

3.13 MINERAL RESOURCES

Table 3.12-1. Potential Impacts on Mineral Resources

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT SIGNIFICANCE
XII. Mineral Resources. Would the project:	-
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	No Impact
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?	No Impact

Note: "-" indicates blank cell

a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?

The proposed project would not result in the loss of availability of known mineral resources that would be of value to the region and the residents of the State. According to Mineral Resources Zones Maps, no areas of mineral deposits are indicated (California Department of Conservation 1999). Therefore, there would be no impact.

b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?

The proposed project does not involve mining of any locally important resources nor is it near potential surface mining areas. No mineral resources of local importance such as construction aggregates, sand, gravel, metals, gypsum, limestone, or granite are identified in the local general plan for the project area (County of Fresno 2000). Therefore, there would be no impact.

3.14 NOISE

Table 3.13-1. Potential Impacts on Noise

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT SIGNIFICANCE
XII. Noise. Would the project result in:	-
a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	No Impact
b) Generation of excessive vibration or ground-borne noise levels?	No Impact
c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	No Impact

Note: "-" indicates blank cell

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

Project construction would cause a temporary increase in ambient noise levels due to generation of noise from heavy equipment such as excavators, trucks, crane, loader, forklift and generators. High-impact equipment such as a pile-driver or jackhammer are not anticipated to be required for construction. The County's Noise Control Ordinance (County of Fresno 1978) states that "noise sources associated with construction, provided such activities do not take place before 6:00 a.m. or after 9:00 p.m. on any day except Saturday or Sunday, or before 7:00 a.m. or after 5:00 p.m. on Saturday or Sunday" are exempt from the noise standards stipulated in Chapter 8.40 of the ordinance. The proposed project would be constructed during standard (daytime) construction hours and would therefore be exempt from the noise standards.

Once completed, operation of the wellhead treatment system will not generate any additional noise above the existing well site operations, with the exception of the occasional use of the new standby generator at Well Site 4. The County's Noise Control Ordinance states that noise from "any mechanical device, apparatus, or equipment used, related to or connected with emergency activities or emergency work" are exempt from the noise standards stipulated in Chapter 8.40 of the ordinance. The standby generator would only be used as a backup energy source during power outages or other emergency situations, and therefore noise generated by the generator would be exempt from the noise standards.

Because all construction noise and operational noise generated by the project would be exempt, the project would not exceed any noise standards, therefore there would be no impact.

b) Generation of excessive vibration or ground-borne noise levels?

High-impact equipment such as a pile-driver or jackhammer are not anticipated to be required for construction, therefore generation of excessive vibration or ground-borne noise is not anticipated. There would be no impact.

c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

There are no public airports in the vicinity of the project site. A private airstrip, POM Wonderful, is approximately 800 feet southeast of Well Site 4 and does not have an adopted land use plan. In any case, the project does not include the construction of habitable buildings or permanent work spaces that would expose residents or employees to excessive noise levels from the airstrip. There would be no impact.

3.15 POPULATION AND HOUSING

Table 3.14-1. Potential Impacts on Population and Housing

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT SIGNIFICANCE
XIII. Population and Housing. Would the project:	-
a) Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	No Impact
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	No Impact

Note: "-" indicates blank cell

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

The proposed project would not directly or indirectly induce population growth in the surrounding area. The project does not involve the construction of housing or commercial or industrial businesses, which could attract more people to the area, and would not remove any obstacle or barrier to population growth. The project does not include any increase in the amount of water supplied to the Del Rey community. Thus, the project would not induce population growth in the area. There would be no impact.

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

The proposed project would not displace any existing people or housing which would necessitate construction of replacement elsewhere. Therefore, there would be no impact.

3.16 PUBLIC SERVICES

Table 3.15-1. Potential Impacts on Public Services

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT SIGNIFICANCE
XIV. Public Services. Would the project:	-
a) Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, or the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the public services:	-
Fire protection?	No Impact
Police protection?	No Impact
Schools?	No Impact
Parks?	No Impact
Other public facilities?	No Impact

Note: "-" indicates blank cell

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

The proposed project would not involve any development related to new housing or employment opportunities that would result in increased population growth in the area. Therefore, there would not be a change in demand for public services, including fire protection, police protection, schools, parks and other public facilities. Furthermore, the project would not result in roadway impacts or increase traffic congestion that could interfere with response times for fire and other emergency responders. Thus, the project would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, or the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities. There would be no impact.

3.17 RECREATION

Table 3.16-1. Potential Impacts on Recreation

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT SIGNIFICANCE
XV. Recreation. Would the project:	-
a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	No Impact
b) Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	No Impact

Note: "-" indicates blank cell

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

The proposed project would not increase the population of the project area by introducing new housing or employment opportunities that would result in increased use or physical deterioration of recreational facilities. There would be no impact.

- b) **Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?**

The proposed project would not involve construction of new or expansion of existing recreational facilities. In addition, the project would not increase the population of the project area by introducing new housing or employment opportunities that would result in construction or expansion of recreational facilities. There would be no impact.

3.18 TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

Table 3.17-1. Potential Impacts on Transportation and Traffic

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT SIGNIFICANCE
XVII. Transportation. Would the project:	-
a) Conflict with a program plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?	No Impact
b) Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	No Impact
c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	No Impact
d) Result in inadequate emergency access?	No Impact

Note: "-" indicates blank cell

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

During construction of the proposed project, construction vehicles would access the project sites via State Route 99 and local roads, including E American Avenue, S Portola Ave, E Jefferson Ave and E Avila Avenue. While construction activities would result in more vehicles to these roadways, due to the small scope and size of the project and the low existing traffic volumes, the project is not anticipated to cause substantial traffic congestion. Additionally, any impacts to roadways would be temporary and short-term. Existing bicycle, pedestrian and transit networks would be maintained, and the project would have no impacts on scenic highways. Therefore, the proposed project during construction and operation would have no impacts on a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system.

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

CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3(a) describes specific considerations for evaluating a project's transportation impacts and states "Generally, VMT is the most appropriate measure of transportation impacts." As stated in CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3(b)(2), "projects that reduce, or have no impact on, VMT should be presumed to cause a less than significant transportation impact."

A temporary minor increase in VMT could occur during project construction as the result of worker trips to the site, materials delivery, and spoils hauling. Any minor increase in VMT would be temporary and would not exceed the 110 vehicle trips per day threshold generally assumed to cause a less-than-significant impact related to VMT (OPR 2017).

Operation of the proposed project would be similar to existing operations at the well site, with on average, one additional well site visit per week for operations and maintenance purposes by Del Rey CSD employees, and approximately one truck trip per year to the site to deliver new carbon and pick up the spent carbon material for disposal. Operation of the project would therefore have a negligible

increase in VMT over existing operations. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, and there would be no impacts.

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

The proposed project would not increase hazards due to a geometric design feature or be incompatible with existing uses. Therefore, there would be no impact.

d) Result in inadequate emergency access?

Traffic disruption from construction activities would be short-term and limited to the immediate vicinity of the construction areas, and is therefore unlikely to interfere with emergency access. Alternative routes would be available if temporary road closures are necessary for installation of the new pipeline between well sites 5 and 6, which would be communicated to local emergency response providers. There would be no impact.

3.19 TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

Table 3.18-1. Potential Impacts on Tribal Cultural Resources

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT SIGNIFICANCE
XVIII. Tribal Cultural Resources.	
Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:	-
a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or	No Impact
b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.	No Impact

Note: "-" indicates blank cell

a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k).

As discussed in the Historic Property Inventory Report prepared for the project (AECOM 2019b), the project sites are not listed on the California Register of Historical Resources or any local register of historical resources. There would be no impact.

b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of

Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.

As discussed in the Historic Property Inventory Report prepared for the project (AECOM 2019b), there are no known tribal cultural resources in the project area. The proposed project would include implementation of accidental discovery protocols to avoid impacts if previously unknown resources are encountered. There would be no impact.

3.20 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Table 3.19-1. Potential Impacts on Utilities and Service Systems

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT SIGNIFICANCE
XIX. Utilities and Service Systems. Would the project:	-
a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?	No Impact
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years?	No Impact
c) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that 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?	No Impact
d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?	No Impact
e) Comply with federal, State, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	No Impact

Note: "-" indicates blank cell

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

The proposed project would not involve any development that would increase population growth or change the demand for water supply, water treatment, electric power, natural gas or telecommunication facilities, which would require or result in the relocation or construction of new expanded utilities services. The project would not result in substantial increases in impervious surface area which could result in increased storm water runoff and therefore does not require new or expanded storm drainage systems. Thus, there would be no impact.

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

The proposed project would install GAC treatment equipment at well sites, which are currently utilized to provide water supply to the Del Rey community and no changes in water supply are proposed as part of the project. Water use during construction would be minor and would come from existing sources. Thus, there would be no impact related to water supplies.

- c) **Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that 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?**

Wastewater services would not be required during the construction or operation of the project. Contractors would use portable sanitary facilities or nearby public facilities. Therefore, there would be no impact related wastewater treatment capacity.

- d) **Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?**

Solid waste in the County of Fresno is transferred to American Avenue Disposal Site. During construction of the project, typical construction waste would be generated. However, the amount of waste generated is expected to be small due to the small scope and size of the project. The project would not generate waste in excess of State or local standards or in excess of capacity of local infrastructure. There would be no impact.

- e) **Comply with federal, State, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?**

A Waste Management Plan and Waste Log would be required as part of the County of Fresno's Construction and Demolition Debris Recycling Program, which are designed to assist the County’s compliance with the State mandate. The mandate requires a minimum of 65 percent of all waste generated from a permitted project to be repurposed or recycled (County of Fresno, no date). Construction and demolition material from the proposed project would be disposed according to federal, state and local law. Therefore, there would be no impact.

3.21 WILDFIRE

Table 3.20-1. Potential Impacts on Wildfire

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT SIGNIFICANCE
XIX. Wildfire. If located in or near State Responsibility Areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:	-
a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	No Impact
b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?	No Impact

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT SIGNIFICANCE
c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts on the environment?	No Impact
d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, therefore of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?	No Impact

Note: "-" indicates blank cell

a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

The project area is not in or near a State Responsibility Area or in a very high fire hazard severity zone (Cal Fire 2007), therefore this threshold of significance is not applicable to the proposed project. Nevertheless, the project would not be inconsistent with the Fresno County Master Emergency Services Plan, and no evacuation routes would be impeded or disrupted during the construction or operation of the project. There would be no impact.

b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?

The project area is not in or near a State Responsibility Area or in a very high fire hazard severity zone (Cal Fire 2007), therefore this threshold of significance is not applicable to the proposed project. Nevertheless, there are no factors such as steep slopes, prevailing winds or high fuel sources in which the proposed project would result in exposing project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire. Therefore, there would be no impact.

c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines, or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts on the environment?

The project area is not in or near a State Responsibility Area or in a very high fire hazard severity zone (Cal Fire 2007), therefore this threshold of significance is not applicable to the proposed project. Nevertheless, the minor infrastructure upgrades and construction required for the project would be undertaken on existing well sites and within County road right-of-way and would not exacerbate fire risk in the surrounding area. Thus, there would be no impact.

d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, therefore of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?

The project area is not in or near a State Responsibility Area or in a very high fire hazard severity zone (Cal Fire 2007), therefore this threshold of significance is not applicable to the proposed project. Nevertheless, the project area is generally flat with little to no slope and there have been no recent fires in the project vicinity that would result in runoff or drainage changes. Therefore, the proposed project would not expose the public to a risk of post-fire slope instability or drainage changes. There would be no impact.

3.22 MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Table 3.21-1. Mandatory Findings of Significance

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT SIGNIFICANCE
XVIII. Mandatory Findings of Significance.	-
a) Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	No Impact
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)	No Impact
c) Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	No Impact

Note: “-” indicates blank cell

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

As discussed within this document, the project would have less than significant or less-than-significant with mitigation impacts on natural habitats, threatened and endangered species or cultural resources. Therefore, the proposed project would not substantially degrade the quality of the environment. There would be no impact.

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

As discussed within this document, the proposed project would have little to no impact on the environment. No other present or foreseeable future projects in the vicinity of the well sites are known of that would cause impacts that could combine with impacts of the proposed project to cause a significant cumulative impact. There would be no impact.

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

As discussed within this document, the proposed project would not have environmental effects that would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly. There would be no impact.

4 REFERENCES

- AECOM. 2018a. Del Rey Wellhead Treatment Systems Project- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Biological Assessment.
- _____. 2018b. Historic Property Inventory Report for the City of Del Rey Water Meter Installation and Granular Activated Carbon Wellhead Treatment Projects Fresno County, California.
- _____. 2020. Del Rey Wellhead Treatment Systems Project - Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Analysis. January 10.
- California Air Resources Board (CARB). 2019. Area Designations Maps/State and National, <https://ww3.arb.ca.gov/desig/adm/adm.htm>. Accessed January 2020.
- California Department of Conservation. 2018a. Division of Land Resource Protection, Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, Rural Land Mapping Edition. Fresno County Important Farmland 2016. Sheet 2 of 2. Available online: ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dlrp/FMMP/pdf/2016/fre16_e.pdf
- California Department of Conservation. 2018b. DOC Maps: California Geology. Available online at: <https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/geology/>. Accessed on December 11, 2019.
- California Department of Conservation. 2019. Reported California Landslides interactive map. Available online at: <https://www.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/landslides>. Accessed on December 11, 2019.
- California Department of Fish and Wildlife. 2021. California Natural Diversity Database query, September 16, 2021.
- California State Water Resources Control Board (State Water Board). 2017. Action Focuses Board on Reducing Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Building Resilience to Climate Change Impacts. Available at: https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/conservation_portal/docs/2017mar/pr030717_climate_change.pdf. Accessed January 2020.
- Natural Resources Conservation Services. 2019. Web Soil Survey. Available online at: <https://websoilsurvey.sc.egov.usda.gov/App/HomePage.htm>. Accessed on December 11, 2019.
- San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD). 2015. Guidance for Assessing and Mitigating Air Quality Impact. Available at: https://www.valleyair.org/transportation/GAMAQI_12-26-19.pdf. Accessed January 2020.
- _____. 2018. Project Ambient Air Quality Analysis Applicability Determination. Available at: http://www.valleyair.org/policies_per/Policies/APR-2030.pdf. Accessed January 2020.
- _____. 2019. Ambient Air Quality Standards & Valley Attainment Status. Available at: <https://www.valleyair.org/aqinfo/attainment.htm>. Accessed January 2020.
- United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA). 2017. Understanding Global Warming Potentials. Available at <https://www.epa.gov/ghgemissions/understanding-global-warming-potentials>. Accessed January 2020.
- U.S. Geological Survey. 2019. US Quaternary Faults interactive map. Available online at: <https://usgs.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=5a6038b3a1684561a9b0aadf88412fcf>. Accessed on December 10, 2019.

5 DOCUMENT PREPARERS

The following AECOM staff contributed to the preparation of this document and supporting studies:

Annamarie Guerrero..... Archaeologist
Emma Rawnsley.....Senior Environmental Planner
John Chamberlain Quality Reviewer
Mark ReitzEngineer
Matthew Bettelheim.....Senior Biologist
Michelle Dunn Environmental Planner
Paola Pena..... Air Quality Scientist
Roshni Saxena..... Environmental Planner
Saana Deichsel Biologist
Stephanie Osby Environmental Planner