



NOTICE OF INTENT TO ADOPT A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

TO: Agencies, Organizations, and Interested Parties.

SUBJECT: Notice of Intent to Adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Blossom Heights Site Plan Review project.

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the City of Orange Cove, as lead agency under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), has prepared a Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) and supporting Initial Study for the Blossom Heights Site Plan Review project and is providing public notice in compliance with Title 14, Chapter 3, §15072 and §15073 of the California Code of Regulations, as amended.

The City has prepared this Notice of Intent to Adopt a MND to provide an opportunity for input from public agencies, organizations, and interested parties on the environmental analysis addressing the potential effects of the proposed project.

PROJECT TITLE: Blossom Heights Site Plan Review

PROJECT LOCATION: The 2.9 acre project site is located northeast of the intersection between Jacobs and Adams Avenue in the City of Orange Cove. The site is north and south of medium density residential dwellings, east of agricultural land, and west of high density residential dwellings for seniors.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The proposed project is a high density residential site plan including 50' wide interior parking lot road. The 42 proposed units are distributed between 5 two-story multifamily buildings with 4 units per floor, 8 units per complex, for a total of 64,306 square feet. The lot will be graded from back of lot to front of lot, north to south, along the same grade as the natural hydrology. The proposed interior parking lot road would be 50 feet wide and connect Adams Avenue and Jacob Avenue, although it is not intended as a thru street.

PUBLIC REVIEW: The MND is available for a 20-day public review period beginning November 16, 2021 and ending December 9, 2021. Copies of the MND are available for review at City Hall, located at 633 6th Street, Orange Cove, CA 93646.

AGENCY/ PUBLIC COMMENTS: Written comments on the MND for the proposed project must be received no later than December 10, 2021. Send comments by mail to 633 6th Street, Orange Cove, CA

93646 or by email, to tristan@weplancities.com. If you require additional information, please contact Tristan Suire at (559) 734-8737.

PUBLIC HEARING: The Orange Cove Planning Commission will consider this item tentatively planned for January 18, 2022 or as soon thereafter as possible. Hearing will be held at the City Council Chambers at 633 6th Street, Orange Cove, CA 93646.

To confirm the date and time of the meetings and for additional information concerning the proposed project, please check the City's website.





Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration

Blossom Heights Site Plan Review Project

Site Plan Review 2021- (Blossom Heights)

City File No.

The contract city planners have reviewed the proposed project described below to determine whether it could have a significant effect on the environment as a result of project completion. "Significant effect on

the environment” is defined as a substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse change in any of the physical conditions within the area affected by the project including land, air, water, minerals, flora, fauna, ambient noise, and objects of historic or aesthetic significance.

NAME OF PROJECT: Blossom Heights Site Plan Review

PROJECT FILE NUMBER:

PROJECT LOCATION AND ASSESSORS PARCEL NUMBER: Subject property is located northeast of the intersection between Jacobs and Adams Avenue, in the northeast quadrant of the city. The Assessor’s Parcel Numbers (APN) are 375-234-19, 20, & 24, containing approximately 2.9 acres. The property is located in Section 12, of Township 15 South, Range 24 East, M.D.B.&M.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The proposed project consists of a General Plan Amendment application, Rezone Amendment application, and application for site plan review of a proposed multifamily residential development to allow for the construction of 44 high density attached residential dwellings, at a density of 0.066 acres per unit.

APPLICANT CONTACT INFORMATION:

Brian Young and Darrell Lashinski, Property Owner / Applicant
55735 Stewart Avenue, Visalia, CA 93291

FINDING: In accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act, the City of Orange Cove has prepared an Initial Study to determine whether the proposed project may have any significant adverse effect on the environment. The Initial Study and Proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration reflect the independent judgement of the contract city planner and city staff. On the basis of the Initial Study, the City of Orange Cove hereby finds:

Although the proposed project may have a significant adverse impact on the environment, there will not be a significant adverse impact in for this instance because the project has incorporated specific provisions to reduce impacts to less than significant levels and/or mitigation measures described herein have been added to the project. A Mitigated Negative Declaration has thus been prepared.

The Initial Study, which provides the foundation and reasons for this conclusion, is attached and/or referenced herein and is hereby made a part of this document.

PROPOSED MITIGATION MEASURES:

The following Mitigation Measures are extracted from the Initial Study. These measures are designed to avoid or minimize potentially significant impacts, thereby reducing them to an insignificant level. A Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) is an integral part of project implementation pursuant to AB 3180, passed in 1988, and ensures that mitigation is properly implemented by the City and

the implementing agencies. The MMRP will describe actions required to implement the appropriate mitigation for each CEQA category including identifying the responsible agency, program timing, and program monitoring requirements. Based on the analysis and conclusions of the Initial Study, the impacts of the proposed project would be mitigated to less-than-significant levels with the implementation of the mitigation measures presented below.

XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Discussion: The proposed project will be connected to the city's water system. The city water supply originates from Millerton Lake, the surface waters of which are conveyed by the Friant-Kern Canal, which is then treated to meet State Drinking Water Standards, and finally transmitted to residents, businesses, and industry in the city. The State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) issued the City of Orange Cove a Compliance Order first in February of 2017, and then again in June of 2020, for failure to ensure that sufficient water was available to adequately, dependably, and safely supply all users under maximum demand conditions. This is because the Friant Kern Canal is periodically shut down for extended time periods during winter months for maintenance such as herbicide application. Therefore the City must address the need to develop an alternative source of supply to meet the demands on the system during foreseeable Friant Kern shutdowns.

The City of Orange Cove has submitted two applications to the SWRCB Division of Financial Assistance (DFA) with regards to providing adequately reliable water supply. The first is to fund construction of two new package surface water treatment plants to replace the existing aging plants. The completion of this application and construction will take several years, however it is an imperative to providing sufficient treatment infrastructure. The second is to fund a planning project to develop additional source capacity, however the application has not been deemed complete by the DFA.

The current assessment by the SWRCB that the supply of water in Orange Cove is insufficient to support annexations on the grounds that the residential dwellings intended for these projects will exceed the capacity of Orange Cove to reliably supply users under maximum demand conditions, implies that the addition of residential dwellings within the city will similarly strain water demands. This has the potential to lead to expanded entitlements on water to supplement supply, and therefore the following measures must be incorporated into the project to ensure less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measure USS-4: The completion of the two aforementioned DFA applications and subsequent compliance with SWRCB standards will secure the water supply needed to reliably ensure that the project will not require new resources or entitlements. If the SWRCB requires the identification of additional groundwater source capacity, then plans for aquifer recharge and recovery systems, water tower infrastructure, or other capacity increasing practices must be considered to mitigate the impacts of potentially acquiring additional water supply resources.

USS-4 The following measures shall be implemented:

Measure USS-4.A: Before initiation of construction or ground-disturbing activities associated with the project, the City shall require compliance with all SWRCB standards pursuant of

Compliance Order No. 03_23_17R_001, evidenced by the completion and submission of two (2) pending applications with the DFA.

Measure USS-4.B: If compliance with the SWRCB is contingent on implementation of plans related to water supply, then this project applicants must incorporate during buildout all applicable aspects of those plans as mitigation measures in order to keep impacts to a less than significant level.

Measure USS-4.C: To the maximum extent feasible, limit use of turf or water intensive landscape features present on all lots in the proposed project, and encourage use of drought resistant vegetation, gravels, and other xeriscaped landscape features.

PUBLIC REVIEW PERIOD:

Before 5:00 P.M. on _____ ending date, any person may:

1. Review the Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration as an informational document only; or
2. Submit written comments regarding the information, analysis, and mitigation measures in the Draft MND. Before the MND is adopted, planning staff will prepare written responses to any comments, and revise the Draft MND, as necessary, to reflect any concerns raised during the public review period. All written comments will be included as part of the Final MND.

Circulated On: _____

Adopted On: _____

Circulation Period: _____

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

CITY OF ORANGE COVE

BLOSSOM HEIGHTS PROJECT

Section 21081.6 of the Public Resources Code and Section 15097 of the CEQA Guidelines require adoption of a Mitigation Monitoring or Reporting Program for all projects for which an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) or Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) has been prepared, pursuant of AB 3180 enacted January 1, 1989.

The Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) describes the procedures for implementation of the mitigation measures adopted for the proposed project as identified in the Initial Study and MND. The proposed MMRP will be considered by the City of Orange Cove prior to the adoption of the MND. The MMRP will be in place through all phases of the proposed project, including design, construction, and operation as applicable. The City is responsible for administering the MMRP activities or delegating them to staff, other departments, consultants, or contractors. The City will also ensure that monitoring is documented through required reports and any potential shortcomings are promptly corrected. Tracking compliance will be the responsibility of the designated environmental monitor. Impacts that require mitigation measures are as follows:

Potentially Significant <u>Impact</u>	Less Than Significant with <u>Mitigation</u>	Less Than Significant <u>Impact</u>	No <u>Impact</u>
--	---	--	-------------------------

Utilities and Social Services --

Would the project:

1. Have sufficient water supplied available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?

☐

☒

☐

☐

Sources: Tentative Tract Map Application filed by Brian Young and Darrell Lashinski
Letter from State Water Resources Control Board Dated 5/27/21 regarding Compliance
Order No. 03_23_17R_001_A1, Initial Study prepared for the Blossom Heights Project.

Finding of Fact: The project will have a less than significant impact with incorporation of mitigation measures.

Discussion: The proposed project will be connected to the city's water system. The city water supply originates from Millerton Lake, the surface waters of which are conveyed by the Friant-Kern Canal, which is then treated to meet State Drinking Water Standards, and finally transmitted to residents, businesses, and industry in the city. The State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) first issued the City of Orange Cove a Compliance Order in February of 2017, and then again in June of 2020, for failure to ensure that sufficient water was available to adequately, dependably, and safely supply all users under maximum demand conditions. This is because the Friant Kern Canal is periodically shut down for extended time periods during winter months for maintenance such as herbicide application. Therefore the City must address the need to develop an alternative source of supply to meet the demands on the system during foreseeable Friant Kern maintenance shutdowns.

The City of Orange Cove has submitted two applications to the SWRCB Division of Financial Assistance (DFA) with regards to providing adequately reliable water supply. The first is to fund construction of two new package surface water treatment plants to replace the existing aging plants. The completion of this application and construction will take several years, however it is an imperative to providing sufficient water treatment infrastructure. The second is to fund a planning project to develop additional groundwater source capacity, however the application has not been deemed complete by the DFA.

The current assessment by the SWRCB that the supply of water in Orange Cove is insufficient to support pending annexations on the grounds that the residential dwellings intended for these projects will exceed the capacity of Orange Cove to reliably supply users under maximum demand conditions, implies that the addition of residential dwellings within the city will similarly strain water demands. This has the potential to lead to expanded entitlements on water to supplement supply, and therefore the following measures must be incorporated into the project to ensure a less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measure USS-4: The completion of the two aforementioned DFA applications and subsequent compliance with SWRCB standards will secure the water supply needed to reliably ensure that the project will not require new resources or entitlements. If the SWRCB requires the identification of additional groundwater source capacity, then plans for aquifer recharge and recovery systems, water tower infrastructure, or other capacity increasing practices must be considered to mitigate the impacts of potentially acquiring additional water supply resources. Further, the proposed project will be required to implement best practices regarding landscape features to reduce the water demands generated by the future maintenance of the proposed project.

USS-4 The following measures shall be implemented:

Measure USS-4.A: Before initiation of construction or ground-disturbing activities associated with the project, the City shall require compliance with all SWRCB standards pursuant of Compliance Order No. 03_23_17R_001, evidenced by the completion and submission of two (2) pending applications with the DFA.

Measure USS-4.B: If compliance with the SWRCB is contingent on implementation of plans related to water supply, then the project applicants must incorporate during buildout all applicable aspects of those plans as mitigation measures in order to keep impacts to a less than significant level.

Measure USS-4.C: To the maximum extent feasible, limit use of turf or water intensive landscape features present on all lots in the proposed project, and encourage use of drought resistant vegetation, gravels, and other xeriscaped landscape features.

Monitoring and Reporting:

Enforcement Agency- Contract City Engineers (A&M Consulting Engineers) or applicable monitoring consultant.

Monitoring Frequency- Prior to approval of site plan review. Prior to initiation of construction or ground-disturbing activities, and ongoing during construction.

Compliance Action- Project Permit Compliance Review, to be conducted at the discretion of the enforcement agency.

INITIAL ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY

1.0 PROJECT OVERVIEW

BACKGROUND

Applicant: Piro Enterprises, Inc., 3811 Crowell Road, Turlock, CA. 95382
Engineer: NorthStar Engineering, Inc., 620 12th Street, Modesto, CA. 95354

Location:

The subject property is located approximately 450' south of South Avenue, between Anchor Avenue and Orange Street, in the southwest quadrant of the city. The APN for the subject property is 378-021-28, 40, 41, & 42; containing approximately 30.7 acres. The property is located in Sections 23 & 24, of Township 15 South and Range 24 East, M.D.B.&M.

Request:

The applicant has applied for a planning application that pertains to APN 378-021-28, 40, 41, & 42, containing 30.74 acres. Said application is as follows:

1. A tentative subdivision map that will be constructed in at least two phases. Subdividing 4 existing parcels into 156 R-1-6 Medium Density residential units, providing for a density of approximately 5 units per acre.

Staff has determined that the subject property is within the planning area of the Orange Cove General Plan, and that the proposed subdivision would meet the criteria for R-1-6 Medium Density Residential Districts as defined by the City of Orange Cove Zoning Ordinance.

Zone:

The subject property is zoned R-1-6 (Medium Density Residential District) by the City of Orange Cove. The proposed subdivision does not require any change in zoning.

General Plan:

The Orange Cove General Plan designates the property as “medium density” residential. The applicant does not require redesignation of the subject property.

Site:

The subject property is currently vacant. No original use could be found for the subject property, it is assumed an agricultural plot or historically vacant, California Department of Conservation has the subject property classified as “Farmland of Local Importance”. Surrounding land uses are as follows:

North: High density single- and multi-family residential development.

East: Citrus Middle School and Orange Cove High School

West: High density and medium density residential

South: Open space and public facilities including a community center.

Water:

Water including hydrants will be provided to the site by the City of Orange Cove, consistent with the city’s Water Master Plan.

Sewer:

The City of Orange Cove will provide sewer collection and treatment. The developer will be required to install a sewer collection system consistent with the city’s Sewer Master Plan.

Storm Drainage:

Storm water management is provided by the City of Orange Cove through a system of curbs and gutters, drop inlets, storm water lines and retention basins. All storm water emanating from the subject property will be diverted to the adjacent curb and gutter system, which will be required to be installed consistent with the direction of the city engineer.

Police and Fire Services:

Police protection and fire suppression will be provided by the City of Orange Cove.

2.0 CITY OF ORANGE COVE

Orange Cove is an agricultural service community with strong ties to the citrus industry. Forty percent of the city's labor force in 2000 was employed in agriculture, and in data collected between 2012-2016, 59% of the population identified as blue collar laborers. Orange Cove lies in the "citrus belt" of Fresno County along the east side of the San Joaquin Valley at the base of the Sierra foothills.

Population

Orange Cove's population has shown a steady increase between 1970 and 2010, however population growth has leveled off in the past decade between 2011 and 2021. According to the State Department of Finance, Orange Cove's population fell to 9,581 on 1/1/2021.

Table 1: Population Growth Trends

Year	Population	Num. Change	Percent Change	Avg. Ann. Growth
1970	3,392	-	-	-
1980	4,062	670	20%	2.0%
1990	6,543	2,481	61%	6.1%
2000	7,722	1,179	18%	1.8%
2010	11,049	3,327	43%	4.3%
2019(est.)	10,273	-776	-7%	-0.8%
2021(est.)	9,581	-692	-7%	-3.5%

Source: 1990, 2000, and 2020 US Census Bureau, California Department of Finance.

For the purpose of preparing Orange Cove's General Plan, population projections were developed representing low, medium and high estimates for the years 2012 and 2025. The forecasted medium population in 2012 was 12,081, the actual recorded population was 10,205. Likewise, the forecasted medium population in 2025 is 19,618, which is likely to be high given current rates of population growth and the fact that the population would need to more than double in the next five years to meet this projection. Orange Cove's population is now following the General Plan's low population projections. The other 14 cities within Fresno County have largely also tapered off their average annual population growth, with the exceptions of the Cities

of Clovis and Fowler, which have both maintained positive population growth between 2010 and 2020. Orange Cove's growth rate is now among the bottom five of cities in the county.

Income

The median household income for Orange Cove in 1990 was \$15,888. The median income rose to \$22,525 in 2000, and again rose slightly to \$25,677 as of 2019. By comparison, Fresno County's median household income in 2019 was \$53,969, and the State of California's was \$75,235. There is a widening disparity between the increase in median household income in Orange Cove and that of the county and state.

In 1990, Orange Cove ranked 1st among California cities in lowest per capita income, at \$4,385. Over two decades later in 2014 it ranked 7th among California cities in lowest per capita income, at \$9,734. The data from the Fresno County Council of Governments (COG) further details recent changes in income. The American Community Survey concluded in 2014 that the median family income was \$25,030, with 53% of persons below poverty level, and over 70% of children under 18 below poverty level. Fortunately the most recent data from the US census suggests that only 9.5% of all persons in Orange Cove are in poverty, representing a marked improvement.

Employment

Orange Cove's main employer is agriculture, with over 40% of its residents working in packinghouses, fields, as supervisors, or in agriculture-related industries such as equipment maintenance. One of, if not the largest single employer based in Orange Cove is the Orange Cove-Sanger Citrus Association, which purports to employ approximately 100 people in the city. The next largest industry is manufacturing, employing about 10% of the population, followed by healthcare, with 9.6% of city residents. The city's workforce also includes persons working in the following sectors; retail, wholesale, administration, accommodation, public service, and education.

Age

The median age of residents in Orange Cove is 23.6 years. The average household size is 4.39, and 89.7% of households are families. The greatest percentage of the city's population in selected age groups are those that occupy the under 18 years of age category, at 39.9% of the total population. The next largest age groups are 25-44 years of age, at 26.4% of the population, and 45-64 years of age, at 15.8%. Finally, 12.3% of the population is 18-24 years of age, and only 5.7% is 65 years of age or older.

The above age data can be used to forecast trends in the community, however it is important to note that it is collected from the 2010 census, and in the past decade population growth in Orange Cove has leveled off. The first trend is a slight decline in school-aged children, which may impact the city's schools and employment rates. The second is the disproportionate amount of younger households, 44 years of age and under at 66.3%, to older households 45 years of age and older at 33.8%. This relates both to the labor force, which is young enough to endure strenuous labor associated with the agriculture industry, and to housing, which must be able to accommodate the large population of young families.

Ethnicity

The ethnic profile of the population of Orange Cove, currently and historically, is primarily made up of Hispanic populations. The 2019 Census Bureau data states that 95% of the population of Orange Cove identifies as Hispanic, a four percent increase from 91% in 2000. This corresponds with a drop in the population that identifies as white only from 7% in 2000 to 3.4% in 2019. There is also 1% of the population each identifying as Black or African American, and two or more ethnicities, respectively.

INITIAL ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY

1.0 PROJECT OVERVIEW

BACKGROUND

Applicant: Piro Enterprises, Inc., 3811 Crowell Road, Turlock, CA. 95382

Engineer: NorthStar Engineering, Inc., 620 12th Street, Modesto, CA. 95354

Location:

The subject property is located approximately 450' south of South Avenue, between Anchor Avenue and Orange Street, in the southwest quadrant of the city. The APN for the subject property is 378-021-28, 40, 41, & 42; containing approximately 30.7 acres. The property is located in Sections 23 & 24, of Township 15 South and Range 24 East, M.D.B.&M.

Request:

The applicant has applied for a planning application that pertains to APN 378-021-28, 40, 41, & 42, containing 30.74 acres. Said application is as follows:

1. A tentative subdivision map that will be constructed in at least two phases. Subdividing 4 existing parcels into 156 R-1-6 Medium Density residential units, providing for a density of approximately 5 units per acre.

Staff has determined that the subject property is within the planning area of the Orange Cove General Plan, and that the proposed subdivision would meet the criteria for R-1-6 Medium Density Residential Districts as defined by the City of Orange Cove Zoning Ordinance.

Zone:

The subject property is zoned R-1-6 (Medium Density Residential District) by the City of Orange Cove. The proposed subdivision does not require any change in zoning.

General Plan:

The Orange Cove General Plan designates the property as “medium density” residential. The applicant does not require redesignation of the subject property.

Site:

The subject property is currently vacant. No original use could be found for the subject property, it is assumed an agricultural plot or historically vacant, California Department of Conservation has the subject property classified as “Farmland of Local Importance”. Surrounding land uses are as follows:

North: High density single- and multi-family residential development.

East: Citrus Middle School and Orange Cove High School

West: High density and medium density residential

South: Open space and public facilities including a community center.

Water:

Water including hydrants will be provided to the site by the City of Orange Cove, consistent with the city’s Water Master Plan.

Sewer:

The City of Orange Cove will provide sewer collection and treatment. The developer will be required to install a sewer collection system consistent with the city’s Sewer Master Plan.

Storm Drainage:

Storm water management is provided by the City of Orange Cove through a system of curbs and gutters, drop inlets, storm water lines and retention basins. All storm water emanating from the subject property will be diverted to the adjacent curb and gutter system, which will be required to be installed consistent with the direction of the city engineer.

Police and Fire Services:

Police protection and fire suppression will be provided by the City of Orange Cove.

2.0 CITY OF ORANGE COVE

Orange Cove is an agricultural service community with strong ties to the citrus industry. Forty percent of the city's labor force in 2000 was employed in agriculture, and in data collected between 2012-2016, 59% of the population identified as blue collar laborers. Orange Cove lies in the "citrus belt" of Fresno County along the east side of the San Joaquin Valley at the base of the Sierra foothills.

Population

Orange Cove's population has shown a steady increase between 1970 and 2010, however population growth has leveled off in the past decade between 2011 and 2021. According to the State Department of Finance, Orange Cove's population fell to 9,581 on 1/1/2021.

Table 1: Population Growth Trends

Year	Population	Num. Change	Percent Change	Avg. Ann. Growth
1970	3,392	-	-	-
1980	4,062	670	20%	2.0%
1990	6,543	2,481	61%	6.1%
2000	7,722	1,179	18%	1.8%
2010	11,049	3,327	43%	4.3%
2019(est.)	10,273	-776	-7%	-0.8%
2021(est.)	9,581	-692	-7%	-3.5%

Source: 1990, 2000, and 2020 US Census Bureau, California Department of Finance.

For the purpose of preparing Orange Cove's General Plan, population projections were developed representing low, medium and high estimates for the years 2012 and 2025. The forecasted medium population in 2012 was 12,081, the actual recorded population was 10,205. Likewise, the forecasted medium population in 2025 is 19,618, which is likely to be high given current rates of population growth and the fact that the population would need to more than double in the next five years to meet this projection. Orange Cove's population is now following the General Plan's low population projections. The other 14 cities within Fresno County have largely also tapered off their average annual population growth, with the exceptions of the Cities

of Clovis and Fowler, which have both maintained positive population growth between 2010 and 2020. Orange Cove's growth rate is now among the bottom five of cities in the county.

Income

The median household income for Orange Cove in 1990 was \$15,888. The median income rose to \$22,525 in 2000, and again rose slightly to \$25,677 as of 2019. By comparison, Fresno County's median household income in 2019 was \$53,969, and the State of California's was \$75,235. There is a widening disparity between the increase in median household income in Orange Cove and that of the county and state.

In 1990, Orange Cove ranked 1st among California cities in lowest per capita income, at \$4,385. Over two decades later in 2014 it ranked 7th among California cities in lowest per capita income, at \$9,734. The data from the Fresno County Council of Governments (COG) further details recent changes in income. The American Community Survey concluded in 2014 that the median family income was \$25,030, with 53% of persons below poverty level, and over 70% of children under 18 below poverty level. Fortunately the most recent data from the US census suggests that only 9.5% of all persons in Orange Cove are in poverty, representing a marked improvement.

Employment

Orange Cove's main employer is agriculture, with over 40% of its residents working in packinghouses, fields, as supervisors, or in agriculture-related industries such as equipment maintenance. One of, if not the largest single employer based in Orange Cove is the Orange Cove-Sanger Citrus Association, which purports to employ approximately 100 people in the city. The next largest industry is manufacturing, employing about 10% of the population, followed by healthcare, with 9.6% of city residents. The city's workforce also includes persons working in the following sectors; retail, wholesale, administration, accommodation, public service, and education.

Age

The median age of residents in Orange Cove is 23.6 years. The average household size is 4.39, and 89.7% of households are families. The greatest percentage of the city's population in selected age groups are those that occupy the under 18 years of age category, at 39.9% of the total population. The next largest age groups are 25-44 years of age, at 26.4% of the population, and 45-64 years of age, at 15.8%. Finally, 12.3% of the population is 18-24 years of age, and only 5.7% is 65 years of age or older.

The above age data can be used to forecast trends in the community, however it is important to note that it is collected from the 2010 census, and in the past decade population growth in Orange Cove has leveled off. The first trend is a slight decline in school-aged children, which may impact the city's schools and employment rates. The second is the disproportionate amount of younger households, 44 years of age and under at 66.3%, to older households 45 years of age and older at 33.8%. This relates both to the labor force, which is young enough to endure strenuous labor associated with the agriculture industry, and to housing, which must be able to accommodate the large population of young families.

Ethnicity

The ethnic profile of the population of Orange Cove, currently and historically, is primarily made up of Hispanic populations. The 2019 Census Bureau data states that 95% of the population of Orange Cove identifies as Hispanic, a four percent increase from 91% in 2000. This corresponds with a drop in the population that identifies as white only from 7% in 2000 to 3.4% in 2019. There is also 1% of the population each identifying as Black or African American, and two or more ethnicities, respectively.

3.0 DISCUSSION OF POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

This section of the Initial Study analyzes potential impacts of the proposed project. For each topic issue 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.

Potentially Significant <u>Impact</u>	Less Than Significant with <u>Mitigation</u>	Less Than Significant <u>Impact</u>	No <u>Impact</u>
---	--	---	------------------

I. AESTHETICS --

Would the project:

1. Have a substantial
adverse effect on a
scenic vista

☐☐☒☐

Discussion: The project will have an impact on the visual environment due to the construction of homes and subsequent loss of open space, over 30 acres of urbanization will adversely impact the vista. However, this “potential to degrade scenic resources” is acknowledged in the Final EIR prepared for the Orange Cove General Plan. The Orange Cove City Council adopted a “Statement of Overriding Consideration” when the Final EIR was certified.

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 not any significant scenic resources on the subject property including trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings.

3. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

Discussion: The project will be consistent with the visual character of the immediately adjacent neighborhoods that reside to the North and West, as well as the community center and public schools to the South and East, respectively. Given the subject property is within Orange Cove's City limits, and zoned for medium density residential purposes, it is likely that the plots will be further developed for residential purposes within the next 5 years. This is consistent with and discussed further in the Land Use Element of the Orange Cove General Plan.

4. Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

Discussion: The new sources of light that will be introduced into the area will be street lighting that will be installed when the subdivision is constructed, as well as lighting from the homes themselves. In general, this lighting will only illuminate the ground directly below the light standards. The addition of lighting to the street-lined areas of the community is typical of parcels transitioning from vacant to residential.

Potentially Significant <u>Impact</u>	Less Than Significant with <u>Mitigation</u>	Less Than Significant <u>Impact</u>	No <u>Impact</u>
---	--	---	---------------------

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 states 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?

Discussion: The proposed project will urbanize approximately 30 acres of land that was previously used as a vacant lot. However the California Department of Conservation includes the property as "Farmland of Local Importance". Despite this designation, there are no contracts in place to maintain the land as an agricultural preserve. Further, the environmental impact of this urbanization was acknowledged in the EIR prepared for the Orange Cove General Plan. A "Statement of Overriding Consideration" was adopted for

	Potentially Significant <u>Impact</u>	Less Than Significant with <u>Mitigation</u>	Less Than Significant <u>Impact</u>	No <u>Impact</u>
--	---	--	---	---------------------

this environmental document when the Final EIR was certified by the Orange Cove City Council.

2. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?
- | | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The proposed subdivision is not under an agricultural preserve contract nor will it adversely impact existing agricultural operations since land on two sides of the subject property are currently urbanized. None of the properties adjacent to the proposed subdivision are zoned for agriculture, and curiously enough none of the land within the city of Orange Cove is zoned R-A for Single-Family Agricultural Districts, although there is a corresponding zoning ordinance.

3. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code §12220(g)) or timberland (as defined in Public Resources Code §4526)?
- | | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The subject property 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?
- | | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Potentially Significant <u>Impact</u>	Less Than Significant with <u>Mitigation</u>	Less Than Significant <u>Impact</u>	No <u>Impact</u>
---	--	---	---------------------

Discussion: The subject property is not forested, and the proposed project would not impact forested lands.

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 forestland to non-forest use?
- | | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: The project will result in the conversion of vacant farmland to non-farmland uses. The impact of this conversion was discussed in the EIRs prepared on the Orange Cove General Plan. A "Statement of Overriding Consideration" was approved for the EIR, which acknowledged the environmental impact of converting farmland to non-farmland uses. Further, the subject property is not currently zoned nor used for agricultural or forested uses.

III. AIR QUALITY --

Where available, the significance of 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?
- | | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Potentially Significant <u>Impact</u>	Less Than Significant with <u>Mitigation</u>	Less Than Significant <u>Impact</u>	No <u>Impact</u>
---	--	---	---------------------

Discussion: The project will have little if any impact on the Air District's Quality Plan. The project will not generate enough emissions to cause the Air District to exceed

thresholds established by the SJVAPCD for ozone precursors and CO₂. The project will generate the following trips:

156 single-family units x 9.55 trips per household = 1,490 trips per day

These trips can be converted to peak morning and evening trips. The single-family residential homes will generate 118 trips per peak morning hour and 148 trips per peak evening hour.

Most if not all residential trips will utilize the two collector streets, S. Anchor Avenue, and to a lesser degree Orange Street, that border the subject site to the east and west respectively. Traffic wishing to travel east and west using South Avenue can travel to the citrus farms to the east, and the toward the City of Reedley to the west. Traffic wishing to travel north and south can access Anchor Avenue which leads toward downtown and eventually out of the city to the north, and past schools and a community center to the south. Given that peak hour trips will be diffused among many intersections both around and within the proposed subject site, it is very unlikely that any intersection that is near or adjacent will be adversely impacted. Further, because the subdivision is within half of a mile of open space, the community center, schools, a city office, and a church many people are expected to walk to these destinations rather than drive.

While the air emissions generated by the project will add to the Air Basin's already nonattainment status for certain pollutants including ozone (both one and eight-hour measurements), PM 10, and PM 2.5, the project is not deemed significant by the Air Quality District because it does not meet certain emissions thresholds.

In the case of the Blossom Estates project the sensitive receptors adjacent to the project include; residents who live in single and multi-family dwellings both to the north and west. As well as a community center to the south and schools to the east.

Potentially Significant <u>Impact</u>	Less Than Significant with <u>Mitigation</u>	Less Than Significant <u>Impact</u>	No <u>Impact</u>
---	--	---	---------------------

Most of the emissions that could have an adverse impact on the health of the nearby residents will stem from the operation of motor vehicles. The amount of emissions

(pollutants) generated by this project over time (buildout of the project will occur over a period of five years) will depend on the number of trips entering and exiting the project site as well as the types of vehicles and the speed that the vehicle will be driving.

In conclusion, because of the above findings and conditions in the San Joaquin Valley that clearly dominate the air quality in the Valley such as climate change, topography, air inversions, wildfires, agricultural spraying, discing, pruning, harvesting, land leveling, trucking, etc.; and emissions flowing from the north end of the Valley towards the south, the purpose of requiring a Health Risk Screening/Assessment for this project is unnecessary and unreasonable.

There are situations where such an assessment would be warranted. Examples would include a land-use decision where an agricultural chemical company, fossil fuel refinery, dump site, or manufacturing operations that was generating a significant volume of toxic air emissions was being proposed adjacent to residential development, a school or hospital. This project does not fall into any of these categories. For this reason, the air quality analysis provides sufficient information to show that the long-term operation of the project will not have an adverse impact on the health or well-being of the residents who live nearby.

The urbanization of this area of Orange Cove and its impact on air quality were discussed in the Final EIR that was certified by the Orange Cove City Council. The City Council adopted a "Statement of Overriding Consideration" when the Final EIR was certified.

2. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality Violation?

☐☐☒☐

Potentially Significant <u>Impact</u>	Less Than Significant with <u>Mitigation</u>	Less Than Significant <u>Impact</u>	No <u>Impact</u>
---	--	---	---------------------

Discussion: The project will not violate any air quality standards nor will it exceed the Air District's emissions thresholds causing the project to be deemed significant.

Air emissions will be generated during the construction phase of the project, but the Air District's fugitive dust rules (Regulation VIII, Fugitive PM 10 Prohibitions) will ensure that the project will not violate any of the District's standards for dust emissions.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 3. Result in a cumulatively
considerable net increase
of any criteria pollutant for
which the project region
is in nonattainment under
an applicable federal or state
ambient air quality standard
(including releasing emissions
which exceed quantitative
thresholds for ozone
precursors)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: The proposed project will not generate significant criteria pollutants for which the region is in nonattainment, nor will emissions exceed thresholds established by the SJVAPCD for ozone precursors. The impact of urban development within the project area on air quality was discussed in the EIRs prepared for the Orange Cove General Plan, and a "Statement of Overriding Consideration" was adopted for the Final EIR.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 4. Expose sensitive receptors
to substantial pollution
concentrations? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Potentially Significant <u>Impact</u>	Less Than Significant with <u>Mitigation</u>	Less Than Significant <u>Impact</u>	No <u>Impact</u>
---	--	---	---------------------

Discussion: Residents that live in the proposed project area will not be exposed to any substantial pollution concentrations. The lots adjacent to the north are high-density residential dwellings, and the schools and residential dwellings to the east and west are each buffered by 84' and 60' roadways respectively. To the south there is a community center and open space, disqualifying uses that would potentially increase concentrations of pollutants.

5. Create objectionable odors

affecting a substantial ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐
number of people?

Discussion: The project is not expected to result in odors that will affect residents on or adjacent to the site. The construction of the subdivisions will not create any odors that will be obnoxious to surrounding residents. Residential uses are not typically expected to produce objectionable odors from maintenance over time.

IV. **BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES** --

Would the project:

1. Has 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.

	Potentially Significant <u>Impact</u>	Less Than Significant with <u>Mitigation</u>	Less Than Significant <u>Impact</u>	No <u>Impact</u>
Fish and Wildlife Service?				

Discussion: The proposed project will not have an adverse impact on special status species of plants or animals. The subject property is vacant, and given the history of the community, may have once been used for agriculture. The likelihood of sensitive species inhabiting the site is remote, given cultural practices associated with historical farming and treatment of vacant lots; including soil disruption and compaction, spraying, irrigating, and tillage or discing.

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

Discussion: There are no riparian woodland corridors that exist within or adjacent to the subject property, nor are there any sensitive natural communities within the subject area or nearby. The territory is currently fallow and any native habitat was removed in favor of the vacant lot, which has now grown over with unprotected grasses.

3. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including,
- ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

	Potentially Significant <u>Impact</u>	Less Than Significant with <u>Mitigation</u>	Less Than Significant <u>Impact</u>	No <u>Impact</u>
but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?				

Discussion: The subject property does not contain a wetland as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. Further, the territory does not contain any soil types that are associated with wetlands (hydrophytic soils).

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: The proposed project will not impede the migration of fish or wildlife species. The territory is currently fallow and does not contain any channels, woodland, shrubland, or other wildlife corridor or nursery site.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 5. Conflict with any local policy or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Potentially Significant <u>Impact</u>	Less Than Significant with <u>Mitigation</u>	Less Than Significant <u>Impact</u>	No <u>Impact</u>
---	--	---	---------------------

Discussion: There are no local policies or ordinances in the City of Orange Cove 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?
- | | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

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

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES --

Would the project:

1. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Cal. Code Regs. tit. 14 §15064.5?
- | | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: There are no historical structures on the site nor has the site been identified by the Southern San Joaquin Valley Archaeological Information Center as a site that contains a historical resource. The subject property has no structures on the site whatsoever, and no historical use for the site could be identified, therefore it is presumed historically vacant or agricultural. The proposed project will not have an adverse impact

Potentially Significant <u>Impact</u>	Less Than Significant with <u>Mitigation</u>	Less Than Significant <u>Impact</u>	No <u>Impact</u>
---	--	---	---------------------

on historical resources according to the EIRs prepared for the Orange Cove General Plan. A "Statement of Overriding Consideration" was adopted for the Final EIR.

2. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Cal. Code Regs. tit. 14 §15064.5?
- | | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: Although there are no known archaeological resources located within the subject territory, the proposed project could result in the disturbance of subsurface archaeological resources during excavation and/or grading of the land. However, the discovery of this type of resource is not especially likely given the lack of previously discovered archaeological resources in adjacent developments.

If during the development of the property archaeological or historical resources are uncovered, the developer must comply with the requirements of CEQA that regulate archaeological and historical resources (Public Resources Code §21083.2 and §21084.1).

3. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?
- | | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: Although there are no known paleontological resources located in the study 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 a professional cultural resource's evaluation and/or data recovery excavation can be planned and implemented.

	Potentially Significant <u>Impact</u>	Less Than Significant with <u>Mitigation</u>	Less Than Significant <u>Impact</u>	No <u>Impact</u>
4. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion: The placement of the subject property and lack of evidence of human remains in surrounding developments suggests that it is unlikely that any human remains exist within the subject territory. However, should any human remains be discovered during excavation, grading, construction, or any other part of the development process, 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. 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 in the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the Area or based on other substantial evidence of	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

	Potentially Significant <u>Impact</u>	Less Than Significant with <u>Mitigation</u>	Less Than Significant <u>Impact</u>	No <u>Impact</u>
a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.				

Discussion: While Orange Cove 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 movement is sufficient so that potential impacts are reduced. The City of Orange Cove requires that all new structures be built within the city consistent with Zone II seismic standards of the Uniform Building Code.

- | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 2. Strong seismic ground shaking? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: With incorporation of Zone II seismic standards, as required by the City of Orange Cove, the potential for significant impacts on residential and commercial development due to seismic ground shaking will be minimal.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 3. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The San Joaquin loam soils located throughout the project area are not subject to liquefaction or other seismic-related ground failure.

- | | | | | |
|----------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 4. Landslides? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|----------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The project area occupies level ground (0-3% slope) and therefore potential for landslides is remote.

	Potentially Significant <u>Impact</u>	Less Than Significant with <u>Mitigation</u>	Less Than Significant <u>Impact</u>	No <u>Impact</u>
5. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion: The project area occupies level ground and the project area soils are composed primarily of San Joaquin loam with few erosive qualities. Therefore, potential for soil erosion or loss of topsoil is remote.

6. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potential result in on or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Discussion: Soils on the project site (San Joaquin loam and a very small amount of Alamo clay in the southeastern corner of the subject property) are considered stable. Further, the project area occupies a level ground, no more than 3% slope, and therefore the potential for unstable construction conditions are less than significant.

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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Discussion: The subject property is not located on any expansive soils.

	Potentially Significant <u>Impact</u>	Less Than Significant with <u>Mitigation</u>	Less Than Significant <u>Impact</u>	No <u>Impact</u>
8. 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion: The proposed subdivisions will be required to connect to the city's sewer and wastewater systems when residential construction commences.

VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS --

Would the project:

1. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Discussion: Greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions are emissions of various types of gases that are known to be causing an increase in global temperatures and by proxy impacting climate patterns. Scientists recognize GHGs resulting from human activities, particularly the use of machinery that burns fossil fuels for power, as the primary cause of climate change and its subsequent negative environmental consequences. Key greenhouse gases include carbon dioxide, methane, nitrous oxides, and hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs).

Greenhouse gas emissions will occur primarily during the construction of the project and when motorized vehicles are operated - each mile traveled (VMT) will generate GHGs.

Potentially Significant <u>Impact</u>	Less Than Significant with <u>Mitigation</u>	Less Than Significant <u>Impact</u>	No <u>Impact</u>
---	--	---	---------------------

Also the operation of heating and cooling equipment and gas range appliances installed in residential uses will lead to the cumulative production of GHGs.

The volume of GHGs generated by 40 acres of residential land uses (both single-family residential and multi-family residential uses) is insignificant when compared to emissions generated by the City of Orange Cove or the San Joaquin Valley as a whole. Due to energy conservation regulations (Title 24) implemented throughout the State, motorized vehicles becoming gradually more fuel efficient, installation of solar panels on single- and multi- family residential dwellings, and residential development's move toward all electric homes and away from the use of natural gas, and the incorporation of pedestrian friendly design features as per the Orange Cove General Plan, residential dwellings of today will generate less GHG emissions than dwellings that were built as recently as a decade ago. For these reasons, the project will not result in a significant release of GHG emissions when compared to the carbon budget of Orange Cove or the San Joaquin Valley as a whole.

2. Conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?
- ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

Discussion: The Orange Cove General Plan does not have any plans, policies, or regulations pertaining to the regulation of greenhouse gas emissions; however, design standards contained in the General Plan do attempt to create a pedestrian and cyclist-friendly living environment thereby promoting walking and biking and less dependence on single occupancy motorized vehicles. Further, recent updates to the Uniform Building Code will increase the "R" Factor (resistance to the conductive flow of heat; insulation factor) in the walls of the residential dwellings that will be constructed after January 1, 2020, will be required to install solar panels on the residential unit prior to occupancy.

Potentially Significant <u>Impact</u>	Less Than Significant with <u>Mitigation</u>	Less Than Significant <u>Impact</u>	No <u>Impact</u>
---	--	---	---------------------

VIII. 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?

☐☐☒☐

Discussion: The project will not involve the transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials.

2. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonable foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment.

☐☐☐☒

Discussion: The project does not involve the handling, storage, or transportation of hazardous materials.

3. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substance, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing

☐☐☐☒

Potentially Significant <u>Impact</u>	Less Than Significant with <u>Mitigation</u>	Less Than Significant <u>Impact</u>	No <u>Impact</u>
---	--	---	---------------------

or proposed school?

Discussion: The project does not involve the handling, storage, transportation, or disposal of hazardous materials.

4. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code §65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?
- | | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The project site is not included on any list of known hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code §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 in or working in the project area?
- | | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The subject area is not adjacent to a public or private airport, nor is it within two miles of an airport.

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

Discussion: The subject area is not adjacent nor in the vicinity of a private airstrip.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 7. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: The project will not impair implementation nor physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. The proposed project is not adjacent to a roadway, highway, or freeway that serves as a major route for the movement of emergency vehicles. Should these types of vehicles utilize South Avenue, Anchor Avenue, Orange Avenue, or planned interior streets within the subdivision, traffic exiting the subdivision would be restricted from entering these roadways until emergency vehicles have cleared the intersections along these roadways.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 8. Expose people or structures to a significant loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Potentially Significant <u>Impact</u>	Less Than Significant with <u>Mitigation</u>	Less Than Significant <u>Impact</u>	No <u>Impact</u>
---	--	---	---------------------

with wildlands.

Discussion: There are no wildlands adjacent to urbanized areas or intermixed with residences. However, the subject property has open space directly to the south which is dominated by grassland. Orange Cove receives an average annual rainfall of 15.6 inches, over an average of less than 50 precipitation days each year. This lack of precipitation coupled with Fresno counties designation of the months of May through November as the wildfire season, creates a situation in which the grass to the south may become a fire hazard as it dries, compounded by the major collector road to the east. The likelihood of exposure of the subject property to a wildland fire remains low. Further the local fire district requires that grassland within the city must be plowed down during the wildfire season, mitigating the source of fuel and therefore maintaining a less than significant impact.

IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY --

Would the project:

1. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

Discussion: There will be no discharge of runoff into any surface or subsurface waters. Storm water runoff will be diverted to drop inlets throughout the subdivision and this runoff will be diverted to a nearby storm water basin.

2. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

	Potentially Significant <u>Impact</u>	Less Than Significant with <u>Mitigation</u>	Less Than Significant <u>Impact</u>	No <u>Impact</u>
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.				

Discussion: The development will utilize treated water from the Friant-Kern Canal. The city now requires water meters for all new residential development. This metering will serve to reduce water consumption in addition to outside water regulations mandated by the State.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 3. 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: The project area's drainage patterns will not be significantly altered. All of the drainage that emanates from the project site will be diverted to Orange Cove's storm drainage system through a series of drop inlets and storm drainage pipes.

4. Substantially alter the

	Potentially Significant <u>Impact</u>	Less Than Significant with <u>Mitigation</u>	Less Than Significant <u>Impact</u>	No <u>Impact</u>
existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alternation of the course of a stream or river, 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"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion: The project area's drainage patterns will not be significantly altered. All surface runoff will be transported by conveyance of the subdivision's stormwater drainage system, composed of gutters, drop inlets and storm drainage pipes. This is the means by which the project will divert the surface runoff to Orange Cove's system of storm drainage ponds.

5. 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Discussion: All stormwater runoff will be retained in Orange Cove's stormwater retention basins. This basin system has the capacity to accommodate the additional runoff that will be generated by the proposed subdivision project. Residential uses do not typically provide additional sources of polluted runoff.

6. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Potentially Significant <u>Impact</u>	Less Than Significant with <u>Mitigation</u>	Less Than Significant <u>Impact</u>	No <u>Impact</u>
---	--	---	---------------------

Discussion: No aspect of the proposed project is expected to degrade water quality. No water from the site will enter any adjacent surface water systems and therefore risk of water quality degradation is markedly reduced.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 7. 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: There is no housing placed within a 100-year flood hazard area of any kind. However, the southeast quadrant of the subject property is within a 500-year flood hazard area. This territory occupies an area between the Alta East Branch Channel to the west, and the Friant Kern Canal to the east, however even at its closest point the subject property is over 0.5 mile from either aqueduct. Both of these waterways are subject to high levels of artificial channelization, and their cement lined banks exacerbate flooding potential, as does the even grade of the land. Due to subsidence and drought the flows of both canals are expected to decrease in coming years, decreasing potential for flooding.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 8. Place within a 100-year
flood hazard area
structures that would
impede or redirect
flood flows? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: None of the subject property is within a 100-year floodplain.

	Potentially Significant <u>Impact</u>	Less Than Significant with <u>Mitigation</u>	Less Than Significant <u>Impact</u>	No <u>Impact</u>
9. 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion: The project site is not located downstream from a major dam, nor any levees, and therefore is not at risk of being flooded due to the failure of a levee or dam.

10. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Discussion: The project is located over 120 miles inland from the Pacific Ocean, the closest source of tsunami, there are no major inland water bodies within several miles capable of producing a seiche, and the even grade of the surrounding land in tandem with the content of surrounding soils present no reasonable danger of a mudflow.

X. LAND USE AND PLANNING --

Would the project:

1. Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Discussion: The proposed project will not physically divide any established Orange Cove community. The subject property is located in the southwest quadrant of the city, and represents a logical extension of the urbanized part of the community.

2. Conflict with any applicable				
---------------------------------	--	--	--	--

	Potentially Significant <u>Impact</u>	Less Than Significant with <u>Mitigation</u>	Less Than Significant <u>Impact</u>	No <u>Impact</u>
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"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion: The project is entirely consistent with the Land Use Element of the General Plan, as well as the zoning ordinance. There are no specific plans, special districts, or local coastal programs that address the subject territory.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 3. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The project site is not subject to any habitat or natural community conservation plans.

XI. 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Potentially Significant <u>Impact</u>	Less Than Significant with <u>Mitigation</u>	Less Than Significant <u>Impact</u>	No <u>Impact</u>
---	--	---	---------------------

Discussion: The site is not known to harbor mineral resources that would be valuable to the region. The site is not adjacent to a river floodplain, which is an area that typically supports sand and gravel resources.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The site is not known to harbor mineral resources that would be locally important, nor are there any plans for mineral resource recovery sites on the subject property.

XII. 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: The proposed project will not generate any excessive noise, nor will it expose persons to excessive noise levels. Due to the surrounding land uses (open space,

	Potentially Significant <u>Impact</u>	Less Than Significant with <u>Mitigation</u>	Less Than Significant <u>Impact</u>	No <u>Impact</u>
public facilities, residential, and schools) that the site is bound by, the likelihood of future residents being exposed to excessive noise levels is remote.				

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

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Discussion: There are no significant ground borne vibrations produced in the project area or in the surrounding properties.

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

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Discussion: The proposed project will not increase ambient noise levels on lands adjacent to the subject property. The transition of the subject properties from fallow land to single-family residential development may temporarily increase ambient noise levels, however the surrounding area is largely developed as single- and multi- family homes and schools. This ambient noise produced by the proposed project will be at the same levels of existing ambient noise in the area.

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

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Potentially Significant <u>Impact</u>	Less Than Significant with <u>Mitigation</u>	Less Than Significant <u>Impact</u>	No <u>Impact</u>
---	--	---	---------------------

Discussion: Construction activities associated with residential development create very little noise compared to construction associated with commercial or industrial development. During the construction of homes, roads, infrastructure, and parks, noise beyond ambient levels will be generated, however this increase in noise levels will only occur during day-time hours and will only last for the period of time that it takes to complete the proposed subdivision project. These are the same periodic increases in ambient noise already present without the proposed project, as the adjacent collector street, Anchor Avenue, serves as a major thoroughfare, producing ample noise from traffic.

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 the project area to be exposed to excessive noise levels?
- | | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The project site is not within an airport land use plan, nor within 2 miles of a public airport and therefore will not be subjected to any noise generated by air traffic.

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?
- | | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Potentially Significant <u>Impact</u>	Less Than Significant with <u>Mitigation</u>	Less Than Significant <u>Impact</u>	No <u>Impact</u>
---	--	---	---------------------

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

XIII. 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)?

Discussion: The project is not considered to be growth-inducing but growth-accommodating. Some households will relocate within Orange Cove to take advantage of the newer housing that will be provided by the project while other households that need additional bedrooms will move into these units. The construction of 156 new single-family dwellings will support approximately 624 persons (156 single-family residential units x four persons per household = 624 persons). Data from the 2010 Census states that there were 2,231 housing units in the city. In addition, the current population estimates for the City of Orange Cove put the number of people at 9,581. Compared to this data, the proposed project is deemed an insignificant growth inducing project, and will be constructed in two phases, which could require up to a 5 year buildout.

The growth-inducing impacts associated with the adoption of the Orange Cove General Plan was discussed in the EIR prepared for the General Plan. A "Statement of Overriding Considerations" was approved when the EIR was certified by the Orange Cove City Council.

2. Displace substantial

	Potentially Significant <u>Impact</u>	Less Than Significant with <u>Mitigation</u>	Less Than Significant <u>Impact</u>	No <u>Impact</u>
numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion: There is no existing housing on the subject property.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 3. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: There are no dwelling units, informal housing, or transient populations on subject property to displace.

XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES --

Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Discussion: The project will receive fire protection services from the Orange Cove Fire District, which is headquartered in Orange Cove. The project site is located about a mile away from the fire department, which is within the 5-minute response time of the station. Fire hydrants will be installed throughout the project site as a condition of approval. Also, fire sprinklers are required to be installed in all new residential units. The project will have a less than significant impact on fire protection services in Orange Cove. No mitigation measures are required.

	Potentially Significant <u>Impact</u>	Less Than Significant with <u>Mitigation</u>	Less Than Significant <u>Impact</u>	No <u>Impact</u>
Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion: The project will receive police protection from the Orange Cove Police Department, headquartered in central Orange Cove. The project site is located about a mile away from the police station thereby ensuring that police services can be provided to the site within a 5-minute response time. The project will have a less than significant impact on police protection services in Orange Cove. No mitigation measures are required.

Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
----------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Discussion: The project is located within the Kings Canyon Unified School District. The project will generate approximately 0.75 school aged children per residential unit from the residential portion of the development - 117 school-aged children. The project will have a less than significant impact on schools in Kings Canyon Unified School District because the development will be required to pay school impact fees, which will assist in the expansion of Orange Cove's schools and the ADA generated by these students will pay for additional teachers should they be required. No mitigation measures are required.

Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Discussion: The project will not have a significant impact on parks in the community. Each residential unit will be required to pay a park impact fee, which will finance the purchase and construction of parks as needed. No mitigation measures are required.

Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Discussion: The project will not adversely impact other public facilities in the community.

XV. RECREATION --

	Potentially Significant <u>Impact</u>	Less Than Significant with <u>Mitigation</u>	Less Than Significant <u>Impact</u>	No <u>Impact</u>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion: There may be a slight increase in the number of persons using local parks, however, the proposed subdivision will pay park impact fees, which will preempt the project's impact on Orange Cove's park system.

2. Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Discussion: The proposed residential project will pay park impact fees. The long-term maintenance of the landscaping within the subdivision will be the responsibility of a landscaping and lighting district.

XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC --

Would the project:

1. Exceed the capacity of the

	Potentially Significant <u>Impact</u>	Less Than Significant with <u>Mitigation</u>	Less Than Significant <u>Impact</u>	No <u>Impact</u>
existing circulation system, based on an applicable measure of effectiveness (as designated in a general plan policy, ordinance, etc.), taking into account all relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion: A less than significant impact is expected, The subject territory, when fully developed, will generate:

156 single family units x 9.55 trips per household = 1,490 trips per day

These trips can be converted to peak morning and evening trips. The single-family residential homes will generate 118 trips per peak morning hour and 148 trips per peak evening hour.

Most if not all residential trips will utilize the two collector streets, S. Anchor Avenue, and to a lesser degree Orange Street, that border the subject site to the east and west respectively. Traffic wishing to travel east and west using South Avenue can travel to the citrus farms to the east, and the toward the City of Reedley to the west. Traffic wishing to travel north and south can access Anchor Avenue which leads toward downtown and eventually out of the city to the north, and past schools and a community center to the south. Given that peak hour trips will be diffused among many intersections both around and within the proposed subject site, it is very unlikely that any intersection that is near or adjacent will be adversely impacted. Further, because the subdivision is within half of a

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	---	------------------------------------	--------------

mile of open space, the community center, schools, a city office, and a church many people are expected to walk to these destinations rather than drive.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 2. Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: The traffic generated by the project is not expected to conflict with Fresno County's Congestion Management Program because of the amount of traffic that will be added to local streets by the build out of the project area. The County's Management

Program generally focuses on major roadways that cross the county, not local Orange Cove streets.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The proposed project is not expected to affect air traffic patterns in any way.

	Potentially Significant <u>Impact</u>	Less Than Significant with <u>Mitigation</u>	Less Than Significant <u>Impact</u>	No <u>Impact</u>
4. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves, or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion: The project will not have an adverse impact on the level of service (LOS) of South Avenue, Orange Avenue, or Anchor Avenue, which are existing streets surrounding the subject property. There are no design hazards present in the project that would substantially increase hazards, and the additional traffic from the proposed residential development will not cause a significant impact on the surrounding or interior roadways.

5. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Discussion: The project will not conflict with any policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation.

XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS --

Would the project:

1. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Potentially Significant <u>Impact</u>	Less Than Significant with <u>Mitigation</u>	Less Than Significant <u>Impact</u>	No <u>Impact</u>
---	--	---	---------------------

Discussion: The project will generate approximately one hundred gallons of effluent per day per person. The average population of a single residential unit is estimated to be approximately four persons per residential unit, or a total population of 642 persons (156 single family residential units x four persons per household = 642 persons) Therefore the project will generate about 64,200 gallons per day of wastewater.

The Orange Cove Wastewater Treatment Facility (WWTF) was originally designed to treat 1.0 million gallons per day (mgd) of waste effluent. Recently, the WWTF was expanded to have a capacity of 3.0 mgd. This increase in capacity will easily accommodate the increase in effluent flow generated by the project. The plant's expansion was in response to a Notice of Violation issued by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board (Order No. 89-064) on December 17, 1998.

In addition to the City increasing the plant's treatment capacity it also converted the wastewater treatment plant from a tertiary treatment plant to an advanced secondary treatment plant, which reduced the operational complexity and costs for the plant. This conversion required modifications to equipment in the plant (e.g., headworks, pumps, screens, the secondary treatment process, biosolids handling, etc.) and construction of improvements that supported the new or modified equipment.

2. Require or result in the

construction of new water	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
or wastewater treatment				
facilities or expansion of				
existing facilities, the				
construction of which could				
cause significant				
environmental effects?				

Discussion: The Orange Cove Wastewater Treatment Facility (WWTF) was originally designed to treat 1.0 million gallons per day (mgd) of waste effluent. Recently, the

Potentially Significant <u>Impact</u>	Less Than Significant with <u>Mitigation</u>	Less Than Significant <u>Impact</u>	No <u>Impact</u>
---	--	---	---------------------

WWTF was expanded to have a capacity of 3.0 mgd. This increase in capacity will easily accommodate the increase in effluent flow generated by the project. The estimated effluent generated by the project after development is 0.0642 mgd, or about 2% of the expanded capacity of the WWTF. Therefore no new construction of water or wastewater treatment will result from the proposed project.

3. Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental effects?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Discussion: The proposed subdivision is designed to channel stormwater runoff into the subdivision's gutter system, which will then be conveyed to a local storm water retention basin. The project will not have a significant environmental effect on the City's stormwater drainage system.

4. Have sufficient water supplied available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Discussion: The proposed project will be connected to the city's water system. The city has ample water and pressure to serve this project. The city receives its water from the Friant-Kern Canal, which is treated to meet State Drinking Water Standards, and then transmitted to residents and businesses in the city.

- | | Potentially
Significant
<u>Impact</u> | Less Than
Significant with
<u>Mitigation</u> | Less Than
Significant
<u>Impact</u> | No
<u>Impact</u> |
|--|---|--|---|--------------------------|
| 5. 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion: The Orange Cove Wastewater Treatment Facility (WWTF) was originally designed to treat 1.0 million gallons per day (mgd) of waste effluent. Recently, the WWTF was expanded to have a capacity of 3.0 mgd. This increase in capacity will easily accommodate the increase in effluent flow generated by the project. The estimated effluent generated by the project after development is 0.0642 mgd, or about 2% of the expanded capacity of the WWTF. Therefore the addition of the proposed project's projected demand will not significantly impact the wastewater treatment provider.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 6. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: The City of Orange Cove contracts with Mid-Valley for solid waste collection and recycling services. The proposed project will be integrated into Mid-Valley pick-up routes, which already include adjoining properties.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 7. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

	Potentially Significant <u>Impact</u>	Less Than Significant with <u>Mitigation</u>	Less Than Significant <u>Impact</u>	No <u>Impact</u>
solid waste?				

Discussion: All construction waste and waste produced by the maintenance of the completed project will be recycled or disposed of properly, pursuant of RCRA as well as state and local regulations.

XVIII. 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?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

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

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

	Potentially Significant <u>Impact</u>	Less Than Significant with <u>Mitigation</u>	Less Than Significant <u>Impact</u>	No <u>Impact</u>
with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?				

3. Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?
- | | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

CHECKLIST PREPARED BY:

Tristan J. Suire, contract city planner

5/21/2021