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GENERAL INFORMATION

What is being proposed?

The City of Firebaugh has received an application for rezoning and development of a 0.2 acre site located on the southeast corner of State Highway 33 and Zozaya Street.

The Assessor Parcel Number of the site is 008-030-033. There is a description of the specific planning actions along with maps and diagrams in the study.

What is this document?

The attached document is a review of potential environmental impacts that may occur if the City approves the proposed project.

Why is this document being prepared?

The California Environmental Quality Act of 1970 requires government agencies to analyze how development projects may impact the environment - before considering and approving or denying the project. Once the document is prepared, it must be made available to the public and circulated for review to potentially affected public agencies for a period of 20 days.

Will this study result in any changes to the project?

An environmental study may recommend measures to reduce or eliminate environmental impacts. These measures (called mitigation measures) may include actions to be taken during project construction (such as watering soils to keep down dust) or may include changes to the design of the project itself.

How do I comment on this study?

Send written comments to the City's planning consultant: Karl Schoettler, Collins & Schoettler Planning Consultants, 1002 W. Main Street, Visalia, CA 93291.

How is this project reviewed by the City?

Following review by City staff, this particular project will require a public hearing before the Firebaugh Planning Commission and Firebaugh City Council. If you are interested in knowing the time and date for these meetings, please contact the Firebaugh City Clerk at (559) 659-2043.

Who do I contact for more information?

Karl Schoettler, Planning Consultant
Collins & Schoettler
1002 W. Main Street
Visalia, CA 93291
(559) 734-8737 or

Ben Gallegos, City Manager
City of Firebaugh
1133 P Street
Firebaugh, CA 93622
(559) 659-2043
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1.0 INTRODUCTION

Executive Summary

This document is an analysis of potential environmental impacts of the project titled the “Valley Health Team Project” being proposed within the City of Firebaugh. The project is primarily a proposal to develop a 7,800 square foot parcel with an employee parking lot to serve a previously-approved medical clinic on an adjacent site. The site is located on the southeast corner of side of N Street (State Highway 33) and Zozaya Street. Associated actions include a zone change and a General Plan Amendment.

This environmental study determined the project will not have significant impacts on the environment provided that mitigation measures are incorporated into the project design and operation. As such, the study recommends the City adopt a "Mitigated Negative Declaration" for the project. Several measures were identified in the study that would reduce impacts that will occur. These measures and impacts pertain to the following issues:

- Aesthetics
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Land Use

A more thorough discussion of environmental impacts and mitigation measures is found in Section 4.0 of this document. Mitigation measures are also fully listed in the proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration, found in Appendix A.

1.1 What is This Document?

The following document is an analysis of potential environmental impacts of the project titled “Valley Health Team Project” being proposed in the City of Firebaugh. The project is a request to amend land use and zoning designations for the subject site, and approve an amendment to a Conditional Use Permit permit to expand a previously-approved medical clinic onto an existing parcel, with the development of an employee parking lot. The site contains approximately 7,800 square feet, located on the southeast corner of N Street (State Highway 33) and Zozaya Street. A more detailed project description can be found under Section 1.3 (Project Description), below.

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires public agencies to evaluate the potential environmental effects of development projects and actions that may impact the environment. The action of amending zoning and land use designations, and approving a Conditional Use Permit is considered to be a "project" under CEQA and must be evaluated for its environmental impacts.
The first step of environmental review is to determine whether a project is exempt from further review. CEQA contains a list of projects and actions normally considered to be exempt. The act of amending zoning and land use designations, and a Conditional Use Permit, as proposed, is not exempt from review. The next step is to prepare an Initial Environmental Study (IES) (which is this document). The IES is an initial review of the project and its potential effects. The IES includes:

- A profile of existing conditions on the project site and vicinity.
- A checklist of potential environmental effects of the project. This checklist helps the agency focus its examination of environmental issues.
- A discussion of the environmental effects contained on the checklist.
- A list of measures (mitigation measures) that can be employed to reduce or eliminate environmental effects resulting from the project.

The purpose of the IES is to determine the magnitude of potential environmental impacts of the project. The IES will make one of three determinations regarding the project:

- **The project will not have a significant impact on the environment.** A “Negative Declaration” is prepared to adopt the findings of the study.
- **The project could have a significant impact on the environment,** however mitigation measures have been devised that will minimize those potential impacts to a level that is considered "less than significant". A "Mitigated Negative Declaration" is prepared to adopt the findings of the study.
- **The project will have a significant impact on the environment** and an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) must be prepared. An EIR is an in-depth discussion of the project and its impacts. Mitigation measures that can reduce the magnitude of the impacts should also be discussed. The EIR must also examine alternatives to the project that may or may not reduce environmental impacts. These alternatives could include an alternative site or a different way to design the project. The EIR must also discuss "cumulative impacts" which are impacts that will occur when the project is considered along with other development in the area or the region that may be occurring in the same time frame.

Within an EIR, impacts that cannot be reduced to a level that is "less than significant" must be acknowledged. When considering these impacts, the decision-making body (typically the Planning Commission and City Council) must consider and adopt a "Statement of Overriding Considerations" - a statement contained in a resolution that finds that the benefits of the project outweigh its negative environmental effects.

Environmental analysis must be conducted before the decision-making body can take action on the project itself - in this case, approving a zone change, General Plan amendment and amended Conditional Use Permit.
Public Review

CEQA requires the environmental analysis to be made available for public review. This allows members of the public, individuals, property owners and potentially affected public agencies to review the findings of the study. The review period for this Initial Environmental Study is 20 days. Individuals and agencies may submit comments on the study during the public review period. These comments must be considered by City of Firebaugh prior to taking action on the project.

The IES must also be considered by the Planning Commission and City Council in public hearings. Any person may speak on the environmental study at the public hearing and any comments must be considered by the decision-making bodies. If, after taking testimony from the public, considering written comments submitted during the public review period, and considering the environmental study itself, the decision-making bodies feel that the findings of the study are correct, they may then adopt the findings of the study. If however, the decision-making body feels the study does not adequately analyze and document the project, it may require additional study, or preparation of a full Environmental Impact Report.

What is a "Significant Impact"?

The word "significant" is a subjective term, however, CEQA contains a list of impacts that are normally considered to be "significant". Impacts most commonly found to be significant for development projects in valley communities include:

- Loss of prime farmland
- Impacts to air quality above threshold levels
- Loss of endangered plant and animal species or habitat
- Impacts on infrastructure – such as exceeding local water or sewer systems
- Groundwater
- Traffic/circulation – exceeding capacity of roadways
- Public services
- Cumulative impacts

This list is not all-inclusive - impacts will vary depending on the nature of a specific project, its site and surroundings. Further, if an impact was acknowledged as significant in a previous EIR (such as an EIR for a General Plan), preparation of a new EIR is not required.

1.2 Location

The City of Firebaugh is located along State Highway 33 and the San Joaquin River in the northern portion of western Fresno County. It is approximately 30 miles west of the Fresno-Clovis Metropolitan Area and 18 miles east of Interstate 5, the major surface transportation route between
San Francisco and Los Angeles (see Map 1). The City of Mendota is located about 8 miles southeast of Firebaugh, while the City of Dos Palos is located about 15 miles to the northwest.

The project site includes one parcel containing approximately 7,800 square feet located on the southeast corner of N Street (State Highway 33) and Zozaya Street (see Map 2).

1.3 Project Description

The project consists of a proposal to amend the land use and zoning designations for the site, and amend an existing Conditional Use Permit for a previously-approved medical clinic, to expand the clinic to the subject site, which will be used to add employee parking for the clinic. These actions are summarized as follows:

- **General Plan Amendment 2019-03.** This action is an amendment of the Land Use Map of the 2030 Firebaugh General Plan to change the land use designation on portions of the project site from “Medium Density Residential” to “Neighborhood Commercial”.

- **Zone Change 2019-03.** This action is a Zone Change, to change the zoning of the project site from R-1 (Single Family Residential) to C-1 (Neighborhood Commercial).

- **Amendment to Conditional Use Permit 2016-01.** This action is a proposal to amend a Conditional Use Permit for a previously-approved medical clinic, to expand the clinic grounds onto the parcel at the corner of N Street and Zozaya Street. The original medical clinic project was approved for the conversion of an existing building (and associated facilities) into a medical clinic. The clinic has not yet been established but the use permit is still valid.

More recently the applicant has determined that additional parking will be necessary to serve staff of the clinic. This has resulted in the desire to construct parking on the parcel at the southeast corner of N Street and Zozaya Street. The existing house would be demolished and a new employee parking area would be constructed. The proposed design is shown in Exhibit 1. The parking lot would take access from Zozaya Street. This would be a one-way “in” driveway, so that vehicles would enter from Zozaya and exit onto N Street through an existing driveway to the south. In this fashion the clinic would not impact Zozaya Street with exiting vehicles.
Map 2: Project Location
Map 3: Aerial Photo of Site

Lot proposed for rezone/General Plan Amendment and parking lot

Site approved for medical clinic
Exhibit 1: Proposed Project Layout
2.0 CITY OF FIREBAUGH

2.1 Overview

Since incorporation in 1914, the City of Firebaugh has grown to an estimated population of 8,112 in 2018, according to the California Department of Finance. Since 1970 the City’s population has grown by nearly 200% - or an average annual growth rate of 2.6%. Since 2010 the average annual growth rate has dropped to about 0.9% By 2025, Firebaugh is projected to have a population of 11,800 persons – based on the General Plan’s “medium” growth projection. The average household size in Firebaugh is 4.01 persons – considerably larger than the average size in Fresno County at 3.21 persons per household. This rate points to a need for the development of more affordable housing.

Agriculture is the mainstay of Firebaugh's economy, with the major crops grown in the area being alfalfa, melons, rice, cotton and various vegetables. The majority of employment within the area is related to agriculture, involving either farm labor or employment in industries processing agricultural products. Toma-Tek is the largest agricultural operation employing upwards of 700 persons during peak processing periods. Major non-agriculture related employers include the Firebaugh School District and the City of Firebaugh. Firebaugh has historically had unemployment rates significantly higher than Fresno County, California, and the nation as a whole. Rates upward of 25% are typical. To a great extent, these high rates are due to the seasonal nature of the agricultural industry.

3.0 PROJECT SETTING

3.1 Project Site

Existing Land Use & Surrounding Lands:

The site includes a single family dwelling on a residential parcel containing approximately 7,800 square feet. The dwelling contains 1,334 square feet (3 bedrooms/1 bathroom) and was built in 1969.

Land in the vicinity of the site is characterized by a variety of existing uses, as follows:

North: Single family home
East: Single family home
South: Vacant commercial building approved for medical clinic
West: Highway 33, vacant land and railroad
3.2 Land Use Controls

The project site is designated “Medium Density Residential” on the Proposed Land Use Map of the 2030 Firebaugh General Plan. As noted previously, the land use designation is proposed to be amended to “Neighborhood Commercial” – to be consistent with the designation of the site immediately to the south.

The site is currently zoned R-1 (Single Family Residential) by the City of Firebaugh zoning map. The proposed zoning of the site is C-1 (Neighborhood Commercial). This zone is consistent with the proposed General Plan designation and is also consistent with the zoning of the approved medical clinic, immediately to the north.

Surrounding Lands

According to the 2030 Firebaugh General Plan’s Proposed Land Use Map, land to the north and east of the site is designated “Medium Density Residential”; land to the south is designated “Neighborhood Commercial”; land to the west is designated “Public/Quasi Public”.

In terms of zoning, land to the north is zoned R-1 (Single Family Residential), land to the east is zoned R-3 (Medium High Density Multi Family Residential), land to the south is zoned C-1 (Neighborhood Commercial) and land to the west is zoned M-1 (Light Industrial).

3.3 Traffic and Circulation

Circulation

The parcel at the southwest corner of N Street and Zozaya Street has direct access from Zozaya Street. The site to the south (approved for the medical clinic) has access from N Street (State Route 33).

In the vicinity of the site N Street is improved with one travel lane in the northbound direction and two travel lanes southbound, with a continuous left turn median. Improvements along the site frontage include curbs and gutters.

Zozaya Street is classified as a local street and features one travel lane and one parking lane in each direction along with curbs, gutters and sidewalks. Zozaya terminates a short distance east of the site into a fence. The corner of Zozaya and N Street is controlled with a stop sign for westbound traffic on Zozaya.

The project applicant will be required to secure an encroachment permit from Caltrans for improvements proposed within the highway right-of-way.
Additional information on circulation issues can be found in the Circulation Element of the Firebaugh General Plan.
4.0 DISCUSSION OF POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

This section of the Initial Study analyzes potential impacts of the proposed project. For each topic a determination of the magnitude of the impact is made (via checklist) and then the impact is analyzed and discussed. Where appropriate, mitigation measures are identified that will reduce or eliminate an impact.

I. AESTHETICS — Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:

1. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

| Potentially Significant Impact: | ☐ | Less than Significant with Mitigation: | ☒ | Less than Significant Impact: | ☐ | No Impact: | ☐ |

Discussion: There are no recognized scenic vistas on or around the site. The site is occupied by an existing single family home situated on a residential street. Associated improvements include a driveway, sidewalk and landscaping, among other features. The project will remove the house and other improvements and replace them with a parking lot (featuring 17 parking spaces), curbing, driveway from Zozaya Street, landscaping and masonry walls.

The project represents a marked change from the existing residential character of the site, to more of a commercial character with a parking lot. In order to reduce the visual impact of the project the City will require a decorative concrete block wall along the site’s Zozaya frontage, along with landscaping, featuring a combination of groundcover, shrubs and trees. The masonry wall will be planted with climbing vines to soften the appearance of the wall.

Mitigation Measures

The project shall submit a landscaping and irrigation plan for review and approval by the City that features a six foot concrete masonry wall east of the driveway and a four foot high wall within a landscape planter along the Zozaya Street frontage of the site. Landscaping on the street side of the wall shall feature a combination of groundcover, shrubs and turf. Climbing vines shall be trained onto the wall.

With these measures the project’s impacts on aesthetics will be reduced to a less than significant level.
2. **Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?**

| Potentially Significant Impact: | ☐ | Less than Significant with Mitigation: | ☐ | Less than Significant Impact: | ☐ | No Impact: | ☒ |

**Discussion:** There are no significant stands of trees, rock outcroppings, historic buildings or other recognized scenic features on the project site. This portion of State Highway 33 is not designated a State Scenic Highway according to Caltrans records. There will be no impact.

3. **In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality 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?**

| Potentially Significant Impact: | ☐ | Less than Significant with Mitigation: | ☒ | Less than Significant Impact: | ☐ | No Impact: | ☐ |

**Discussion:** See 1. & 2. As noted above, the site is occupied by an existing single family home situated on a short residential street. Associated improvements include a driveway, sidewalk and landscaping, among other features. The project will remove the house and other improvements and replace them with a parking lot (featuring 17 parking spaces), curbing, driveway from Zozaya Street, landscaping and masonry walls.

The project represents a marked change from the existing residential character of the site to a commercial character with a parking lot. In order to reduce the visual impact of the project the City will require a decorative concrete block wall along the site’s Zozaya frontage along with landscaping, featuring a combination of groundcover, shrubs and trees. The masonry wall will be planted with climbing vines to soften the appearance of the wall.

With these measures the project’s impacts on aesthetics will be reduced to a less than significant level.

**Mitigation Measures**

The project shall submit a landscaping and irrigation plan for review and approval by the City that features a six foot concrete masonry wall east of the driveway and a four foot high wall within a landscape planter along the Zozaya Street frontage of the site. Landscaping on the street side of the wall shall feature a combination of groundcover, shrubs and turf. Climbing vines shall be trained onto the wall.
4. **Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?**

| Potentially Significant Impact: | ☐ | Less than Significant with Mitigation: | ☐ | Less than Significant Impact: | ☒ | No Impact: | ☒ |

**Discussion:** The project will include the installation of light fixtures to illuminate the parking lot. These will be placed on standard poles. These fixtures have the potential to illuminate neighboring parcels and create a negative impact. In order to reduce this impact the project shall be required to adjust the lamps and install hoods to reduce or eliminate light glare.

**Mitigation Measures**

1. Light fixtures on the site shall be hooded and adjusted prior to occupancy to reduce any impacts to neighboring parcels.

**II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST 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 the forest carbon measurement methodology provided in the Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:

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

| Potentially Significant Impact: | ☐ | Less than Significant with Mitigation: | ☐ | Less than Significant Impact: | ☒ | No Impact: | ☒ |

**Discussion:** The Important Farmland Maps prepared by the State of California Department of Conservation shows the classified as “Urban and Built Up Land”. Accordingly, there will be no impact.

2. **Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?**

| Potentially Significant Impact: | ☐ | Less than Significant with Mitigation: | ☐ | Less than Significant Impact: | ☒ | No Impact: | ☒ |
**Discussion:** A review of Fresno County Assessor Parcel Maps and agricultural preserve maps maintained by the State of California Department of Conservation indicate that the subject site is not entered into an agricultural preserve contract, nor is it zoned for agricultural use.

3. **Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)) or timberland (as defined in Public Resources Code section 4526)?**

| Potentially Significant Impact: | □ | Less than Significant with Mitigation: | □ | Less than Significant Impact: | □ | No Impact: | ☒ |

**Discussion:** The site is not zoned for forestry and is not forested.

4. **Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?**

| Potentially Significant Impact: | □ | Less than Significant with Mitigation: | □ | Less than Significant Impact: | □ | No Impact: | ☒ |

**Discussion:** The site is not forested and the project will not impact forest land.

5. **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?**

| Potentially Significant Impact: | □ | Less than Significant with Mitigation: | □ | Less than Significant Impact: | □ | No Impact: | ☒ |

**Discussion:** No aspect of the project will result in conversion of farmland to non-farmland or forest land to non-forest use.

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

1. **Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?**

| Potentially Significant Impact: | □ | Less than Significant with Mitigation: | □ | Less than Significant Impact: | ☒ | No Impact: | □ |

**Discussion:** Amendment of the site’s land use and zoning designations will have no impact on local or regional air quality. Emissions generated by the development project proposed for the site will generally fall into two categories: short term and long term.
Short-term air pollution impacts are those which are generated at construction sites and usually consist of particulate matter (PM-10 (10 microns or smaller in diameter) as well as emissions from motor vehicles and equipment operating on (and to and from) the site.

During construction, grading activities may result in suspended dust particles, particularly under windy conditions. This short-term potential impact can be mitigated by on-site dust suppression measures. These measures include watering of all graded or excavated material at least twice a day, stopping grading and excavation activities when the wind speed exceeds 20 mph for one hour, watering or covering all material transported off-site, and minimizing the area disturbed by grading and excavation activities.

The San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District has jurisdiction over construction site activities, ensuring that dust suppression measures will be implemented. The District's dust control rules are contained in Regulation VIII. Further, the applicant must secure a permit to construct from the Air District, prior to beginning work on the expansion project.

The District’s rules also pertain to emissions from construction equipment, primarily consisting of ozone-causing emissions – Reactive Organic Gases (ROG) and oxides of nitrogen. Given the relatively small size of the project site, the project’s construction-related emissions are expected to be below the Air District’s thresholds for significance - however the District’s construction-site standards will apply to this project site. Among others, these standards include rules limiting idling times for vehicles and ensuring that vehicles are properly-tuned. In order to ensure compliance with these standards, the project must apply for a permit to construct from the Air District, prior to construction.

Long-term air pollution impacts are those which occur from the "operation" of a given use. Vehicles used by staff of the clinic will be the main source of emissions.

A review of the Air District’s Guide for Assessing Air Quality Impacts indicates that the project is below the threshold for having to prepare a detailed air quality analysis. Given that the project is located on State Highway 33 should enhance the ability of residents to make relatively short trips for goods and services.

It should also be noted that the project will be required to undergo the Valley Air District’s Indirect Source Reduction review, obtain a permit to construct and comply with District rules for construction and operation.
1. **Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?**

| Potentially Significant Impact: | Less than Significant with Mitigation: | Less than Significant Impact: | X | No Impact: |
|--------------------------------|--|------------------|--|--|---|

**Discussion:** See III 1. With the project being subject to Air District construction site and operational rules, the project will not violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an air quality violation.

2. **Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?**

| Potentially Significant Impact: | Less than Significant with Mitigation: | Less than Significant Impact: | X | No Impact: |
|--------------------------------|--|------------------|--|--|---|

**Discussion:** The proposed development will not generate significant criteria pollutants for which the region is non-attainment nor will emissions exceed thresholds established by the SJVAPCD for ozone precursors. However the project (along with other development occurring in Firebaugh and throughout the Valley) will contribute to a cumulative deterioration of air quality. This was acknowledged in the Environmental Impact Report that was prepared for the 2030 Firebaugh General Plan.

3. **Exposure sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?**

| Potentially Significant Impact: | Less than Significant with Mitigation: | Less than Significant Impact: | X | No Impact: |
|--------------------------------|--|------------------|--|--|---|

**Discussion:** Dust generated during the construction phase of the project could temporarily impact residents on nearby parcels, however with the incorporation of dust-reducing measures mentioned above, the proposed project should not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.

4. **Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?**

| Potentially Significant Impact: | Less than Significant with Mitigation: | Less than Significant Impact: | X | No Impact: |
|--------------------------------|--|------------------|--|--|---|

**Discussion:** There is no aspect of the proposed project that would generate odors. The proposed project is not expected to store or handle materials or chemicals that generate significant odors. There are no known sources of objectionable odors in the surrounding area that would affect the site.
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES --
Would the project:

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact:</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation:</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact:</th>
<th>No Impact:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[x]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion:** The Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) prepared for the 2030 Firebaugh General Plan contains information on protected plant and animal species and habitat that are known to occur in the Firebaugh area. A survey conducted for the DEIR found the bulk of protected species and habitat likely to occur within or near the San Joaquin River and its riparian corridor.

The subject site is located about 1/2 mile west of the river in an urbanized part of the community that has been developed and used for a single family dwelling for decades.

Given these facts it is expected that the project will have no impact on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

2. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact:</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation:</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact:</th>
<th>No Impact:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[x]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion:** According to maps prepared for the 2030 Firebaugh General Plan Draft Environmental Impact report, there are no areas of riparian habitat or other sensitive communities located on or nearby the site or surrounding areas (which are fully developed with urban and agricultural uses). Accordingly, the project will have no effects on riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities.
3. **Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?**

| Potentially Significant Impact: | ☐ | Less than Significant with Mitigation: | ☐ | Less than Significant Impact: | ☐ | No Impact: | ☒ |

**Discussion:** According to maps and research prepared for the Draft Environmental Impact Report for the 2030 Firebaugh General Plan, there are no federally protected wetlands on the site, nor will the development project affect any protected wetlands. Accordingly, the project will have no impact on this resource.

4. **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?**

| Potentially Significant Impact: | ☐ | Less than Significant with Mitigation: | ☐ | Less than Significant Impact: | ☐ | No Impact: | ☒ |

**Discussion:** According to information contained in the Draft Environmental Impact for the 2030 Firebaugh General Plan, the project site is not within or adjacent to any known wildlife migration or nursery sites. The closest known migration route is along the San Joaquin River corridor, about ½ mile east of the site. Therefore, there will be no impact in this category.

5. **Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?**

| Potentially Significant Impact: | ☐ | Less than Significant with Mitigation: | ☐ | Less than Significant Impact: | ☐ | No Impact: | ☒ |

**Discussion:** There are no local policies or ordinances in Firebaugh protecting biological resources.
6. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?

| Potentially Significant Impact: | ☐ | Less than Significant with Mitigation: | □ | Less than Significant Impact: | ☐ | No Impact: | ☒ |

**Discussion:** There are no adopted habitat conservation plans that apply to the project site.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES --

Would the project:

1. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in 15064.5?

| Potentially Significant Impact: | ☐ | Less than Significant with Mitigation: | □ | Less than Significant Impact: | ☒ | No Impact: | ☐ |

**Discussion:** Based on information contained in the Draft Environmental Impact report for the 2030 Firebaugh General Plan, there are no known historical resources present on or adjacent to the project site. The site is part of a residential neighborhood that has been developed since the 1970’s.

2. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to ‘15064.5’?

| Potentially Significant Impact: | ☐ | Less than Significant with Mitigation: | □ | Less than Significant Impact: | ☒ | No Impact: | ☐ |

**Discussion:** Although there are no known archaeological resources located in the project area, the proposed project could result in disturbance of subsurface archaeological resources during excavation and/or grading. If this occurs, the developer will comply with the requirements of CEQA that regulate archaeological and historical resources (Public Resources Code Section 21083.2 and 21084.1), and all local, state and federal regulations that regulate archaeological and historical resources, if during the course of development on the sites archeological or human remains are encountered.
3. **Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?**

| Potentially Significant Impact: | □ | Less than Significant with Mitigation: | □ | Less than Significant Impact: | × | No Impact: | □ |

**Discussion:** Although there are no known paleontological resources located in the project area, the proposed project does have the potential to directly or indirectly destroy a paleontological resource. If any cultural or paleontological materials are uncovered during project activities, work in the area shall halt until professional cultural resources evaluation and/or data recovery excavation can be planned and implemented.

4. **Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?**

| Potentially Significant Impact: | □ | Less than Significant with Mitigation: | □ | Less than Significant Impact: | × | No Impact: | □ |

**Discussion:** Due to past disturbance of the site’s soils it is unlikely that any human remains exist at the site. However, should any human remains be discovered during grading and construction, the Fresno County Coroner must be notified immediately. (The Coroner has two working days to examine the remains and 24 hours to notify the Native American Heritage Commission [NAHC] if the remains are Native American. The most likely descendants then have 24 hours to recommend proper treatment or disposition of the remains, following the NAHC guidelines).

VI. ENERGY. **Would the project:**

1. **Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?**

| Potentially Significant Impact: | □ | Less than Significant with Mitigation: | □ | Less than Significant Impact: | × | No Impact: | □ |

**Discussion:** Development of the site will comply with California Green Building Code requirements as well as Title 24 standards for energy efficiency. The only aspect of the site that will consume energy on an ongoing basis is site lighting. Such lighting will consist of energy-efficient LED light fixtures, in compliance with California requirements. Accordingly, the project’s impacts will be less than significant.
2. **Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?**

| Potentially Significant Impact: | ☐ | Less than Significant with Mitigation: | ☐ | Less than Significant Impact: | ☒ | No Impact: | ☐ |

**Discussion:** See item VI.1. Improvements associated with the parking lot project will be constructed to be compliant with California’s current standards for renewable energy and energy efficiency.

---

**VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS**

Would the project:

Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

1. **Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault?** Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.

| Potentially Significant Impact: | ☐ | Less than Significant with Mitigation: | ☐ | Less than Significant Impact: | ☒ | No Impact: | ☐ |

**Discussion:** While Firebaugh is located in an area that is subject to ground shaking from earthquakes, the distance to faults that will be the likely cause of ground motions is sufficient so that potential impacts are reduced. The City requires all new structures in the community to be built consistent with Zone II seismic standards of the Uniform Building Code.

2. **Strong seismic ground shaking?**

| Potentially Significant Impact: | ☐ | Less than Significant with Mitigation: | ☐ | Less than Significant Impact: | ☒ | No Impact: | ☐ |

**Discussion:** See response to VII. 1. above. With incorporation of Zone II seismic standards, the potential for significant impacts due to seismic ground shaking will be minimal.
3. **Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?**

| Potentially Significant Impact: | <☐> | Less than Significant with Mitigation: | <☐> | Less than Significant Impact: | <☒> | No Impact: | <☐> |

**Discussion:** While the potential for ground failure at the site is low, the applicant will be required to prepare an engineered soils study that will make recommendations as to preparation of site soils and foundation systems used for structures on the site. Implementation of these recommendations will reduce the potential of impacts related to ground failure to a less than significant level.

4. **Landslides?**

| Potentially Significant Impact: | <☐> | Less than Significant with Mitigation: | <☐> | Less than Significant Impact: | <☐> | No Impact: | <☒> |

**Discussion:** The project site is level. There is no realistic possibility of landslide activity on the site.

5. **Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?**

| Potentially Significant Impact: | <☐> | Less than Significant with Mitigation: | <☐> | Less than Significant Impact: | <☒> | No Impact: | <☐> |

**Discussion:** Absorption rates, drainage patterns, and the rate and amount of surface runoff will change with the proposed project, due to an increase in the amount of impervious surfaces (a parking lot). Standard required construction practices and compliance with City ordinances and regulations, *The Uniform Building Code*, and adherence to professional engineering design approved by the City will mitigate potential soil erosion impacts from the project.

6. **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?**

| Potentially Significant Impact: | <☐> | Less than Significant with Mitigation: | <☐> | Less than Significant Impact: | <☒> | No Impact: | <☐> |

**Discussion:** Soils on the project site are considered to be stable. Further, implementation of the recommendations of the engineered soils study required for the project will reduce the potential for stability problems to a less than significant level.
7. **Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?**

| Potentially Significant Impact: | ☐ | Less than Significant with Mitigation: | ☐ | Less than Significant Impact: | ☒ | No Impact: | ☐ |

**Discussion:** According to the Soil Survey of Western Fresno County, the site is underlain by the Wedoka Clay (0 to 1 percent slopes) which has high runoff and very slow permeability. Limitations for Wedoka soils are characterized as “severe” for construction of small commercial buildings, streets and shallow excavations.

These issues can be mitigated through various techniques, including bracing/reinforcement of foundations, and/or the importation of more suitable soils. As with all development in Firebaugh, the project will be required to prepare an engineered soils study that will detail soil limitations and recommendations for site soil preparations and appropriate foundation techniques.

8. **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?**

| Potentially Significant Impact: | ☐ | Less than Significant with Mitigation: | ☐ | Less than Significant Impact: | ☐ | No Impact: | ☒ |

**Discussion:** There are no septic systems included with the project, accordingly, there will be no impacts.

**VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS:** Would the project:

1. **Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?**

| Potentially Significant Impact: | ☐ | Less than Significant with Mitigation: | ☒ | Less than Significant Impact: | ☐ | No Impact: | ☐ |

**Discussion:** Greenhouse gas emissions (GHG) are emissions of various types of gases that are believed to be causing an increase in global temperatures, which is affecting the world’s climate patterns. Scientists recognize GHG resulting from human activities, particularly the use of machinery that burns fossil fuels for power. Key greenhouse gases include carbon dioxide, methane, nitrous oxide, and hydrofluorocarbons.

Greenhouse gases generated by the project are expected to be relatively minimal, given the small size of the project. Some GHG’s will be generated during construction, through the operation of gasoline-burning grading equipment and other motorized vehicles.
Greenhouse gas emissions resulting from operations of the project will occur primarily from employees traveling to and from the site.

The project will be required to employ Best Practical Solutions (BPS) to avoid a requirement to quantify and be determined to have a less than significant individual and cumulative impact for greenhouse gas emissions.

As such, greenhouse gas emissions generated from future development on the site would not be considered a significant impact if the project would implement BPS strategies, in accordance with Air District recommendations. Compliance with the following measures would ensure that any impacts remain less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures**

1. The project shall demonstrate compliance with the applicable BPS strategies to the Planning Division prior to the issuance of a building permit. The following PBS strategies are considered to be applicable, feasible, and effective in reducing greenhouse gas emissions generated by development on the site:
   
a. The project applicant shall provide a pedestrian access network that internally links all residential units and connects to the existing surrounding external streets and pedestrian facilities.
   
b. The project applicant shall ensure site design and building placement minimize barriers to pedestrian access and interconnectivity. Physical barriers such as wells, berms, landscaping, and slopes between uses that impede bicycle or pedestrian circulation shall be eliminated. In addition, barriers to pedestrian access of neighboring facilities and sites shall be minimized.
   
c. Any transit stops associated with the project shall be provided with safe and convenient bicycle/pedestrian access and provide essential transit stop improvements (i.e., shelters, route information, benches, and lighting).
   
d. The project applicant shall incorporate bike lanes and routes into the street system, as applicable.
   
e. The project applicant shall plant trees to provide shade.
   
f. Require truck idling to be restricted during construction phases of the project. During construction, the site shall be posted with signs that restrict truck idling to fifteen minutes or less.
   
g. Reuse and recycle construction and demolition waste;
   
h. Use low or zero-emission vehicles where practical, including construction vehicles;
   
i. Conservative use of both potable and non-potable water to the maximum extent practicable;
2. *Conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?*

| Potentially Significant Impact: | ☐ | Less than Significant with Mitigation: | ☒ | Less than Significant Impact: | ☐ | No Impact: | ☐ |

**Discussion:** A less than significant impact is expected. The project will comply with requirements of the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District to implement Best Practical Solutions (BPS), which will ensure compliance with the District’s Greenhouse Gas standards.

**IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS:** Would the project:

1. *Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?*

| Potentially Significant Impact: | ☐ | Less than Significant with Mitigation: | ☐ | Less than Significant Impact: | ☒ | No Impact: | ☐ |

**Discussion:** Prior to demolition of the existing house, an analysis shall be conducted to determine the potential for asbestos in construction materials. If asbestos is detected then demolition will be performed consistent with adopted protocols for asbestos removal. No other aspect of the project involves the transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials.

2. *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?*

| Potentially Significant Impact: | ☐ | Less than Significant with Mitigation: | ☐ | Less than Significant Impact: | ☒ | No Impact: | ☐ |

**Discussion:** See response in IX. 1. There are no aspects of the project that would 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. As noted above, the existing dwelling will be analyzed for the potential for asbestos and if detected, appropriate removal techniques will be implemented. This is already a requirement of the law.
3. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact:</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation:</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact:</th>
<th>No Impact:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion:** The project will not emit hazardous emissions or hazardous materials and further it is not located within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.

4. 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?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact:</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation:</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact:</th>
<th>No Impact:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion:** See response to IX 2, above. The project site is not included on any list of known hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact:</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation:</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact:</th>
<th>No Impact:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion:** The project site is located about 2/10 of a mile northeast of the single runway at Firebaugh Municipal Airport, and is within the area of review by the Fresno County Airport Land Use Commission. According to the adopted review area boundaries map the site is within the “Primary Review Area Boundary” and is within the “Horizontal Zone”. According to the Airport Land Use plan residential uses in this area are considered to be “acceptable” with “little or no risk”. The project’s impacts will be less than significant.

6. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact:</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation:</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact:</th>
<th>No Impact:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion:** The project site is not located within the vicinity of any known private airstrips.
7. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

| Potentially Significant Impact: | ☑ | Less than Significant with Mitigation: | ☑ | Less than Significant Impact: | ☑ | No Impact: | ☑ |

**Discussion:** The project is not expected to impair implementation of any adopted emergency evacuation plans. The project design proposes no changes to local roadways, that would impair or slow evacuation or emergency response activities. Firebaugh police and fire department officials have been involved in the review of the proposed project to ensure the site is accessible to emergency vehicles.

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

| Potentially Significant Impact: | ☑ | Less than Significant with Mitigation: | ☑ | Less than Significant Impact: | ☑ | No Impact: | ☑ |

**Discussion:** There are no wildlands on or adjacent to the project site that might be the source of a fire.

**X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY** -- Would the project:

1. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?

| Potentially Significant Impact: | ☑ | Less than Significant with Mitigation: | ☑ | Less than Significant Impact: | ☑ | No Impact: | ☑ |

**Discussion:** Proposed development on the site will comply with all City ordinances and standards to assure proper grading and drainage. Compliance with all local, state, and federal regulations will prevent violation of water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. The project will be required to prepare a grading and drainage plan for review and approval by the City Engineer, prior to issuance of building permits. Storm drainage will be directed to an existing City-owned basin west of the site.
2. **Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?**

| Potentially Significant Impact: | ☐ | Less than Significant with Mitigation: | ☐ | Less than Significant Impact: | ☐ | No Impact: | ☒ |

**Discussion:** The project involves the development of a new parking lot to serve a previously-approved medical clinic. The project will remove an existing single family home and related improvements, including landscaping. Some new landscaping will be installed as part of the project but must comply with local and state water efficient landscape requirements. From this perspective, the project will likely result in a minor reduction in citywide water use. Therefore there will be no impact.

3. **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?

| Potentially Significant Impact: | ☐ | Less than Significant with Mitigation: | ☐ | Less than Significant Impact: | ☒ | No Impact: | ☐ |

**Discussion:** The project will not significantly affect drainage or flooding. A grading and drainage plan must be prepared by the applicant and submitted for review and approval by the City Engineer, prior to construction. There are no streams or rivers on or adjacent to the site. The site is not located within a 100- or 500-year flood zone.

   ii. **Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site.**

   **Discussion:** The project will generate stormwater runoff, with the creation of impervious surfaces (the new parking lot). It is expected the project will be designed to direct storm drainage to an existing city-owned storm drainage basin northwest of the site. The applicant will be required to submit an engineered grading and drainage plan for review and approval by the City Engineer, prior to issuance of building permits.

   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?**

| Potentially Significant Impact: | ☐ | Less than Significant with Mitigation: | ☐ | Less than Significant Impact: | ☒ | No Impact: | ☐ |

**Discussion:** The project will generate stormwater runoff, with the creation of impervious surfaces (a new parking lot). It is expected the project will be designed to
direct storm drainage to an existing storm drainage basin northwest of the site. The applicant will be required to submit an engineered grading and drainage plan for review and approval by the City Engineer, prior to issuance of building permits.

iv. Impede or redirect flood flows?

| Potentially Significant Impact: | □ | Less than Significant with Mitigation: | □ | Less than Significant Impact: | ☑ | No Impact: | ☑ |

**Discussion:** According to FEMA flood map 06019C1430H, the site is located within Flood Zone X, which indicates the site is not subject to extensive flooding. Accordingly, there is a less than significant impact.

v. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?

| Potentially Significant Impact: | □ | Less than Significant with Mitigation: | □ | Less than Significant Impact: | ☑ | No Impact: | ☑ |

**Discussion:** No aspect of the project is expected to significantly degrade water quality. During construction, the contractor will be required to implement Best Management Practices (consistent with National Pollution Discharge Elimination System requirements) to control storm drainage and sediments emanating from the site. Prior to construction the applicant will be required to file a Water Quality Control Management Plan for review and approval by the City Engineer.

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

| Potentially Significant Impact: | □ | Less than Significant with Mitigation: | □ | Less than Significant Impact: | ☑ | No Impact: | ☑ |

**Discussion:** According to Flood Map No. 06019C1430H, the project site and surrounding area is located within Flood Zone “X” – defined as “Other Areas: Areas determined to be outside the 0.2% annual chance floodplain”. Accordingly, the chance of flooding and resulting release of pollutants at the site is remote.

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

| Potentially Significant Impact: | □ | Less than Significant with Mitigation: | □ | Less than Significant Impact: | ☑ | No Impact: | ☑ |

**Discussion:** The project will be required to prepare and submit a water quality control plan to be implemented during construction, as required by the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System. This plan must be reviewed and approved by the City
Engineer prior to start of construction. Also, in compliance with the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act of 2014, the City of Firebaugh is participating in preparation of the Sustainable Groundwater Management Plan for the Delta-Mendota sub basin. Upon adoption, future development in the City must be compliant with the policies and standards of this plan. To reduce water demands, the project will implement a low-water-using landscape scheme.

**XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING -**

Would the project:

1. **Physically divide an established community?**
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   **Discussion:** The project proposes the removal of an existing single family home on the corner of a residential street. The site is adjacent to existing commercial development (an approved medical clinic). In this sense the project represents an expansion of commercial use into a residential neighborhood. To reduce the potential impact of this, the project has been designed with the following design strategies.

   **Mitigation Measures**

   1. The north side of the site will feature a masonry wall and landscaping, to screen the site from other homes on the street.
   2. The parking lot will be reserved for employees only; the public (customers) cannot enter the parking lot
   3. The driveway to the parking lot will be "one-way in" – so that employee vehicles will enter the site from Zozaya Street but cannot exit onto Zozaya.

   With the foregoing measures in place, the project’s impacts on land use will be reduced to a less than significant impact.

2. **Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?**
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   **Discussion:** There are no land use plans, policies or regulations applicable to the site that are adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.

3. **Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?**
Discussion: The project site is not subject to any habitat or natural community conservation plan.

XII. MINERAL RESOURCES --
Would the project:

1. 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?

Discussion: A review of maps maintained by the State of California Department of Conservation indicates that site is not known to harbor mineral resources that would be valuable to the region.

2. 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?

Discussion: See response to XII. 1. There will be no impact.

XIII. NOISE -- Would the project result in:

1. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?

Discussion: Construction of the project can be expected to increase ambient noise levels in the project vicinity. In the short term, noise levels will be raised during construction of the project by the operation of heavy equipment and other associated activities. Because construction noise will generally occur intermittently on Monday through Saturdays during daylight hours, the impact of noise on surrounding land uses is not expected to be significant.
In the long term, the project will add some traffic to the west end of Zozaya Street that will somewhat increase the ambient noise levels in this neighborhood. However these noise levels should be relatively consistent with those already experienced in this and other existing developed areas of Firebaugh, particularly those along Highway 33.

2. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

| Potentially Significant Impact: | ☐ | Less than Significant with Mitigation: | ☐ | Less than Significant Impact: | ☒ | No Impact: | ☐ |

**Discussion**: See response to XIII. 1. above.

3. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

| Potentially Significant Impact: | ☐ | Less than Significant with Mitigation: | ☐ | Less than Significant Impact: | ☒ | No Impact: | ☐ |

**Discussion**: See response to XIII. 1. above. While the project may result in a minor increase in ambient noise levels, this increase is not expected to be substantial.

4. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

| Potentially Significant Impact: | ☐ | Less than Significant with Mitigation: | ☐ | Less than Significant Impact: | ☒ | No Impact: | ☐ |

**Discussion**: As noted above, construction activities associated with the project may result in significant temporary noise increases for parcels nearby the site. Construction will be limited to daylight hours Monday through Saturday. These noise levels should be consistent with or lower than noise generated by other transportation-related sources immediately west of the site, including traffic along Highway 33, the railroad, and aircraft at Firebaugh Municipal Airport.

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

| Potentially Significant Impact: | ☐ | Less than Significant with Mitigation: | ☐ | Less than Significant Impact: | ☒ | No Impact: | ☒ |

**Discussion**: The project site is located about 2/10 mile east of the Firebaugh Municipal Airport. However the project consists of the construction of a parking lot to serve a
previously-approved medical clinic. No persons will be introduced to the site on a permanent basis, therefore there will be no impact.

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

| Potentially Significant Impact: | ☐ | Less than Significant with Mitigation: | ☐ | Less than Significant Impact: | ☐ | No Impact: | ☑ |

**Discussion:** The project site is not located within the vicinity of any private airstrips.

**XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING**

-- Would the project:

1. *Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?*

| Potentially Significant Impact: | ☐ | Less than Significant with Mitigation: | ☐ | Less than Significant Impact: | ☐ | No Impact: | ☑ |

**Discussion:** The project is consists of a the construction of a small parking lot to serve a previously-approved medical clinic. There will be no introduction of population to the site or community. There will be no impact.

2. *Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?*

| Potentially Significant Impact: | ☐ | Less than Significant with Mitigation: | ☐ | Less than Significant Impact: | ☑ | No Impact: | ☐ |

**Discussion:** The project would result in the elimination of one single family home, which will be demolished to make way for construction of a parking lot. This impact is considered to be less than significant.

3. *Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?*

| Potentially Significant Impact: | ☐ | Less than Significant with Mitigation: | ☐ | Less than Significant Impact: | ☑ | No Impact: | ☐ |

**Discussion:** See previous item. One single family home will be removed to accommodate the project. Based on a per-unit rate of approximately 4 persons, the removal of this unit will not displace substantial numbers of people.
**XV. PUBLIC SERVICES**

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

*Fire protection?*

| Potentially Significant Impact: | ☐ | Less than Significant with Mitigation: | ☐ | Less than Significant Impact: | ☒ | No Impact: | ☐ |

**Discussion:** Properties within city limits receive fire protection services by the Firebaugh Fire Department. The Department is headquartered at facilities located on 11th Street, between O and P Streets, in central Firebaugh.

Development of the site may actually reduce the potential demand for services of the fire department, as an older existing dwelling will be removed and replaced with a parking lot.

The Fire Department has been involved in review of the design of the project to ensure adequate access and fire safety. The project is expected to have a less than significant impact.

*Police protection?*

| Potentially Significant Impact: | ☐ | Less than Significant with Mitigation: | ☐ | Less than Significant Impact: | ☒ | No Impact: | ☐ |

**Discussion:** The project site receives police protection services by the Firebaugh Police Department. The Department is headquartered at facilities located on 11th Street, between O and P Streets, in central Firebaugh.

Development of the subject site may add to the workload for the Police Department, however, as a parking lot, this is not expected to have a significant impact on the Department’s ability to respond to emergencies with its current personnel and equipment.
Schools?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact:</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation:</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact:</th>
<th>No Impact:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion:** The project is within the Firebaugh-Las Deltas Unified School District (F.L.D.S.D.) The District operates a high school, a continuation high school, a middle school and two elementary schools, serving Firebaugh and the surrounding area. As the project consists of the removal of a single dwelling and replacement with a parking lot (to serve a previously-approved medical clinic) there will be no impact on the school district and its ability to serve the community.

Parks?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact:</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation:</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact:</th>
<th>No Impact:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion:** The project consists of the removal of a dwelling and its replacement with a parking lot to serve a previously-approved medical clinic. There will be no impact on the City’s parks and recreation system.

Other public facilities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact:</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation:</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact:</th>
<th>No Impact:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion:** No other public facilities (that are not otherwise discussed elsewhere in this study) are expected to be impacted by the project.

**XVI. RECREATION --**

1. **Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact:</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation:</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact:</th>
<th>No Impact:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion:** See response to XV. (Parks) above. The project involves construction of a parking lot on a small site to serve a previously-approved medical clinic. There will be no increase in 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.
2. **Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?**

| Potentially Significant Impact: | ☐ | Less than Significant with Mitigation: | ☐ | Less than Significant Impact: | ☐ | No Impact: | ☒ |

**Discussion:** The project does not include the construction of recreational facilities. There will be no impact.

**XVII. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC --**

Would the project:

1. **Conflict with a program plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?**

| Potentially Significant Impact: | ☐ | Less than Significant with Mitigation: | ☐ | Less than Significant Impact: | ☒ | No Impact: | ☐ |

**Discussion:** The project will comply with Firebaugh’s policies and ordinances concerning the City’s circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities. In particular, the project will be required to construct new public sidewalks around the site frontage. This installation will comply with current ADA standards, providing for safer movement for disabled individuals, including across the Zozaya Street driveway that will serve the proposed parking lot.

2. **Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?**

| Potentially Significant Impact: | ☐ | Less than Significant with Mitigation: | ☐ | Less than Significant Impact: | ☒ | No Impact: | ☐ |

**Discussion:** The project proposes the construction of a small parking lot to accommodate employee parking for a previously-approved medical clinic. By itself the project will not generate traffic – it is designed to accommodate parking demands generated by the medical clinic.
3. **Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact:</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation:</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact:</th>
<th>No Impact:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion:** The project site is located about 2/10 mile east of the Firebaugh Municipal Airport. The site is within the Primary review zone established by the Fresno County Airport Land Use Plan. According to the Review Area Boundaries map in the Airport Land use plan, the project site is located within the Horizontal Zone. According to the Airport/Land Use Safety Compatibility Criteria Table, the proposed project is considered an “acceptable” use.

4. **Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact:</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation:</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact:</th>
<th>No Impact:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion:** The project is not anticipated to increase hazards due to any design feature. The project will install sidewalks to current City and Caltrans standards along the project frontage. The project will be required to secure an encroachment permit from Caltrans, prior to construction work in the roadway right-of-way.

5. **Result in inadequate emergency access?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact:</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation:</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact:</th>
<th>No Impact:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion:** No impact is expected. The project has been reviewed for emergency access by the Firebaugh Police and Fire Departments as well as the City Engineer. The site circulation design meets City standards for access, aisle width, turning radii, etc.
XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

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:

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

| Potentially Significant Impact: | ☐ | Less than Significant with Mitigation: | ☐ | Less than Significant Impact: | ☒ | No Impact: | ☒ |

Discussion:

The site is not listed in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in any local register of historical resources. The site is flat, within an urbanized area and has been developed with a single family home for decades. There are no waterways or other features on or adjacent the site that are typically known to have attracted settlement or other activities by Native Americans.

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.

| Potentially Significant Impact: | ☐ | Less than Significant with Mitigation: | ☐ | Less than Significant Impact: | ☒ | No Impact: | ☒ |

Discussion:

As discussed above, there are no aspects of the site that indicate it has archaeological resources important to Native American tribes. The City conducted consultation with a list of tribes prepared by the Native American Heritage Commission, in compliance with State law. No contact or request for consultations from these tribes was received by the City.
XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS: Would the project:

1. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact:</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation:</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact:</th>
<th>No Impact:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion:

The project includes construction of a new parking lot and will not generate wastewater flows. Therefore there will be no impact.

2. Require or result in the relocation or construction of new water or wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact:</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation:</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact:</th>
<th>No Impact:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion: The project will not result in the relocation or construction of new water or wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities. There will be no impact.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact:</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation:</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact:</th>
<th>No Impact:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion:

The project involves the removal of an existing single family home and related landscaping and other improvements, and construction of a new parking lot and associated landscaping. New landscaping must demonstrate a reduction in water use over “business as usual” (consistent with the City and State Model Water Efficient Landscape regulations). Therefore, the project will likely result in a reduction of water usage.

4. 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?
Discussion: The project will not generate wastewater, therefore there will be no impact.

5. 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?

Discussion: The project involves the removal of an existing single family home and related landscaping and other improvements, and construction of a new parking lot and associated landscaping. Waste generated by removal of the dwelling will be recycled (as appropriate) as required by the City of Firebaugh’s Construction and Demolition Debris ordinance. Once complete the project will generate no solid waste, other than minimal amounts of landscaping maintenance waste. This green waste will be channeled to the City’s green waste composting program. As a result, the project will have a less than significant impact.

6. Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

Discussion: See response to XIX. 5. All demolition waste will be recycled or disposed of properly. Any landscape maintenance waste will be channeled to the City’s green waste composting program. Accordingly, the project will comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste and have a less than significant impact.

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?

Discussion: The site is not located in or near any State responsibility areas or lands classified as a “very high” fire hazard severity zone. The site is within a developed urban
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neighborhood in Firebaugh, on the floor of the San Joaquin Valley. There will be no impact.

\[ b) \text{ Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?} \]

| Potentially Significant Impact: | ☐ | Less than Significant with Mitigation: | ☐ | Less than Significant Impact: | ☐ | No Impact: | ☒ |

**Discussion**: The project site is level and not subject to winds or other factors that would expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire.

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?*

| Potentially Significant Impact: | ☐ | Less than Significant with Mitigation: | ☐ | Less than Significant Impact: | ☐ | No Impact: | ☒ |

**Discussion**: The site is level, not forested and therefore not subject to wildfire. No infrastructure measures will be required to mitigate the potential for wildfire.

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?*

| Potentially Significant Impact: | ☐ | Less than Significant with Mitigation: | ☐ | Less than Significant Impact: | ☐ | No Impact: | ☒ |

**Discussion**: The site is level and not subject to flooding or landslides resulting from post-fire slope instability or slope changes.
XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE --

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

| Potentially Significant Impact: | ☐ | Less than Significant with Mitigation: | ☒ | Less than Significant Impact: | ☐ | No Impact: | ☐ |

2. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?

| Potentially Significant Impact: | ☐ | Less than Significant with Mitigation: | ☐ | Less than Significant Impact: | ☒ | No Impact: | ☐ |

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

| Potentially Significant Impact: | ☐ | Less than Significant with Mitigation: | ☒ | Less than Significant Impact: | ☐ | No Impact: | ☐ |
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