the following proposed project:

INITIAL STUDY APPLICATION NO. 7616 and **TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP APPLICATION NO. 8195-R** filed by **JIM ANDERSON**, proposing to create three (3) parcels and a remainder from an existing 3.33-acre parcel located in the R-2 m (Low Density Multiple-Family Residential, Mountain Overlay, 6,000 square-foot minimum parcel size required) and C-4 m (Central Trading) Zone Districts. The subject property is generally located on the southeast corner of Dalton Avenue and State Highway 168 and is approximately 2.5 miles northeast of the unincorporated community of Shaver Lake (APN 120-301-22) (44185 State Highway 168) (Sup. Dist. 5). Adopt the Mitigated Negative Declaration prepared for Initial Study Application No. 7616 and take action on TPM Application No. 8195-R with Findings and Conditions.

(hereafter, the "Proposed Project")

The County of Fresno has determined that it is appropriate to adopt a Negative Declaration for the Proposed Project. The purpose of this Notice is to (1) provide notice of the availability of IS Application No. 7616 and the draft 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 Negative Declaration from June 10, 2026 through July 9, 2026

Email written comments to ddominguezrogge@fresnocountyca.gov, or mail comments to:

Fresno County Department of Public Works and Planning
Development Services and Capital Projects Division
Attn: Dana Dominguez-Rogge
2220 Tulare Street, Suite B

E262610000159

Fresno, CA 93721

IS Application No. 7616 and the draft 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 www.co.fresno.ca.us/initialstudies. An electronic copy of the draft Negative Declaration for the Proposed Project may be obtained from Dana Dominguez-Rogge at the addresses above.

For questions please call Dana Dominguez-Rogge (559) 600-4232

Published: June 10, 2026

Summary Form for Electronic Document Submittal

Form F

Lead agencies may include 15 hardcopies of this document when submitting electronic copies of Environmental Impact Reports, Negative Declarations, Mitigated Negative Declarations, or Notices of Preparation to the State Clearinghouse (SCH). The SCH also accepts other summaries, such as EIR Executive Summaries prepared pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15123. Please include one copy of the Notice of Completion Form (NOC) with your submission and attach the summary to each electronic copy of the document.

SCH #: 2026060510

Project Title: Initial Study No. 7616 and Tentative Parcel Map No. 8195-R

Lead Agency: Fresno County

Contact Name: Dana Dominguez-Rogge

Email: ddominguezrogge@fresnocountyca.gov Phone Number: (559) 600-4232

Project Location: Shaver Lake, APN 120-301-22 Fresno County
City *County*

Project Description (Proposed actions, location, and/or consequences).

Allow the creation of three (3) parcels and a remainder from an existing 3.33-acre parcel located in the R-2 m (Low Density, Multiple-Family Residential Mountain Overlay, 6,000 square-foot minimum parcel size required) and C-4 m (Central Trading) Zone Districts.

The subject property is located on the southeast corner of Dalton Avenue and State Highway 168 and is approximately 2.5 miles northeast of the unincorporated community of Shaver Lake.

Identify the project's significant or potentially significant effects and briefly describe any proposed mitigation measures that would reduce or avoid that effect.

It has been determined that there would be no impacts or a less than significant impact to Aesthetics, Agricultural and Forestry Resources, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Energy, Geology and Soils, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Hydrology and Water Quality, Land Use Planning, Mineral Resources, Noise, Population and Housing, Public Services, Recreation, Transportation, Utilities and Service Systems, and Wildfire.

Potential impacts related to Cultural Resources and Tribal Cultural Resources have determined to be less than significant with compliance with included mitigation measures.

If applicable, describe any of the project's areas of controversy known to the Lead Agency, including issues raised by agencies and the public.

No areas of controversy were identified by reviewing agencies or the public.

Provide a list of the responsible or trustee agencies for the project.

County of Fresno, Department of Public Works and Planning

File original and one copy with: Fresno County Clerk 2221 Kern Street Fresno, California 93721		Space Below For County Clerk Only. CLK-2046.00 E04-73 R00-00	
Agency File No: IS 7616	LOCAL AGENCY MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION		County Clerk File No: E202610000159
Responsible Agency (Name): Fresno County	Address (Street and P.O. Box): 2220 Tulare St. Sixth Floor	City: Fresno	Zip Code: 93721
Agency Contact Person (Name and Title): Dana Dominguez-Rogge, Planner	Area Code: (559)	Telephone Number: 600-4232	Extension: N/A
Project Applicant/Sponsor (Name): Jim Anderson	Project Title: Tentative Parcel Map No. 8195-R		
Project Description: Allow the creation of three (3) parcels and a remainder from an existing 3.33-acre parcel located in the R-2 m (Low Density Multiple-Family Residential, Mountain Overlay, 6,000 square-foot minimum parcel size required) and C-4 m (Central Trading) Zone Districts.			
Justification for Mitigated Negative Declaration: Based upon the Initial Study prepared for Tentative Parcel Map Application No. 8195-R, 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 Energy, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Mineral Resources, Noise, Public Services and Recreation. Potential impacts related to Aesthetics, Agricultural and Forestry Resources, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Geology and Soils, Hydrology and Water Quality, Land Use and Planning, Population and Housing, Transportation, Utilities and Services Systems and Wildfire have been determined to be less than significant. Potential impacts relating to Cultural Resources and Tribal Cultural Resources have been determined to be less than significant with the identified Mitigation Measures.			
FINDING: The proposed project will not have a significant impact on the environment.			
Newspaper and Date of Publication: Fresno Business Journal – June 10, 2026		Review Date Deadline: July 9, 2026	
Date: 6/10/2026	Type or Print Signature: Tawanda Mtunga Principal Planner	Submitted by (Signature): Dana Dominguez-Rogge Planner	

State 15083, 15085

County Clerk File No.: E202610000159

**LOCAL AGENCY
MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION**