

INSTRUCTIONS ON EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

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

I. AESTHETICS -- Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
 Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: Scenic vistas are singular vantage points that offer unobstructed views of valued viewsheds, including areas designated as official scenic vistas along major highways. The viewshed and visible components of the landscape within that viewshed, including the underlying landform and overlaying land cover, establish the visual environment for the scenic vista.

The project will not result in cumulative impacts on a scenic vista because there is no development proposed. Therefore, the project will not result in any adverse project or cumulative level effect on a scenic vista.

b) 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 Incorporated
 Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not propose any use of outdoor lighting or building materials with highly reflective properties such as highly reflective glass or high-gloss surface colors. Therefore, the project will not create any new sources of light pollution that could contribute to sky glow, light trespass or glare and adversely affect day or nighttime views in area.

II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES -- In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:

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

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated

Less Than Significant Impact

No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not propose any conversion of any lands designated as 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. Therefore, no Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Statewide or Farmland of Local Importance will be converted to a non-agricultural use.

b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?

Potentially Significant Impact

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated

Less Than Significant Impact

No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not propose any type of land use change. Therefore, the project does not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act Contract.

III. AIR QUALITY -- Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District or applicable portions of the State Implementation Plan (SIP); violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation; expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations; or create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

Potentially Significant Impact

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated

Less Than Significant Impact

No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project will not result in emissions of significant quantities of criteria pollutants listed in the California Ambient Air Quality Standards or toxic air contaminants as identified by the California Air Resources Board.

In general, air quality impacts from the proposed project would be the result of emissions from motor vehicles owned by the subject inactive special district.

The project will not generate significant levels of air pollutants. As such, the project will not expose sensitive populations to excessive levels of air pollutants.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

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

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
 Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: There is no development of any kind proposed therefore no impacts direct or indirect would occur to biological resources.

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

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
 Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: There is no proposed development therefore no impacts direct or indirect would occur to biological resources.

c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
 Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: There is no proposed development therefore no impacts direct or indirect would occur to biological resources.

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?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
 Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project would not adversely affect any potential wildlife movement paths. In addition, migratory fish would not be affected since the project is not located near any open water habitat.

- e) Conflict with the provisions of any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Communities Conservation Plan, other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan or any other local policies or ordinances that protect biological resources?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
 Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: The project consists of the dissolution of two inactive resource conservation districts, one inactive drainage district, and one inactive County Service Area, which may impose a less than significant impact. Both conservation districts have been inactive for more than ten years no conservation services have been provided therefore no change will occur in services provided, as there was none provided previously. The Silver Creek Drainage District has been inactive for approximately ten years drainage service within the districts boundaries have been provided by the County of Fresno no change will occur.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

- a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in 15064.5; cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to 15064.5; or disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
 Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not include any proposed development or disturbance of human remains therefore it has been determined that there are no impacts to these resources.

- b) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated

Less Than Significant Impact

No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not include any proposed development therefore would not impact to any unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS -- Would the project:

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

- 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? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.

Potentially Significant Impact

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated

Less Than Significant Impact

No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project is not located in a fault rupture hazard zone identified by the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, Special Publication 42, Revised 1997, Fault-Rupture Hazards Zones in California. Therefore, there will be no impact from the exposure of people or structures to adverse effects from a known hazard zone as a result of this project.

- ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?

Potentially Significant Impact

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated

Less Than Significant Impact

No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: No construction is proposed therefore there will be no impact from the exposure of people or structures to potential adverse effects from strong seismic ground shaking as a result of this project.

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

Potentially Significant Impact

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated

Less Than Significant Impact

No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: There will be no impact from the exposure of people to adverse effects from a known area susceptible to ground failure.

iv. Landslides?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The site is not located within a landslide susceptibility zone. In addition, staff has determined that the geologic environment of the project area is not located within an area of potential or pre-existing conditions that could become unstable in the event of seismic activity.

b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project will not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil for the following reasons:

- The project will not result in unprotected erodible soils; will not alter existing drainage patterns; is not located in a floodplain, wetland, or significant drainage feature; and will not develop steep slopes.
- The project does not propose any type development.
- Both resource conservation districts were intended to enable landowners within the district's boundaries to receive technical assistance services from the USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service related to improving land capabilities, conserving resources, preventing and controlling soil erosion, both districts have been inactive for more than ten years therefore no change will occur.

Due to these factors, it has been found that the project will not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil on a project level.

c) Will the project produce unstable geological conditions that will result in adverse impacts resulting from landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated |
|---|---|

Less Than Significant Impact

No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: There is no development of any type proposed therefore there are no geological formations that are unstable or would potentially become unstable as a result of the project.

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

Potentially Significant Impact

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated

Less Than Significant Impact

No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not propose any type of development therefore the project cannot contain expansive soils as defined by Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994).

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

Potentially Significant Impact

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated

Less Than Significant Impact

No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not propose any septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems since no wastewater will be generated.

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS -- Would the project:

a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, storage, use, or disposal of hazardous materials or wastes?

Potentially Significant Impact

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated

Less Than Significant Impact

No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project consist of the dissolution of four inactive special districts. The service that these district have been created to provided has now been provided by various outside agencies no change will occur therefore the project will not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, storage, use , or disposal of hazardous materials or wastes.

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?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
 Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project consist of the dissolution of four inactive special districts, no development will occur therefore the project will not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment.

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

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
 Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project consist of the dissolution of four inactive special districts. Therefore, the project will not have any effect on an existing or proposed school.

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

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
 Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project is not located on a site listed in the State of California Hazardous Waste and Substances sites list compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5.

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

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
 Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not propose any type of development. Therefore, the project will not constitute a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.

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

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
 Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not propose any type of development. As a result, the project will not constitute a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.

g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
 Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not propose any type of development. As a result, the project will not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.

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

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
 Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not propose any type of development. As a result, the project will not 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.

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY -- Would the project:

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project consist of the dissolution of four inactive special districts. Therefor the project will not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements.

b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project will not use any groundwater for any purpose, including irrigation, domestic or commercial demands. In addition, the project does not involve operations that would interfere substantially with groundwater recharge including, but not limited to the following: regional diversion of water to another groundwater basin; or diversion or channelization of a stream course or waterway with impervious layers, such as concrete lining or culverts, for substantial distances (e.g. ¼ mile). Therefore, no impact to groundwater resources is anticipated.

c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site?

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: The project does not involve construction of new or

expanded development that could alter the drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site or that would substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff. Therefore the project will not significantly impact or alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site.

d) 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?

- Potentially Significant Impact
- Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- Less Than Significant Impact
- No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: There are no existing or planned storm water drainage systems proposed by the project, nor does the project require such systems. Furthermore, the proposed project will not result in no a significant increase in pervious surfaces that could contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing storm water drainage systems.

e) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map, including County Floodplain Maps?

- Potentially Significant Impact
- Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- Less Than Significant Impact
- No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not propose any housing; therefore no impact from placing housing in a floodplain can occur.

f) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?

- Potentially Significant Impact
- Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- Less Than Significant Impact
- No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: No 100-year flood hazard areas were identified on the project site therefore, no impact will occur.

g) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death from flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam; or from inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project will not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam or from inundation by seiche, tsunami or mudflow because the project is for dissolution of four inactive special districts that would not involve people being located at the site and would not involve significant structures that would be considered a significant loss if flooding or other inundation events occurred. Additionally the Silver Creek Drainage District has been inactive for approximately ten years, drainage service have been provided by the County of Fresno no change will occur.

IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING -- Would the project:

a) Physically divide an established community?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not propose introducing new infrastructure such major roadways or water supply systems, or utilities to the area. Therefore, the proposed project will not significantly disrupt or divide the established community.

b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project does not propose any land use change.

X.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 to a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
 Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not propose any type of development. Therefore, any future use or availability of mineral resources would not be lost as a result of the project.

XI.NOISE-- Would the project result in:

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

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
 Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: There will be no noise generated by the proposed project.

- b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
 Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not propose any of the following land uses that can be impacted by ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels.

1. Buildings where low ambient vibration is essential for interior operation, including research and manufacturing facilities with special vibration constraints.
2. Residences and buildings where people normally sleep including hotels, hospitals, residences and where low ambient vibration is preferred.
3. Civic and institutional land uses including schools, churches, libraries, other institutions, and quiet office where low ambient vibration is preferred.
4. Concert halls for symphonies or other special use facilities where low ambient vibration is preferred.

In addition, the project does not propose new or expanded infrastructure such as mass transit, highways, major roadways, or intensive extractive industry that could generate excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels on-site or in the surrounding area.

c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project will not result in cumulatively noise impacts.

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

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not involve any uses that may create substantial temporary or periodic increases in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity including but not limited to extractive industry; outdoor commercial or industrial uses that involve crushing, cutting, drilling, grinding, or blasting of raw materials; truck depots, transfer stations or delivery areas; or outdoor sound systems.

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

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is not located within a Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP) for airports or within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport. Therefore, the project will not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive airport-related noise levels.

f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people

residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
 Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is not located within a one-mile vicinity of a private airstrip; therefore, the project will not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive airport-related noise levels.

XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING -- Would the project induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly or indirectly; displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere; or displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
 Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project consist of the dissolution of four inactive special districts that would have no effect on the availability of housing. The project would not displace any housing or people and would not induce population growth. The proposed project will not induce substantial population growth in an area because the project does not propose any physical or regulatory change that would remove a restriction to or encourage population growth in an area including, but limited to new or extended infrastructure or public facilities; new commercial or industrial facilities; large-scale residential development; accelerated conversion of homes to commercial or multi-family use; or regulatory changes including General Plan amendments, specific plan amendments, zone reclassifications, sewer or water annexations; or LAFCO annexation actions.

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES

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

- i. Fire protection?
- ii. Police?
- iii. Schools?
- iv. Parks?

v. Other public facilities?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
 Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project will not result in the need for significantly altered services or facilities. The project does not involve the construction of new or physically altered governmental facilities including but not limited to fire protection facilities, sheriff facilities, schools, or parks in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance service ratios or objectives for any public services. Therefore, the project will not have an adverse physical effect on the environment because the project does not require new or significantly altered services or facilities to be constructed.

XIV. RECREATION

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

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
 Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not propose any residential use, included but not limited to a residential subdivision, mobile home park, or construction for a single-family residence that may increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities in the vicinity.

- a) 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 Incorporated
 Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. Therefore, the construction or expansion of recreational facilities cannot have an adverse physical effect on the environment.

XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC -- Would the project:

- a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic

load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
 Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project will not cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections).

b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the County congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
 Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project will not exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the County congestion management agency for designated roads or highways.

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

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
 Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: There is no development proposed for the project therefor the project will not Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)

g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
 Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is the dissolution of four inactive special districts. The implementation will not result in any construction or new road design features; therefore, will not conflict with policies regarding alternative transportation.

XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS -- Would the project:

a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not involve any uses that will discharge any wastewater to sanitary sewer or on-site wastewater systems (septic). Therefore, the project will not exceed any wastewater treatment requirements.

b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not include new or expanded water or wastewater treatment facilities. In addition, the project does not require the construction or expansion of water or wastewater treatment facilities. Therefore, the project will not require any construction of new or expanded facilities, which could cause significant environmental effects.

c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not include new or expanded storm water drainage facilities. Moreover, the project does not involve any landform modification or require any source, treatment or structural Best Management Practices for storm water. Therefore, the project will not require any construction of new or expanded facilities, which could

cause significant environmental effects.

d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
 Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not involve or require water services from a water district. The project is for the dissolution of four special districts that does rely on water service for any purpose.

e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
 Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project will not produce any wastewater; therefore, the project will not interfere with any wastewater treatment providers service capacity.

f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
 Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project will not generate any solid waste nor place any burden on the existing permitted capacity of any landfill or transfer station within Fresno County.

g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
 Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project will not generate any solid waste nor place any burden on the existing permitted capacity of any landfill or transfer station within Fresno County. Therefore, compliance with any Federal, State, or local statutes or regulation related to solid waste is not applicable to this project.

XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE:

a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, 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?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project is for the dissolution of four inactive special districts. Therefore the project does not have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, 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.

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

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project is for the dissolution of four inactive special districts. The project does not have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable.

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

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: In the evaluation of environmental impacts in this Initial Study, the potential for adverse direct or indirect impacts to human beings were considered in the response to certain questions in sections I. Aesthetics, III. Air Quality, VI. Geology and Soils, VII. Hazards and Hazardous Materials, VIII Hydrology and Water Quality XI. Noise, XII. Population and Housing, and XV. Transportation and Traffic. As a result of this evaluation, there is no substantial evidence that there are adverse effects on human beings associated with this project. Therefore, this project has been determined not to meet this Mandatory Finding of Significance.