



County of Fresno

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

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

APPLICANT: Fresno County Fire Protection District

APPLICATION NOS.: Initial Study No. 8903, Director Review and Approval Application No. 4821 and Variance Application No. 4206

DESCRIPTION: Allow the creation of a five-acre parcel from an existing 157-acre parcel, and a Director Review and Approval application to allow the construction and operation of a public fire station on the newly created five-acre parcel in the AE-20 (Exclusive Agricultural, 20-acre minimum parcel size) Zone District. The proposed five-acre parcel will be removed from Williamson Act Contract No. 4100 through a separate action.

LOCATION: The subject parcel is located on the southeast corner of W. Clarkson and S. Tuolumne Avenues approximately one mile east of the community of Cantua Creek (APN: 038-231-17) (Sup. Dist. 1).

AESTHETICS

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

- A. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista; or
- B. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project proposes to allow for a five-acre parcel to be created and removed from an existing Williamson Act Contract, to construct and operate a public fire station in an area that is predominantly used for agriculture. There are no scenic vistas, resources, or historical buildings identified in the area. The project will have no impact on any aesthetic resources.

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

area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The project site is located on the southeast corner of a large parcel in an agriculturally dominant area consisting of vineyards, orchards and field crops. The project would create a new 10,889 square foot public fire station building on the site and would change the existing visual character. However, this change is not expected to result in a significant impact on the surrounding agricultural landscape which is flat and lacking scenic resources.

- 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 project proposes to allow for a five-acre parcel to be created and removed from an existing Williamson Act Contract, to construct and operate a public fire station in an area that is predominantly used for agriculture. The building will be fitted with lighting to be used during its 24-hour operation. The Fresno County Zoning Ordinance has regulatory standards in place related to the design and orientation of lighting to ensure that no new source of substantial light would adversely affect day or nighttime views of 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:

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

Per the 2022 Fresno County Important Farmland Map, the subject parcel is designated as Prime Farmland. The project proposes to split five-acres from an existing approximately 157-acre parcel to construct and operate a public fire station. The entire

five-acres of the farmland will be permanently converted to non-agricultural use. This amounts to approximately 3.2% of the total parcel to be converted, which is considered less than significant. Furthermore, the subject parcel is under Williamson Act Contract No. 4100. The cancellation (RLCC 1082) will remove five-acres from the contract so as not to conflict with the existing Williamson Act Contract on the remaining larger agricultural parcel.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project site is not located on land zoned for forest land, timberland or timberland zoned Timberland Production, and as such will not result in the loss of forest land or conversion of land for non-forest use.

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The project proposes to construct a building on five-acres out of 157-acres of Farmland. The footprint of the building is small, approximately 3.2% of the total land, and would not result in the off-site 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:

- 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?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

Reviewing Agencies and Departments did not express concern with the project to indicate that the project would result in a conflict with an applicable Air Quality Plan or result in cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant. Project construction is anticipated to result in minor temporary increases in criteria pollutants,

however, the minor increases resulting from construction are not anticipated to result in a significant impact.

- 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:

Emissions resulting from the operation of the public fire station will not result in significant pollutant concentrations. Emissions from fire fighting vehicles may cause a slight increase in nearby pollutants, but the amount is considered less than significant. The nearest sensitive receptors are single family residences located approximately half a mile (0.50 mile) west of the project site. In consideration of the proximity of the site to sensitive receptors, the project is not anticipated to result in substantial pollutant concentrations or adverse emissions and will have a less than significant 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 Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) did not express concern with the project to indicate impacts to special-status species. No special status species has been identified on the project site that would be adversely affected by the operation of the proposed public fire station. Development of the project is not expected to negatively impact the area through habitat modification as the site is not occupied or has no significant habitat for special-status species.

- B. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service; or
- C. Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally-protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

No riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community was identified on the project site.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project proposes to allow for a five-acre parcel to be created and removed from an existing Williamson Act Contract, to construct and operate a public fire station in an area that is predominantly used for agriculture. The project does not cut off movement for any wildlife resident. No migratory wildlife corridor or native wildlife nursery site was identified on the project site.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

Reviewing Agencies and Departments did not identify a local policy or ordinance adopted for the protection of a biological resource that would be in conflict with the project proposal. No Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan or other approved local, regional, or state Habitat Conservation Plans were identified as being in conflict with the project proposal.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION:

The project proposes to allow for a five-acre parcel to be created and removed from an existing Williamson Act Contract, to construct and operate a public fire station in an area that is predominantly used for agriculture. No reviewing Agencies and Departments express concern with the project to indicate that a cultural or historical resource is

present on the site and would be affected by the project proposal. However, a mitigation measure will be implemented in the event that a cultural resource is identified during ground-disturbing activities related to project development.

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 should be followed by photos, reports, video, etc. If such remains are determined to be Native American, the Sheriff-Coroner must notify the Native American Commission within 24 hours.*

VI. 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 will be built to current building code standards which would take into consideration applicable energy efficiency standards. The project construction and operation would not result in a potentially significant impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources. No state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency was identified during Agency and Department review.

VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Would the project:

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

According to Figure 8-1 of the 2024 Fresno County General Plan Background Report and the California Department of Conservation Earthquake Hazard Zone Application (EQ Zapp), the project is not located on a known earthquake fault zone.

2. Strong seismic ground shaking?

3. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

According to the Department of Conservation California Geological Survey the project is not located in an area near a known earthquake fault zone and is not susceptible to liquefaction.

4. Landslides?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

According to the 2024 Fresno County General Plan Background Report the project area is in a low-risk area for landslides.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project would result in the development of the site where impervious surface would be added, and a loss of topsoil would occur. The subject site is relatively flat with small changes in elevation. The project would not result in a loss of topsoil or soil erosion where a significant risk of loss, injury, or death would occur.

C. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

According to the 2024 Fresno County General Plan Background Report the project site is located in an area with low risk for landslides and liquefaction. There have been no known issues with subsidence in the project area. No geologic unit or unstable soil was identified on the project site.

C. 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:

According to the 2024 Fresno County General Plan Background Report the project site is not located in an area known to have expansive soils.

- D. 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; or

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project proposes the installation and use of a septic system to serve the public fire station. No Reviewing Agencies or Departments expressed concern with the soil capability to accommodate the proposed septic system.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

There were no unique paleontological resources or unique geologic features identified on the project site.

VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Would the project:

- A. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment; or

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The emissions produced during the construction activities of the public fire station are expected to temporarily increase but are considered less than significant. The public fire station is not anticipated to produce, in excess, any greenhouse gas emissions that would have a significant impact on the environment. Reviewing Agencies and Departments did not express concern with the project to indicate that there will be the generation of greenhouse gas emissions that could either directly, or indirectly, have a significant impact on the environment.

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

- B. Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

Reviewing Agencies and Departments did not express concern with the project to indicate that a conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases exists as a result of the project.

VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Would the project:

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The project proposes the construction and operation of a public fire station in a rural community. The project site will be the location of any required firefighting equipment and materials including propane, fuel and compressed air. The Fresno County Department of Public Health, Environmental Health Division, states the applicant shall submit a Hazardous Materials Business Plan to them prior to occupying the facility. With adherence to development standards and requirements the project will have a less than significant impact on the creation of public hazards with hazardous materials.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project site is located within 1.20 miles east of an existing school (Cantua Creek Elementary School), and therefore there will be no hazardous emissions within one-quarter mile of a 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?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

According to the NEPAAssist Database, the project site is not located on a listed hazardous materials site and the project would not result or 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 or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project site is not located within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. The nearest airport is Mendota Municipal Airport located approximately 17.50-miles north from the proposed project site.

- 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 identify any conflict with the project and any adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. Additionally, no concerns were expressed that the project would result in a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires.

X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Would the project:

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The project proposes to allow for a five-acre parcel to be created and removed from an existing Williamson Act Contract, to construct and operate a public fire station in an area that is predominantly used for agriculture. A new well will be installed, and ground water will be used to meet the need of daily fire station activities, which is expected to be no more than 2,000 gallons per day, excluding emergency water used in vehicles. The area is not defined as being 'water-short' and Reviewing Agencies and Departments did not express any concern with the project degrading water quality standards or substantially decreasing groundwater supplies. Should the applicant choose to utilize surface water to meet the project needs, then the applicant must apply for and receive and allocation of agricultural surface water pursuant to the regulations of the Westlands Water District.

- C. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on or off site?
 - 1. Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;
 - 2. Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite?

3. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The project proposes to allow for a five-acre parcel to be created and removed from an existing Williamson Act Contract, to construct and operate a public fire station in an area that is predominantly used for agriculture. The project site historically was used as a vineyard. There are no identified drainage sites or channels located on the project site that would be eroded due to the development of the fire station. Abutting the project is an easement held by Westland Water District and a water distribution system, but there will be no impact on this facility from the operation of the public fire station. The proposed facility is located on relatively flat land and does not anticipate substantial erosion or siltation events occurring as a result of the project. Surface runoff is anticipated to be kept onsite per County of Fresno standards and is not expected to result in flooding on or offsite. Fresno County's Road Maintenance and Operations Division recommends a condition of approval to require an Engineered Grading and Drainage Plan to ensure stormwater runoff is adequately handled to not negatively impact the surrounding area. Other reviewing agencies and departments did not express concern with the project to indicate that the project would result in runoff water contributions that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide additional sources of polluted runoff.

4. Impede or redirect flood flows?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project site is not located within a flood hazard area. Applicable agencies reviewed the project site and did not have any comments regarding any requirements and asserted the project as proposed would not impede or redirect flood flows.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project site is not located within a flood hazard area, and the project will not increase the risk of release of pollutants due to project inundation. Additionally, the project site is not located near a body of water where a tsunami or seiche risk is prevalent.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project intends to construct an individual water well and septic system to accommodate the public fire station daily activities. Reviewing Agencies and Departments did not express concern with the project conflicting with a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan.

XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING

Would the project:

- A. Physically divide an established community?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project proposes to allow a five-acre parcel to be created with a Variance, removal of this five-acres from an existing Williamson Act Contract, and the construction and operation of a public fire station in an area that is predominantly used for agriculture. The project site historically was used as a vineyard. The nearest community is Cantua Creek. There is no urbanization around the proposed project site.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project proposes to allow a five-acre parcel to be created with a Variance, removal of this five-acres from an existing Williamson Act Contract, and the construction and operation of a public fire station in an area that is predominantly used for agriculture. The project proposes to allow for a reduced parcel size of five-acres where 20-acres is required through the use of a Variance. Though the proposed Variance conflicts with the Zoning Regulation of the subject parcel, it is not expected to have any impact on the environment.

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 the 2024 Fresno County General Plan Background Report the project site is not located on or near an identified mineral resource or mineral producing site.

XIII. NOISE

Would the project result in:

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The project anticipates the development of a public fire station and related facilities on a 5-acre portion of a large agricultural parcel. The project site historically was used as a vineyard. The project will introduce new sources of ambient and acute noise to the area. This additional noise will come from the additional vehicle traffic generated, outdoor facility activities, and emergency vehicle sirens. No Reviewing Agency or Department expressed any concern with the project exceeding the established standards regarding noise. The noise levels and vibrations associated with the project are not expected to result in significant impacts on the surrounding area.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project site is not located within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. The project site is not located in an airport land use plan. The nearest airport is Mendota Municipal Airport located approximately 17.50-miles north from the proposed project site.

XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING

Would the project:

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The nearest residences are located half a mile west of the project site. The surrounding area is predominantly agricultural, and the construction and operation of the proposed

fire station would not displace people or housing. The nearest community of Cantua Creek may increase in density due to the availability of a new fire station in the area, but this increase is not expected to be substantial or unplanned. The project will not induce unplanned population growth or displace any number of people or housing.

XV. PUBLIC SERVICES

Would the project:

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

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project proposes the construction and operation of a public fire station and will add fire protection services to the area. This will not have an adverse environmental impact on the area or result in the need for additional public services. Reviewing agencies and departments did not provide concerns regarding the project or a need for additional governmental facilities or alteration to existing governmental facilities.

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 anticipates the development of a public fire station and related facilities on a 5-acre portion of a large agricultural parcel. The project site historically was used as a

vineyard. There are no identified recreational facilities in the surrounding area that would be impacted by the proposed development of the parcel and there are no recreational facilities that would need to be constructed as a result of the project.

XVI. TRANSPORTATION

Would the project:

- A. Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities; or
- B. Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project does anticipate increasing traffic in the area, but the volume of trips is not expected to result in impacts related to vehicle miles traveled or any County-adopted program, plan, or ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system. Reviewing agencies and departments did not express concern with the project in terms of a transportation impact resulting from the project.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

Reviewing Agencies and Departments did not express concern with the project design or access to indicate that a hazard due to design features or inadequate emergency access will result from the project.

XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

- A. Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:
 - 1. Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or

2. A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION

Participating California Native American Tribes were notified of the project proposal and given the opportunity to enter into consultation with the County of Fresno in addressing potential tribal cultural resources occurring on the project site. No notified California Native American Tribe expressed concern with the project and did not enter into consultation. The subject parcel has been previously disturbed with farming operations. No reviewing Agency or Department provided comments to indicate that a listed or eligible historical resource is located on the project site. A Mitigation Measure will be implemented to establish procedure for the addressing of a tribal cultural resource, should it be identified during ground disturbing activities related to the project.

Mitigation Measure(s)

See Section V. Cultural Resources Mitigation Measure #1

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?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT:

The project proposes to allow a five-acre parcel to be created with a Variance, removal of this five-acres from an existing Williamson Act Contract, and the construction and operation of a public fire station in an area that is predominantly used for agriculture. The project site historically was used as a vineyard. The project proposes the relocation of an existing power pole and will require the development of an on-site storm water retention basin, but the construction and relocation of these items is not expected to cause significant environmental effects. Reviewing agencies and departments did not identify any significant environmental effects as a result of the project.

- B. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

The project proposes to allow a five-acre parcel to be created with a Variance, removal of this five-acres from an existing Williamson Act Contract, and the construction and

operation of a public fire station in an area that is predominantly used for agriculture. A new individual water well will serve the project's anticipated 2,000 gallon per day water usage. The project site is not an area designated as low-water, and Reviewing Agencies and Departments did not express any concern for the area not being able to serve the project's water usage. The project will have a less than significant impact on water supplies in the area.

- 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?

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project will install a new septic system to serve the project and does not anticipate the use of a wastewater treatment provider. The project will have no impact on a wastewater treatment provider.

- 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 allow a five-acre parcel to be created with a Variance, removal of this five-acres from an existing Williamson Act Contract, and the construction and operation of a public fire station in an area that is predominantly used for agriculture. Reviewing agencies and departments did not provide comments to indicate that the project would result in solid waste generation in excess of State or local standards, or result in a conflict with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulation related to solid waste. The project's solid waste generation will have a less than significant impact on local infrastructure 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:

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

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

As depicted in the 2025 Fresno County Fire Hazard Severity Zones Map, produced by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection, the project site is located within an unzoned Local Responsibility Area near an Incorporated City.

Additionally, this project was routed for review by CalFire. Reviewing Agencies and Departments did not provide comments to indicate that the project would result in impairment to evacuation plans, exposure to pollutant concentrations, exacerbation of fire risk, or exposure to post-fire risks.

XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Would the project:

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The subject site has been determined to be previously disturbed and occupied with human activity. The project does not have the potential to substantially degrade the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a wildlife species and would not cause a wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels.

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

FINDING: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

It has been determined that the project would result in impacts to Cultural Resources and Tribal Cultural Resources. These impacts were determined to be less than significant with the implementation of mitigation measures. With the implementation of

mitigation measures, the project is not anticipated to result in a cumulative considerable impact and would result in a less than significant impact regarding the identified section.

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

FINDING: NO IMPACT:

The project has been determined to not result in substantial adverse effect on human beings.

CONCLUSION/SUMMARY

Based upon the Initial Study No. 8903 prepared for Director Review and Approval Application No. 4821 and Variance Application No. 4206, staff has concluded that the project will not have a significant effect on the environment. It has been determined that there would be no or less than significant impacts to Aesthetics, Agriculture & Forestry Resources, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Energy, Geology/Soils, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Hazards & Hazardous Materials, Hydrology/Water Quality, Land Use/Planning, Mineral Resources, Noise, Population/Housing, Public Services, Recreation, Transportation, Utilities/Service Systems, Wildfire, or Mandatory Findings of Significance.

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

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

AB

G:\4360Devs&P\In\PROJSEC\PROJDOCS\DRA\4800-4899\4821 (Canuta Creek Firehouse)\CEQA\IS 8903 DRA 4821 VA 4206 Initial Study Writeup.docx

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 #: _____

Project Title: Initial Study No. 8903, Director Review and Approval Application No. 4821 and Variance Application 4206

Lead Agency: County of Fresno

Contact Name: Arianna Brown

Email: arbrown@fresnocountyca.gov Phone Number: (559) 600-4245

Project Location: Fresno Fresno
City *County*

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

Allow the creation of a five-acre parcel from an existing 157-acre parcel, and a Director Review and Approval application to allow the construction and operation of a public fire station on the newly created five-acre parcel in the AE-20 (Exclusive Agricultural, 20-acre minimum parcel size) Zone District. The proposed five-acre parcel will be removed from Williamson Act Contract No. 4100 through a separate action. The subject parcel is located on the southeast corner of W. Clarkson and S. Tuolumne Avenues approximately one mile east of the community of Cantua Creek (APN: 038-231-17) (Sup. Dist. 1).

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

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

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, Departments, or the public.

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

County of Fresno Department of Public Works and Planning



County of Fresno

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

INITIAL STUDY ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

1. Project title:

Initial Study No. 8903, Director Review and Approval Application No. 4821 and Variance Application No. 4206

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:

Arianna Brown, Planner, (559) 600-4245

4. Project location:

The subject parcel is located on the southeast corner of W. Clarkson and S. Tuolumne Avenues approximately one mile east of the community of Cantua Creek (APN: 038-231-17) (Sup. Dist. 1).

5. Project sponsor's name and address:

Fresno County Fire Protection District
210 S. Academy Avenue
Sanger, CA 93657

6. General Plan designation:

Agricultural

7. Zoning:

AE-20 (Exclusive Agricultural, 20-acre minimum parcel size) Zone District.

8. Description of project: (Describe the whole action involved, including, but not limited to, later phases of the project, and any secondary, support, or off-site features necessary for its implementation. Attach additional sheets if necessary.)

Allow the creation of a five-acre parcel from an existing 157-acre parcel, and a Director Review and Approval application to allow the construction and operation of a public fire station on the newly created five-acre parcel in the AE-20 (Exclusive Agricultural, 20-acre minimum parcel size) Zone District. The proposed five-acre parcel will be removed from Williamson Act Contract No. 4100 through a separate action.

9. Surrounding land uses and setting: Briefly describe the project's surroundings:

The subject parcel and the surrounding area are used for agriculture

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.?**

Letters sent via Certified Mail on May 5, 2026 to four Tribes:

Dumna Wo Wah Tribal Government, 2191 W. Pico Avenue Fresno, CA 93705

Table Mountain Rancheria, PO Box 410 Friant, CA 93626

Picayune Rancheria of the Chuckchansi Indians, PO Box 2226 Oakhurst, CA 93644

Sana Rosa Rancheria Tachi Yokut Tribe, PO Box 8 Lemoore, CA 93245

A correspondence was received from Table Mountain Rancheria with a determination that the area is outside of their interest.

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.

- | | |
|---|---|
| ☐ Aesthetics | ☐ Agriculture and Forestry Resources |
| ☐ Air Quality | ☐ Biological Resources |
| ☒ Cultural Resources | ☐ Energy |
| ☐ Geology/Soils | ☐ Greenhouse Gas Emissions |
| ☐ Hazards & Hazardous Materials | ☐ Hydrology/Water Quality |
| ☐ Land Use/Planning | ☐ Mineral Resources |
| ☐ Noise | ☐ Population/Housing |
| ☐ Public Services | ☐ Recreation |
| ☐ Transportation | ☒ Tribal Cultural Resources |
| ☐ Utilities/Service Systems | ☐ Wildfire |
| ☐ 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:


Arianna Brown, Planner

Date:

8/27/2026

REVIEWED BY:


Chris Motta, Division Manager

Date:

8/27/2026

G:\4360Devs&PIn\PROJSEC\PROJDOCS\ORA\4800-4899\4821 (Canuta Creek Firehouse)\CEQA\IS 8903 DRA 4821 VA 4206 Initial Study Checklist.docx

INITIAL STUDY ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM (Initial Study No. 8903, Director Review and Approval Application No. 4821 and Variance Application No. 4206)

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

1 = No Impact

2 = Less Than Significant Impact

3 = Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated

4 = Potentially Significant Impact

I. AESTHETICS

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

- 1 a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?
- 1 b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?
- 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:

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

III. AIR QUALITY

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

- 1 a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable Air Quality Plan?
- 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:

- 1 a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?
- 1 b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?
- 1 c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally-protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?
- 1 d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?
- 1 e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?
- 1 f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state Habitat Conservation Plan?

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

- 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:

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

VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Would the project:

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

IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Would the project:

- 2 a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?
- 2 b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?
- 1 c) 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, 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, 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 groundwater 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?
 - 1 i) Result in substantial erosion or siltation on or off site;
 - 1 ii) Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on or off site;
 - 1 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
 - 1 iv) Impede or redirect flood flows?
- 1 d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?
- 1 e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?

XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING

Would the project:

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

XII. MINERAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

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

XIII. NOISE

Would the project result in:

- 2 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?
- 2 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, exposing people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING

Would the project:

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

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

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

XV. PUBLIC SERVICES

Would the project:

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

XVI. RECREATION

Would the project:

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

XVII. TRANSPORTATION

Would the project:

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

XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

- 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?
- 1 b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?
- 1 c) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?
- 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:

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

XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Would the project:

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

Documents Referenced:

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

Fresno County General Plan, Policy Document
Fresno County Zoning Ordinance
Important Farmland 2022 Map, State Department of Conservation
2024 Fresno County General Plan Background Report
2025 Fresno County Fire Hazard Severity Zones Map, California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection

AB

G:\4360Devs&Pln\PROJSEC\PROJDOCS\DRAW\4800-4899\4821 (Canuta Creek Firehouse)\CEQA\IS 8903 DRA 4821 VA 4206 Initial Study Checklist.docx

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 8903	LOCAL AGENCY MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION		County Clerk File No: E-
Responsible Agency (Name): Fresno County	Address (Street and P.O. Box): 2220 Tulare St. Sixth Floor	City: Fresno	Zip Code: 93721
Agency Contact Person (Name and Title): Arianna Brown, Planner	Area Code: 559	Telephone Number: 600-4245	Extension: N/A
Project Applicant/Sponsor (Name): Fresno County Fire Protection District		Project Title: Initial Study No. 8903, Director Review and Approval Application No. 4821 and Variance Application No. 4206	
Project Description: Allow the creation of a five-acre parcel from an existing 157-acre parcel, and a Director Review and Approval application to allow the construction and operation of a public fire station on the newly created five-acre parcel in the AE-20 (Exclusive Agricultural, 20-acre minimum parcel size) Zone District. The proposed five-acre parcel will be removed from Williamson Act Contract No. 4100 through a separate action.			
Justification for Negative Declaration: Based upon the Initial Study No. 8903 prepared for Director Review and Approval Application No. 4821 and Variance Application No. 4206, staff has concluded that the project will not have a significant effect on the environment. It has been determined that there would be no or less than significant impacts to Aesthetics, Agriculture & Forestry Resources, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Energy, Geology/Soils, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Hazards & Hazardous Materials, Hydrology/Water Quality, Land Use/Planning, Mineral Resources, Noise, Population/Housing, Public Services, Recreation, Transportation, Utilities/Service Systems, Wildfire, or Mandatory Findings of Significance. Potential impacts related to Cultural Resources and Tribal Cultural Resources have determined to be less than significant with mitigation.			
FINDING: The proposed project will not have a significant impact on the environment.			
Newspaper and Date of Publication: Fresno Business Journal – September 4, 2026		Review Date Deadline: Planning Commission – October 22, 2026	
Date:	Type or Print Signature: Ober Ramirez Senior Planner	Submitted by (Signature): Arianna Brown Planner	

State 15083, 15085

County Clerk File No.:

**LOCAL AGENCY
MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION**

Notice of Completion & Environmental Document Transmittal

Mail to: State Clearinghouse, P.O. Box 3044, Sacramento, CA 95812-3044 (916) 445-0613

For Hand Delivery/Street Address: 1400 Tenth Street, Sacramento, CA 95814

SCH #**Project Title:** Initial Study No. 8903, Director Review and Approval Application No. 4821 and Variance Application No. 4206Lead Agency: Fresno CountyContact Person: Arianna BrownMailing Address: 2220 Tulare StPhone: 559-600-4245City: FresnoZip: 93721County: Fresno**Project Location:** County: Fresno City/Nearest Community: Cantua CreekCross Streets: W. Clarkson and S. Tuolumne AvenuesZip Code: 93608Longitude/Latitude (degrees, minutes and seconds): 36 ° 30 ' 04.41 " N / 120 ° 17 ' 53.17 " W Total Acres: 157Assessor's Parcel No.: 038-231-17Section: 36 Twp.: 16S Range: 15E Base: M.D.B.M.Within 2 Miles: State Hwy #: N/AWaterways: N/AAirports: N/ARailways: N/ASchools: Cantua Creek Elementary**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: ☐
☒ Mit Neg Dec Other: ☐ 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 ☒ Land Division (Subdivision, etc.) ☐ Other: ☐

Development Type:

☐ Residential: Units ☐ Acres ☐ Transportation: Type ☐
☐ Office: Sq.ft. ☐ Acres ☐ Employees ☐ Mining: Mineral ☐
☐ Commercial: Sq.ft. ☐ Acres ☐ Employees ☐ Power: Type ☐ MW
☐ Industrial: Sq.ft. ☐ Acres ☐ Employees ☐ Waste Treatment: Type ☐ MGD
☐ Educational: ☐ Hazardous Waste: Type ☐
☐ Recreational: ☒ Other: ☐ Public Fire Station
☐ Water Facilities: Type ☐ MGD

Project Issues Discussed in Document:

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

Present Land Use/Zoning/General Plan Designation:

AE-20 (Exclusive Agricultural, 20-acre minimum parcel size) Zone District.

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

Allow the creation of a five-acre parcel from an existing 157-acre parcel, and a Director Review and Approval application to allow the construction and operation of a public fire station on the newly created five-acre parcel in the AE-20 (Exclusive Agricultural, 20-acre minimum parcel size) Zone District. The proposed five-acre parcel will be removed from Williamson Act Contract No. 4100 through a separate action.

Note: The State Clearinghouse will assign identification numbers for all new projects. If a SCH number already exists for a project (e.g. Notice of Preparation or previous draft document) please fill in.

Reviewing Agencies Checklist

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

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

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

Starting Date September 4, 2026 Ending Date October 7, 2026

Lead Agency (Complete if applicable):

Consulting Firm: <u>County of Fresno</u>	Applicant: <u>Jeffery Roberts Planning and Development Services</u>
Address: <u>2220 Tulare Street, 6th Floor</u>	Address: <u>P.O. Box 483</u>
City/State/Zip: <u>Fresno, CA 93721</u>	City/State/Zip: <u>Friant, CA 93626</u>
Contact: <u>Arianna Brown</u>	Phone: <u>(559) 288-0688</u>
Phone: <u>559-600-4245</u>	

Signature of Lead Agency Representative: Arianna Brown

Digitally signed by Arianna Brown
Date: 2026.08.31 15:28:30 -0700

Date: _____

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:

E202610000264

STATE CLEARINGHOUSE NUMBER (if applicable)

SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON REVERSE. TYPE OR PRINT CLEARLY.

LEAD AGENCY

PUBLIC WORKS AND PLANNING

LEAD AGENCY EMAIL

DATE

08/31/2026

COUNTY/STATE AGENCY OF FILING

FRESNO COUNTY

DOCUMENT NUMBER

E202610000264

PROJECT TITLE

IS NO. 8903 & DIRECTOR REVIEW & APPROVAL APP NO. 4821 & VARIANCE APP NO. 4206

PROJECT APPLICANT NAME

FRESNO COUNTY

PROJECT APPLICANT EMAIL

PHONE NUMBER

(559) 600-4245

PROJECT APPLICANT ADDRESS

2220 TULARE ST, STE A

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:

☐ Environmental Impact Report (EIR)	\$4,227.50	\$	0.00
☐ Mitigated/Negative Declaration (MND)(ND)	\$3,043.75	\$	0.00
☐ Certified Regulatory Program (CRP) document - payment due directly to CDFW	\$1,437.25	\$	0.00

☐ Exempt from fee☐ Notice of Exemption (attach)☐ CDFW No Effect Determination (attach)☐ Fee previously paid (attach previously issued cash receipt copy)

☐ Water Right Application or Petition Fee (State Water Resources Control Board only)	\$850.00	\$	0.00
☐ County documentary handling fee	\$50.00	\$	0.00
☐ Other		\$	0.00

PAYMENT METHOD:

☐ Cash ☐ Credit ☐ Check ☒ Other NOITOTAL RECEIVED \$ **0.00**

SIGNATURE

X

AGENCY OF FILING PRINTED NAME AND TITLE

Pricilla Gonzalez Deputy Clerk



E202610000264
County of Fresno

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

FILED

AUG 31 2026 TIME 1:45pm

FRESNO COUNTY CLERK
BY LS DEPUTY

For County Clerk's Stamp

**NOTICE OF INTENT TO ADOPT A
MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION**

Notice is hereby given that the County of Fresno has prepared Initial Study (IS) No. 8903 pursuant to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act for the following proposed project:

INITIAL STUDY NO. 8903 and DIRECTOR REVIEW AND APPROVAL APPLICATION NO. 4821 and VARIANCE APPLICATION NO. 4206 filed FRESNO COUNTY FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT proposing to allow the creation of a five-acre parcel from an existing 157-acre parcel, and a Director Review and Approval application to allow the construction and operation of a public fire station on the newly created five-acre parcel in the AE-20 (Exclusive Agricultural, 20-acre minimum parcel size) Zone District. The proposed five-acre parcel will be removed from Williamson Act Contract No. 4100 through a separate action. The subject parcel is located on the southeast corner of W. Clarkson and S. Tuolumne Avenues approximately one mile east of the community of Cantua Creek (APN: 038-231-17) (Sup. Dist. 1). (hereafter, the "Proposed Project")

The County of Fresno has determined that it is appropriate to adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Proposed Project. The purpose of this Notice is to (1) provide notice of the availability of IS No. 8903 and the draft Mitigated Negative Declaration and request written comments thereon; and (2) provide notice of the public hearing regarding the Proposed Project.

Public Comment Period

The County of Fresno will receive written comments on the Proposed Project and Mitigated Negative Declaration from Friday September 4, 2026, until Wednesday October 7, 2026.

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

Fresno County Department of Public Works and Planning
Development Services and Capital Projects Division
Attn: Arianna Brown
2220 Tulare Street, Suite A
Fresno, CA 93721

IS Application No. 8903 and the draft Mitigated Negative Declaration may be viewed at the above address Monday through Thursday, 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., and Friday, 8:30 a.m. to 12:30 p.m. (except holidays). An electronic copy of the draft Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Proposed Project may be obtained from Arianna Brown at the addresses above

Public Hearing

The Planning Commission will hold a public hearing to consider approving the Proposed Project and the Mitigated Negative Declaration on October 8, 2026 at 8:45 a.m., or as soon thereafter as possible, in Room 301, Hall of Records, 2281 Tulare Street, Fresno, California 93721. Interested persons are invited to appear at the hearing and comment on the Proposed Project and draft Mitigated Negative Declaration.

For questions, please call Arianna Brown at (559) 600-4245.

Published: September 4, 2026