

Addendum

Uncle Green Development Project

Prepared for:



City of Woodlake
350 N. Valencia Ave
Woodlake, CA 93286
(559) 564-8055
Contact: Jason Waters

Prepared by:



Crawford & Bowen Planning, Inc.
113 N. Church Street, Suite 302
Visalia, CA 93291
(559) 840-4414

Contact: Emily Bowen, LEED AP

March 2022

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION ONE – INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Addendum Purpose	1
1.2 Environmental Analysis and Conclusions	2
1.3 Incorporation by Reference	2
1.4 Addendum Process	2
SECTION TWO – PROJECT DESCRIPTION	3
2.1 Location and Setting.....	3
2.2 Project Description.....	3
SECTION THREE – CEQA CHECKLIST	4
3.1 Checklist Evaluation Categories	5
3.2 Environmental Analysis	6

SECTION ONE – INTRODUCTION

This environmental document is an Addendum to the *Uncle Green Development Project* (Approved Project) Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND), adopted on November 18, 2018 (State Clearinghouse (2018101024), by the City of Woodlake.

In order to include delivery services to the Project operations, the City has determined that an Addendum should be prepared to the previous Project IS/MND. As demonstrated in this Addendum, there will be minor additional impacts and the IS/MND continues to serve as the appropriate document addressing the environmental impacts of these changes, pursuant to California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

1.1 Addendum Purpose

When a proposed project is changed or there are changes in environmental setting, a determination must be made by the Lead Agency as to whether an Addendum or Subsequent EIR or MND is prepared. CEQA Guidelines Sections 15162 and 15164 sets forth criteria to assess which environmental document is appropriate. The criteria for determining whether an Addendum or Subsequent MND is prepared are outlined below. If the criteria below are true, then an Addendum is the appropriate document:

- No new significant impacts will result from the project or from new mitigation measures.
- No substantial increase in the severity of environment impact will occur.
- No new feasible alternatives or mitigation measures that would reduce impacts previously found not to be feasible have, in fact been found to be feasible.

Based upon the information provided in Section Three of this document, implementation of the modified Project will not result in new significant impacts or substantially increase the severity of impacts previously identified in the IS/MND, and there are no previously infeasible alternatives that are now feasible. None of the other factors set forth in Section 15162(a)(3) are present.

As such, an Addendum is appropriate, and this Addendum has been prepared to address the environmental effects of the modified Project.

1.2 Environmental Analysis and Conclusions

The previously Approved Project was evaluated under CEQA with an IS/MND in 2018. This Addendum addresses the environmental effects associated with the Project to determine if there are any new or increased environmental impacts due to implementation of the Project within the current regulatory and environmental setting. The conclusions of the analysis in this Addendum remain consistent with those made in the original IS/MND. No new significant impacts will result, and no substantial increase in severity of impacts will result from those previously identified in the IS/MND.

1.3 Incorporation by Reference

In compliance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15150, this Addendum has incorporated by reference the *Uncle Green Development Project IS/MND*, adopted on November 12, 2018 (State Clearinghouse #2018101024). Information from this document incorporated by reference into this Addendum have been briefly summarized in the appropriate section(s) which follow, and the relationship between the incorporated part of the referenced document and this Addendum has been described. The documents and other sources which have been used in the preparation of this Addendum can be found as footnotes in the sections where they are referenced.

1.4 Addendum Process

As described in Section 1.1, an addendum to an adopted negative declaration may be prepared if only minor technical changes or additions are necessary or none of the conditions described in Section 15162 calling for the preparation of a subsequent EIR or negative declaration have occurred.¹ An addendum need not be circulated for public review but can be included in or attached to the Final EIR or Negative Declaration.² The decision-making body shall consider the addendum with the final EIR or adopted negative declaration prior to making a decision on the project.³ Once adopted, the Addendum, along with the original EIR or Negative Declaration, is placed in the Administrative Record, and the CEQA process is complete. A copy of the Addendum will be transmitted to the State Clearinghouse.

¹ CEQA Guidelines, Section 15164(a)

² CEQA Guidelines, Section 15164(c)

³ CEQA Guidelines Section 15164(d)

SECTION TWO – PROJECT DESCRIPTION

2.1 Location and Setting

The City of Woodlake is located in Tulare County in the southern part of the San Joaquin Valley. The 7.7-acre Project site is located at the southeast corner of State Route 216 (Avenue 344) and Road 196. Woodlake is bisected by State Route (SR) 216 and SR 245 and the City is situated five miles north of SR 198.

Lands surrounding the proposed Project are either in agricultural production or are developed with industrial facilities such as citrus packing facilities.

2.2 Project Description

As discussed in the original IS/MND, the Project includes the conversion of an abandoned pipe manufacturing facility to a 116,250 square foot cannabis cultivation facility. Specific Project components include:

- Tenant improvements to an abandoned pipe manufacturing facility to accommodate:
 - Approximately 116,250 total square feet of facility space including:
 - 27,000 square feet of vegetation rooms
 - 77,000 square feet of flower rooms
 - 12,250 square feet of office and other operational rooms
- Construction of an additional 44,000 square feet of cultivation space.
- Installation of curb, gutter, streetlights and 6' sidewalk along the facility on Avenue 344 and Road 196.
- Installation of a new 30-foot drive approach with security gate on Road 196.
- Installation of curb, gutter, 6' sidewalks, street lights, and a partial asphalt road on West Bravo.
- Installing a second drive approach on West Bravo Avenue, along the south side of the facility.
- Installation of a landscape screen along the frontage of the facility on Avenue 344.
- Installation of perimeter security, including lighting, fencing and an alarm system, in accordance with Chapter 5.48 of the Woodlake Municipal Code.

Approved Project Operations

The project at full build-out will employ 10-15 full time staff, and will operate from 8am to 5pm, up to seven days a week. One delivery truck per day is anticipated at full Project buildout.

The facility's electrical needs will be serviced by existing Southern California Edison connections that have been assessed as sufficient for full operation of indoor/mixed light cannabis cultivation.

The Project's water needs will be serviced by an existing on-site well and will eventually connect to the City's water system for fire suppression. Waste water from operational use (effluent water not recycled in cultivation and washing process) will be serviced by the existing on-site storm basin. All other waste water, including sewer use, will be serviced by the existing on-site septic system and eventually connect to City sewer.

The project has an on-site concrete water storage container that could serve as a Fire Department Connection for fire suppression. Additional water storage tanks may be added to supplement any discrepancy in updated Fire Code standards for fire suppression. Another option is to use City water for fire suppression when the site is eventually connected to the City's water system.

To accommodate this Project, the following entitlements are required:

- Conditional Use Permit to operate under a Cannabis Business License (Cultivation and Distribution)

Modified Project Operations

Changes to Project operations include the addition of non-storefront retail activities. Specifically, the Applicant intends to acquire three delivery vans which will provide delivery service between the hours of 10am and 6pm. One van will serve the Visalia area, one will serve the Fresno area and the third van will serve the Bakersfield area. Each van will make up to two daily trips from the facility to its respective service area, which will potentially increase the amount of daily traffic trips by six.

SECTION THREE – CEQA CHECKLIST

The purpose of the checklist is to evaluate the categories in terms of any changed condition (e.g., changed circumstances, project changes, or new information of substantial importance) that may result in a

changed environment result (e.g., a new significant impact or substantial increase in the severity of a previously identified significant effect).⁴

The questions posed in the checklist come from Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines. A “no” answer does not necessarily mean that there are no potential impacts relative to the environmental category, but that there is no change in the condition or status of the impact since it was analyzed and addressed with mitigation measures in the IS/MND prepared for the project. These environmental categories might be answered with a “no” in the checklist, since the proposed project does not introduce changes that would result in modification to the conclusion of the adopted IS/MND.

3.1 Checklist Evaluation Categories

Conclusion in Prior IS/MND – This column provides a cross reference to the section of the IS/MND where the conclusion may be found relative to the environmental issue listed under each topic.

Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts? – Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a)(1), this column indicates whether the changes represented by the revised project will result in new significant environmental impacts not previously identified or mitigated by the IS/MND, or whether the changes will result in a substantial increase in the severity of a previously identified significant impact.

New Circumstances Involving New Impacts? – Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a)(2), this column indicates where there have been substantial changes with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken that will require major revisions to the IS/MND, due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects.

New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification? – Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a)(3)(a-d), this column indicates whether new information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time of the previous FEIR or MND was certified as complete.

Adopted IS/MND Mitigation Measures – Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a)(3), this column indicates whether the IS/ND provides mitigation measures to address effects in the related impact category.

⁴ CEQA Guidelines Section 15162

3.2 Environmental Analysis

As explained in Section One, this comparative analysis has been undertaken pursuant to the provisions of CEQA Sections 15162 and 15164 to provide the City with the factual basis for determining whether any changes in the project, any changes in circumstances, or any new information since the IS/MND was adopted require additional environmental review or preparation of a Subsequent MND or EIR the IS/MND previously prepared.

As described in Section Two, non-storefront activities, specifically, the addition of three delivery vans, will increase the average daily traffic trip by six. Because of this, new analysis for impacts within the Project area is provided in this Section of the Addendum on the following pages.

I. AESTHETICS

Environmental Issue Area	Adopted IS/MND Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Adopted IS/MND Mitigation Measures
<i>Would the project:</i>					
a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	Less Than Significant.	No. There are no identified scenic vistas in the area.	No. There are no identified scenic vistas in the area.	No. There are no identified scenic vistas in the area.	None.
b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	Less Than Significant.	No. There are no scenic resources in the project area.	No. There are no scenic resources in the project area.	No. There are no scenic resources in the project area.	None.
c. In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?	Less Than Significant.	No. The project would not substantially degrade site existing visual character.	No. The project would not substantially degrade site existing visual character.	No. The project would not substantially degrade site existing visual character.	None.

d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	Less Than Significant.	No. The project would not create a source of substantial light or glare.	No. The project would not create a source of substantial light or glare.	No. The project would not create a source of substantial light or glare.	None.
---	------------------------	---	---	---	-------

DISCUSSION

The previously adopted MND determined that the proposed Project would have no significant impacts to aesthetic resources. No additional construction activities will occur other than as stated in the adopted MND. There are no changes to the Project description that would cause an increase in impacts beyond what was previously analyzed. Therefore, the Project impact remains less than significant.

FINAL IS/MND MITIGATION MEASURES

None.

CONCLUSION

The conclusions from the IS/MND remain unchanged.

II. AGRICULTURAL AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

Environmental Issue Area	Adopted IS/MND Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Adopted IS/MND Mitigation Measures
<i>Would the project:</i>					
a. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency to non-agricultural use?	No Impact.	No. The project will not remove any land from agricultural production.	No. The project will continue to not remove any land from agricultural production.	No. The proposed project remains the same concerning agricultural resources.	None.
b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	No Impact.	No. The project will not remove any land from agricultural production.	No. The project will not remove any land from agricultural production.	No. The proposed project remains the same concerning agricultural resources.	None.
c. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?	No Impact.	No. The project will not remove any land from agricultural production.	No. The project will not remove any land from agricultural production.	No. The proposed project remains the same concerning agricultural resources.	None.
d. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	No Impact.	No. There is no forest land on site.	No. There is no forest land on site.	No. There is no forest land on site.	None.
e. Involve other changes in the existing	No Impact.	No. The project will	No. The project will	No. The project will	None.

Environmental Issue Area	Adopted IS/MND Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Adopted IS/MND Mitigation Measures
environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?		not remove any land from agricultural production.	not remove any land from agricultural production.	not remove any land from agricultural production.	

DISCUSSION

As discussed in the adopted MND, the cannabis cultivation facility is located in an area of the City considered urban, built-up land by the State Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program and no Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance or land under Williamson Act contract occurs in the Project area. The Project purpose is to include delivery service for the cannabis cultivation and distribution facility and does not have the potential to result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses or forest land to non-forestland. There is no impact.

FINAL IS/MND MITIGATION MEASURES

None.

CONCLUSION

The Project will have continue to have no impact on agricultural or forestry resources.

III. AIR QUALITY

Environmental Issue Area	Adopted IS/MND Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Adopted IS/MND Mitigation Measures
<i>Would the project:</i>					
a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	Less Than Significant Impact.	No. The project would not create new significant increases in air emissions that would conflict or obstruct implementation of an available air quality plan.	No. The project would not create new significant increases in air emissions that would conflict or obstruct implementation of an available air quality plan.	No. The project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard.	None.
b. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?	Less Than Significant Impact.	No. The project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard.	No. The project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard.	No. The project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard.	None.
c. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.	Less Than Significant Impact.	No. The project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial	No. The project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial	No. The project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial	None.

Environmental Issue Area	Adopted IS/MND Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Adopted IS/MND Mitigation Measures
		pollutant concentrations.	pollutant concentrations.	pollutant concentrations.	
d. Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?	Less Than Significant Impact.	No. The project would not result in other emissions that would affect a substantial number of people.	No. The project would not result in other emissions that would affect a substantial number of people.	No. The project would not result in other emissions that would affect a substantial number of people.	None.

DISCUSSION

The previously adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration determined that the proposed Project would have less than significant impacts on air quality. Changes to the proposed Project include the addition of three delivery vans to Project operations which will provide delivery service between the hours of 10am and 6pm. One van will serve the Visalia area, one will serve the Fresno area and the third van will serve the Bakersfield area. Each van will make up to two daily trips from the facility to its respective service area, which will potentially increase the amount of daily traffic trips by six.

The estimated annual operational emissions of the cannabis cultivation processing facility were estimated by utilizing the California Emissions Estimator (CalEEMod) version 2016.3.2 (Appendix A of the original IS). The estimated operational emissions were lower than the SJVAPCD significance thresholds. The addition of six daily traffic trips will not substantially increase the operational emissions, and the total Project operations will continue to be lower than SJVAPCD’s thresholds for ROG, NOx, PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}.

Therefore, the Project impact remains less than significant.

FINAL IS/MND MITIGATION MEASURES

None.

CONCLUSION

The conclusions from the IS/MND remain unchanged.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Environmental Issue Area	Adopted IS/MND Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Adopted IS/MND Mitigation Measures
<i>Would the project:</i>					
a. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	Less Than Significant Impact.	No. There are no biological resources on the site and there are no changes to the Project description that would result in an increase in biological impacts from the previous IS/MND.	No. There are no biological resources on the site and there are no changes to the Project description that would result in an increase in biological impacts from the previous IS/MND.	No. There are no biological resources on the site and there are no changes to the Project description that would result in an increase in biological impacts from the previous IS/MND.	None.
b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	No Impact.	No. The site does not contain any biologically unique or riparian habitat.	No. The site does not contain any biologically unique or riparian habitat.	No. The site does not contain any biologically unique or riparian habitat.	None.
c. Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	No Impact.	No. The site does not contain any wetlands or other waters that would be impacted.	No. The site does not contain any wetlands or other waters that would be impacted.	No. The site does not contain any wetlands or other waters that would be impacted.	None.

Environmental Issue Area	Adopted IS/MND Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Adopted IS/MND Mitigation Measures
d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	Less Than Significant Impact.	No. The project will not interfere with any fish or wildlife movement or corridors.	No. The project will not interfere with any fish or wildlife movement or corridors.	No. The project will not interfere with any fish or wildlife movement or corridors.	None.
e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	Less Than Significant.	No. There are no trees on site.	No. There are no trees on site.	No. There are no trees on site.	None.
f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	No Impact.	No. The Project is not subject to any adopted biological conservation plans.	No. The Project is not subject to any adopted biological conservation plans.	No. The Project is not subject to any adopted biological conservation plans.	None.

DISCUSSION

The previously adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration determined that the proposed Project would have less than significant to no impacts on biological resources. The Project now includes the use of three delivery vans which will provide delivery service between the hours of 10am and 6pm. No aquatic or wetland features occur on the proposed Project site; therefore, jurisdictional waters are considered absent from the site. Lands surrounding the site are highly disturbed and consist of streets, industrial facilities, active agriculture, and commercial buildings. Addition of van delivery services in the area would not cause an increase in biological impacts, as there are no biological resources on or surrounding the site. Therefore, the Project impact remains less than significant.

FINAL IS/MND MITIGATION MEASURES

None.

CONCLUSION

The conclusions from the IS/MND remain unchanged.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

Environmental Issue Area	Adopted IS/MND Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Adopted IS/MND Mitigation Measures
<i>Would the project:</i>					
a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation.	No. There are no known historic or archaeological resources exist on site.	No. There are no known historic or archaeological resources exist on site.	No. There are no known historic or archaeological resources exist on site.	Yes. CUL-1
b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation.	No. The addition of delivery vehicles to project operations will not create any new impacts. No known historic or archaeological resources exist on site.	No. The addition of delivery vehicles to project operations will not create any new impacts. No known historic or archaeological resources exist on site.	No. The addition of delivery vehicles to project operations will not create any new impacts. No known historic or archaeological resources exist on site.	Yes. CUL-1.
c. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	No Impact.	No. The addition of delivery vehicles to project operations will not disturb human remains.	No. The addition of delivery vehicles to project operations will not disturb human remains.	No. The addition of delivery vehicles to project operations will not disturb human remains	None.

DISCUSSION

The previously adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration determined that the proposed Project would have less than significant impacts to cultural resources, with mitigation implemented. As search was conducted at the California Historic Resources Information System that included the extended project area (see Appendix B of the original IS/MND). As discussed in the original IS/MND, although no known cultural or archaeological resources or human remains exist on site, the possibility exists that such

resources or remains may be discovered during Project site preparation, excavation and/or grading activities. Mitigation Measures CUL-1 will continue to be implemented to ensure that the Project will result in less than significant impacts with mitigation.

FINAL IS/MND MITIGATION MEASURES

CUL – 1 The following measures shall be implemented:

- Before initiation of construction or ground-disturbing activities associated with the Project, the City shall require all construction personnel to be alerted to the possibility of buried cultural resources, including historic, archeological and paleontological resources;
- The general contractor and its supervisory staff shall be responsible for monitoring the construction Project for disturbance of cultural resources; and
- If a potentially significant historical, archaeological, or paleontological resource, such as structural features, unusual amounts of bone or shell, artifacts, human remains, or architectural remains or trash deposits are encountered during subsurface construction activities (i.e., trenching, grading), all construction activities within a 100-foot radius of the identified potential resource shall cease until a qualified archaeologist evaluates the item for its significance and records the item on the appropriate State Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) forms. The archaeologist shall determine whether the item requires further study. If, after the qualified archaeologist conducts appropriate technical analyses, the item is determined to be significant under California Environmental Quality Act, the archaeologist shall recommend feasible mitigation measures, which may include avoidance, preservation in place or other appropriate measure, as outlined in Public Resources Code section 21083.2. The City of Woodlake shall implement said measures.

CONCLUSION

The conclusions from the IS/MND remain unchanged.

VI. ENERGY

Environmental Issue Area	Adopted IS/MND Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Adopted IS/MND Mitigation Measures
<i>Would the project:</i>					
a. Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?	Not evaluated.	No. The Project will not result in inefficient or wasteful use of energy during construction or operation.	No. The Project will not result in inefficient or wasteful use of energy during construction or operation.	No. The Project will not result in inefficient or wasteful use of energy during construction or operation.	None.
b. Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	Not evaluated.	No. The Project does not conflict with any applicable energy use plans.	No. The Project does not conflict with any applicable energy use plans.	No. The Project does not conflict with any applicable energy use plans.	None.

DISCUSSION

This resource was not specifically discussed in the original IS/MND as it was added to CEQA requirements after its adoption. Therefore it is being included in the environmental evaluation within this Addendum.

During construction, the Project would consume energy in two general forms: (1) the fuel energy consumed by construction vehicles and equipment; and (2) bound energy in construction materials, such as asphalt, steel, concrete, and pipes. Title 24 Building Energy Efficiency Standards provide guidance on construction techniques to maximize energy conservation and it is expected that contractors and owners have a strong financial incentive to use recycled materials and products originating from nearby sources in order to reduce materials costs. As such, it is anticipated that materials used in construction and construction vehicle fuel energy would not involve the wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy. During operations, the revised Project would consume energy in the form of fuel energy

consumed by the three delivery vehicles making six vehicle trips per day. Any impacts from the addition of delivery vehicles will remain less than significant.

The proposed Project would be required to implement and be consistent with existing energy design standards at the local and state level. The Project would be subject to energy conservation requirements in the California Energy Code and CALGreen. Adherence to state code requirements would ensure that the Project would not result in wasteful and inefficient use of non-renewable resources due to building operation.

FINAL IS/MND MITIGATION MEASURES

None.

CONCLUSION

The conclusions from the original IS/MND remain unchanged.

VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Environmental Issue Area	Adopted IS/MND Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Adopted IS/MND Mitigation Measures
<i>Would the project:</i>					
a. Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:					
i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	No Impact.	No. The project would not be exposed to fault rupture. However, current building code regulations will be required to be implemented to address potential ground shaking.	No. The project would not be exposed to fault rupture. However, current building code regulations will be required to be implemented to address potential ground shaking.	No. The project would not be exposed to fault rupture. However, current building code regulations will be required to be implemented to address potential ground shaking.	None.
ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?	Less Than Significant.	No. The project would not increase exposure to risks associated with strong seismic ground shaking. However, current	No. The project would not increase exposure to risks associated with strong seismic ground shaking. However, current building code	No. The project would not increase exposure to risks associated with strong seismic ground shaking. However, current building code	None.

Environmental Issue Area	Adopted IS/MND Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Adopted IS/MND Mitigation Measures
		building code regulations will be required to be implemented to address potential ground shaking.	regulations will be required to be implemented to address potential ground shaking.	regulations will be required to be implemented to address potential ground shaking.	
iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	Less Than Significant.	No. The project would not increase exposure to seismic-related ground failure including liquefaction.	No. The project would not increase exposure to seismic-related ground failure including liquefaction.	No. The project would not increase exposure to seismic-related ground failure including liquefaction.	None.
iv. Landslides?	Less Than Significant.	No. The project would not increase exposure to landslides.	No. The project would not increase exposure to landslides.	No. The project would not increase exposure to landslides.	None.
b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	Less Than Significant.	No. The project would not result in soil erosion or the loss of topsoil.	No. The project would not result in soil erosion or the loss of topsoil.	No. The project would not result in soil erosion or the loss of topsoil.	None.
c. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral	No Impact.	No. The project would not increase exposure to risks associated with unstable	No. The project would not increase exposure to risks associated with unstable geologic units or soils.	No. The project would not increase exposure to risks associated with unstable geologic units or soils.	None.

Environmental Issue Area	Adopted IS/MND Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Adopted IS/MND Mitigation Measures
spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?		geologic units or soils.			
d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the most recently adopted Uniform Building Code creating substantial risks to life or property?	Less Than Significant.	No. The project would not increase exposure to risks associated with expansive soil.	No. The project would not increase exposure to risks associated with expansive soil.	No. The project would not increase exposure to risks associated with expansive soil.	None.
e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	No Impact.	No. The project would not implement septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems.	No. The project would not implement septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems.	No. The project would not implement septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems.	None.
f. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation.	No. The addition of delivery vehicles to project operations will not create any new impacts. No known paleontological resource or unique geologic features exist on site.	No. The addition of delivery vehicles to project operations will not create any new impacts. No known paleontological resource or unique geologic features exist on site.	No. The addition of delivery vehicles to project operations will not create any new impacts. No known paleontological resource or unique geologic features exist on site.	Yes. CUL-2.

DISCUSSION

The original IS/MND identified that no active faults underlay the project site and no erosion or loss of topsoil will occur. The Project site is not located within a currently designated Earthquake Fault Zone (formerly Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone). The project does not include the use of septic tanks or other alternative wastewater disposal systems. There are no changes to the Project description that would cause an increase in impacts beyond what was previously analyzed.

The topic of paleontological resources was included under the Cultural Resources section at the time of the original IS/MND, which also included mitigation measure CUL-2. Mitigation was included to reduce impacts to unknown paleontological resources to a less than significant level. Therefore, the Project impact remains less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

FINAL IS/MND MITIGATION MEASURES

CUL-2 The following measures shall be implemented:

The City of Woodlake will incorporate into the construction contract(s) a provision that in the event a fossil or fossil formations are discovered during any subsurface construction activities for the proposed Project (i.e., trenching, grading), all excavations within 100 feet of the find shall be temporarily halted until the find is examined by a qualified paleontologist, in accordance with Society of Vertebrate Paleontology standards. The paleontologist shall notify the appropriate representative at the City of Woodlake, who shall coordinate with the paleontologist as to any necessary investigation of the find. If the find is determined to be significant under CEQA, the City shall implement those measures, which may include avoidance, preservation in place, or other appropriate measures, as outlined in Public Resources Code section 21083.2.

CONCLUSION

The conclusions from the IS/MND remain unchanged.

VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Environmental Issue Area	Adopted IS/MND Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Adopted IS/MND Mitigation Measures
<i>Would the project:</i>					
a. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	Less Than Significant	No. The project would not generate a significant amount of greenhouse gas emissions.	No. The project would not generate a significant amount of greenhouse gas emissions.	No. The project would not generate a significant amount of greenhouse gas emissions.	None.
b. Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	Less Than Significant	No. The project would not conflict with an applicable GHG reduction plan.	No. The project would not conflict with an applicable GHG reduction plan.	No. The project would not conflict with an applicable GHG reduction plan.	None.

DISCUSSION

As discussed in the original IS/MND, the proposed Project would generate exhaust-related GHG emissions during construction resulting from construction equipment operation, material haul and delivery trucks, and by trips by construction worker vehicles; however, emissions would be less than one percent of the EPA reporting threshold. The SJVAPCD has implemented a guidance policy for development projects within their jurisdiction. This policy, “Guidance for Land-use Agencies in Addressing GHG Emission Impacts for New Projects under CEQA,” approved by the Board on December 17, 2009, does not address temporary GHG emissions from construction, nor does this policy establish numeric thresholds for ongoing GHG emissions.

The adopted IS/MND also included estimates of CO₂ production during operations, which were approximately nine percent of the reporting threshold (see Appendix A of the original IS/MND). Modified Project operations include the addition of non-storefront retail activities. Specifically, the Applicant intends to acquire three delivery vans which will provide delivery service between the hours of 10am and 6pm. One van will serve the Visalia area, one will serve the Fresno area and the third van will serve the Bakersfield area. Each van will make up to two daily trips from the facility to its respective service area, which will potentially increase the amount of daily traffic trips by six. These additional trips

will generate additional CO₂; however, those additional emissions will be minimal and within the threshold limits.

Therefore, the proposed Project would not result in a substantial increase in operational GHG emissions. As such, the proposed Project would not interfere or obstruct implementation of an applicable GHG emissions reduction plan. The proposed Project would be consistent with all applicable local plans, policies, and regulations for reducing GHG emissions. Any impacts related to GHG emissions would be less than significant.

FINAL IS/MND MITIGATION MEASURES

None.

CONCLUSION

The conclusions from the IS/MND remain unchanged.

IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Environmental Issue Area	Adopted IS/MND Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Adopted IS/MND Mitigation Measures
<i>Would the project:</i>					
a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	Less Than Significant.	No. The project would not create new or increased impact involving hazardous materials.	No. The project would not create new or increased impact involving hazardous materials.	No. The project would not create new or increased impact involving hazardous materials.	None.
b. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	Less Than Significant.	No. The project would not create additional significant hazard to the public or environmental through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions.	No. The project would not create additional significant hazard to the public or environmental through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions.	No. The project would not create additional significant hazard to the public or environmental through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions.	None.
c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	No Impact.	No. There continues to be no school within one-quarter mile of the site.	No. There continues to be no school within one-quarter mile of the site.	No. There continues to be no school within one-quarter mile of the site.	None.
d. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	No Impact.	No. The project is not designated as a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5.	No. The project is not designated as a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5.	No. The project is not designated as a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5.	None.
e. For a project located within an airport land	Less Than Significant.	No. The project is within Airport	No. The project is within Airport	No. The project is within Airport	None.

Environmental Issue Area	Adopted IS/MND Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Adopted IS/MND Mitigation Measures
use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?		Land Use Plan Zone D, which does not have land use restrictions except ones hazardous to flight. Therefore, the proposed project does not have a significant impact.	Land Use Plan Zone D, which does not have land use restrictions except ones hazardous to flight. Therefore, the proposed project does not have a significant impact.	Land Use Plan Zone D, which does not have land use restrictions except ones hazardous to flight. Therefore, the proposed project does not have a significant impact.	
f. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	Less Than Significant.	No. The project would not impair emergency evacuation or response.	No. The project would not impair emergency evacuation or response.	No. The project would not impair emergency evacuation or response.	None.
g. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?	No Impact.	No. The project site is not located in an areas susceptible to extreme fire hazards or wildland fires.	No. The project site is not located in an areas susceptible to extreme fire hazards or wildland fires.	No. The project site is not located in an areas susceptible to extreme fire hazards or wildland fires.	None.

DISCUSSION

The original IS/MND determined that there would be less than significant impacts to hazards and hazardous materials. The additional delivery vehicle trips would not cause an increase in impacts beyond what was previously analyzed. Therefore, the impact remains less than significant.

FINAL IS/MND MITIGATION MEASURES

None.

CONCLUSION

The conclusions from the IS/MND remain unchanged.

X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Environmental Issue Area	Adopted IS/MND Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Adopted IS/MND Mitigation Measures
<i>Would the project:</i>					
a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?	Less than Significant Impact with mitigation incorporation.	No. The project would not violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements.	No. The project would not violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements.	No. The project would not violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements.	Yes. HYD-1.
b. Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	Less than Significant Impact.	No. The project would not substantially deplete groundwater resources or impair groundwater recharge.	No. The project would not substantially deplete groundwater resources or impair groundwater recharge.	No. The project would not substantially deplete groundwater resources or impair groundwater recharge.	None.
c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would:					
i. result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	Less than Significant Impact.	No. The project would not substantially alter the existing site drainage pattern and it would not alter the course of a stream or river or result in erosion or siltation on or off site.	No. The project would not substantially alter the existing site drainage pattern and it would not alter the course of a stream or river or result in erosion or siltation on or off site.	No. The project would not substantially alter the existing site drainage pattern and it would not alter the course of a stream or river or result in erosion or siltation on or off site.	None.

Environmental Issue Area	Adopted IS/MND Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Adopted IS/MND Mitigation Measures
ii. substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	Less than Significant Impact.	No. The project would not substantially increase the rate of runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off- site.	No. The project would not substantially increase the rate of runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off- site.	No. The project would not substantially increase the rate of runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off- site.	None.
iii. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	Less than Significant Impact.	No. The project would not increase the rate of runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off- site.	No. The project would not increase the rate of runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off- site.	No. The project would not increase the rate of runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off- site.	None.
iv. Impede or redirect flood flows?	Less than Significant Impact.	No. The project would not impede or redirect flood flows.	No. The project would not impede or redirect flood flows.	No. The project would not impede or redirect flood flows.	None.
d. In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	No Impact.	No. The project would not release pollutants due to project inundation.	No. The project would not release pollutants due to project inundation.	No. The project would not release pollutants due to project inundation.	None.
e. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	Less than Significant Impact.	No. The project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater	No. The project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater	No. The project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater	None.

Environmental Issue Area	Adopted IS/MND Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Adopted IS/MND Mitigation Measures
		management plan.	management plan.	management plan.	

DISCUSSION

The previously adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration determined that the proposed Project would result in less than significant impacts on hydrology and water quality with mitigation incorporated. As mentioned in the original IS/MND, during construction activities, there may be an increased potential of exposing excavated soils to wind and water erosion, which could result in temporary minimal increases in sediment load in nearby water bodies, including the Friant Kern Canal. Mitigation Measures HYD-1 will continue to be implemented to ensure that the Project will result in less than significant impacts with mitigation. The additional delivery vehicle trips would not cause an increase in impacts beyond what was previously analyzed. Therefore, the Project impact remains less than significant with mitigation.

FINAL IS/MND MITIGATION MEASURES

- HYD-1: To minimize any potential short-term water quality effects from project-related construction activities, the project contractor shall implement Best Management Practices (BMP's) in conformance with the California Storm Water Best Management Practice Handbook for Construction Activity.

CONCLUSION

The conclusions from the IS/MND remain unchanged.

XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING

Environmental Issue Area	Adopted IS/MND Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Adopted IS/MND Mitigation Measures
<i>Would the project:</i>					
a. Physically divide an established community?	No Impact.	No. The project would not divide an established community.	No. The project would not divide an established community.	No. The project would not divide an established community.	None.
b. Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	No Impact.	No. The project is consistent with the allowable land use.	No. The project is consistent with the allowable land use.	No. The project is consistent with the allowable land use.	None.

DISCUSSION

The previously adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration determined that the proposed Project would have no impact on land use and planning. The Project vicinity is heavily disturbed with industrial and agricultural uses. The site is currently zoned Light Industrial and the General Plan Land Use Designation is Industrial. The addition of delivery vehicles to Project operations would not cause an increase in impacts beyond what was previously analyzed. Therefore, there remains no impact.

FINAL IS/MND MITIGATION MEASURES

None.

CONCLUSION

The conclusions from the IS/MND remain unchanged.

XII. MINERAL RESOURCES

Environmental Issue Area	Adopted IS/MND Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Adopted IS/MND Mitigation Measures
<i>Would the project:</i>					
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.	No. The project would not result in the loss of known mineral resources.	No. The project would not result in the loss of known mineral resources.	No. The project would not result in the loss of known mineral resources.	None.
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.	No. The project would not result in the loss of known mineral resources.	No. The project would not result in the loss of known mineral resources.	No. The project would not result in the loss of known mineral resources.	None.

DISCUSSION

The previously adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration determined that the proposed Project would have no impact to mineral resources. There are no changes to the Project description that would cause an increase in impacts beyond what was previously analyzed. Therefore, there continues to be no impact.

FINAL IS/MND MITIGATION MEASURES

None.

CONCLUSION

The conclusions from the IS/MND remain unchanged.

XIII. NOISE

Environmental Issue Area	Adopted IS/MND Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Adopted IS/MND Mitigation Measures
<i>Would the project:</i>					
a. Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in the ambient noise levels in vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	Less Than Significant.	No. The project would not expose persons to or generate noise levels in excess of standards established by applicable local, regional or national regulations.	No. The project would not expose persons to or generate noise levels in excess of standards established by applicable local, regional or national regulations.	No. The project would not expose persons to or generate noise levels in excess of standards established by applicable local, regional or national regulations.	None.
b. Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	Less Than Significant.	No. The project would not expose persons to excessive groundborne vibration.	No. The project would not expose persons to excessive groundborne vibration.	No. The project would not expose persons to excessive groundborne vibration.	None.
c. For a project located within a private airstrip or 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.	No. The project is not within the established airport noise contour.	No. The project is not within the established airport noise contour.	No. The project is not within the established airport noise contour.	None.

DISCUSSION

The previously adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration determined that the proposed Project would have less than significant to no impact from noise. As mentioned earlier, changed to the Project operations include addition of three delivery vans which will provide delivery service between the hours of 10am and 6pm. One van will serve the Visalia area, one will serve the Fresno area and the third van will serve the Bakersfield area. Each van will make up to two daily trips from the facility to its respective

service area, which will potentially increase the amount of daily traffic trips by six. In accordance with the Woodlake Municipal Code, commercial cannabis operations shall be subject to the City's noise and nuisance ordinances. These measures will ensure any impacts would remain less than significant.

FINAL IS/MND MITIGATION MEASURES

None.

CONCLUSION

The conclusions from the IS/MND remain unchanged.

XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING

Environmental Issue Area	Adopted IS/MND Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Adopted IS/MND Mitigation Measures
<i>Would the project:</i>					
a. 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)?	No Impact.	No. The project would not induce substantial growth in the project area.	No. The project would not induce substantial growth in the project area.	No. The project would not induce substantial growth in the project area.	None.
b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	No Impact.	No. The project will not displace existing housing.	No. The project will not displace existing housing.	No. The project will not displace existing housing.	None.

RESPONSES

The previously adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration determined that the proposed Project would have no impact on population and housing. The addition of delivery vehicles to the operations will not cause an increase in impacts beyond what was previously analyzed. Therefore, there continues to be no impact.

FINAL IS/MND MITIGATION MEASURES

None.

CONCLUSION

The conclusions from the IS/MND remain unchanged.

XV. PUBLIC SERVICES

Environmental Issue Area	Adopted IS/MND Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Adopted IS/MND Mitigation Measures
<i>Would the project:</i>					
a. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:					
Fire protection?	Less Than Significant.	No. The project would not result in a need for new or expanded fire protection facilities.	No. The project would not result in a need for new or expanded fire protection facilities.	No. The project would not result in a need for new or expanded fire protection facilities.	None.
Police protection?	Less Than Significant.	No. The project would not result in a need for new or expanded police protection facilities.	No. The project would not result in a need for new or expanded police protection facilities.	No. The project would not result in a need for new or expanded police protection facilities.	None.
Schools?	No Impact.	No. The project would not result in a need for new or	No. The project would not result in a need for new or	No. The project would not result in a need for new or	None.

		expanded school facilities.	expanded school facilities.	expanded school facilities.	
Parks?	No Impact.	No. The project would not result in a need for new or expanded park facilities.	No. The project would not result in a need for new or expanded park facilities.	No. The project would not result in a need for new or expanded park facilities.	None.
Other public facilities?	No Impact.	No. The project would not result in a need for new or expanded other facilities.	No. The project would not result in a need for new or expanded other facilities.	No. The project would not result in a need for new or expanded other facilities.	None.

DISCUSSION

The previously adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration determined that the proposed Project would have less than significant to no impacts on public services. The addition of three delivery vans for trips between the hours of 10am to 6pm will not cause an increase in impacts beyond what was previously analyzed. Therefore, the Project impact remains less than significant.

FINAL IS/MND MITIGATION MEASURES

None.

CONCLUSION

The conclusions from the IS/MND remain unchanged.

XVI. RECREATION

Environmental Issue Area	Adopted IS/MND Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Adopted IS/MND Mitigation Measures
<i>Would the project:</i>					
a. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	No Impact.	No. The project would not result in the deterioration of an existing park.	No. The project would not result in the deterioration of an existing park.	No. The project would not result in the deterioration of an existing park.	None.
b. Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	No Impact.	No. The project would not result in a need for new or expanded park facilities.	No. The project would not result in a need for new or expanded park facilities.	No. The project would not result in a need for new or expanded park facilities.	None.

DISCUSSION

The previously adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration determined that the proposed Project would have less than significant impacts on recreation. There are no changes to the Project description that would cause an increase in impacts beyond what was previously analyzed. Therefore, the Project impact remains less than significant.

FINAL IS/MND MITIGATION MEASURES

None.

CONCLUSION

The conclusions from the IS/MND remain unchanged.

XVII. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

Environmental Issue Area	Adopted IS/MND Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Adopted IS/MND Mitigation Measures
<i>Would the project:</i>					
a. Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?	Less Than Significant.	No. The project would not conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy regarding the circulation system.	No. The project would not conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy regarding the circulation system.	No. The project would not conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy regarding the circulation system.	None.
b. Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	Less Than Significant.	No. The project would not conflict with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b).	No. The project would not conflict with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b).	No. The project would not conflict with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b).	None
c. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	No Impact.	No. The project would not increase hazards due to a design feature.	No. The project would not increase hazards due to a design feature.	No. The project would not increase hazards due to a design feature.	None.
d. Result in inadequate emergency access?	No Impact.	No. The project would not result in inadequate emergency access.	No. The project would not result in inadequate emergency access.	No. The project would not result in inadequate emergency access.	None.

DISCUSSION

The previously adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration determined that the proposed Project would have less than significant impacts on transportation. Changes to Project operations include the addition of non-storefront retail activities. Specifically, the Applicant intends to acquire three delivery vans which

will provide delivery service between the hours of 10am and 6pm. One van will serve the Visalia area, one will serve the Fresno area and the third van will serve the Bakersfield area. Each van will make up to two daily trips from the facility to its respective service area, which will potentially increase the amount of daily traffic trips by six. The Project vicinity is highly disturbed and surrounded by agricultural and industrial uses such as the Project. Therefore changes to the Project description that would not cause an increase in impacts beyond what was previously analyzed. Therefore, the Project impact remains less than significant.

FINAL IS/MND MITIGATION MEASURES

None.

CONCLUSION

The conclusions from the IS/MND remain unchanged.

XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

Environmental Issue Area	Adopted IS/MND Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Adopted IS/MND Mitigation Measures
<i>Would the project:</i>					
a. Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:	Less Than Significant.	No. There are no identified Tribal Cultural Resources in the area.	No. There are no identified Tribal Cultural Resources in the area.	No. There are no identified Tribal Cultural Resources in the area.	None.
i. Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or	Less Than Significant.	No. There are no structures or historical resources on the project site.	No. There are no structures or historical resources on the project site.	No. There are no structures or historical resources on the project site.	None.
ii. A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c)	Less Than Significant.	No. There are no identified Tribal Cultural Resources in the area.	No. There are no identified Tribal Cultural Resources in the area.	No. There are no identified Tribal Cultural Resources in the area.	None.

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

DISCUSSION

The previously adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration determined that the proposed Project would have less than significant impacts on tribal resources. There are no changes to the Project description that would cause an increase in impacts beyond what was previously analyzed. Therefore, the Project impact remains less than significant.

FINAL IS/MND MITIGATION MEASURES

None.

CONCLUSION

Less than significant impact.

XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Environmental Issue Area	Adopted IS/MND Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Adopted IS/MND Mitigation Measures
<i>Would the project:</i>					
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?	Less Than Significant.	No. The project would not require the relocation or construction of new or expanded utilities.	No. The project would not require the relocation or construction of new or expanded utilities.	No. The project would not require the relocation or construction of new or expanded utilities.	None.
b. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?	Less Than Significant.	No. Impacts resulting from the sewer and water system extensions have been adequately analyzed.	No. Impacts resulting from the sewer and water system extensions have been adequately analyzed.	No. Impacts resulting from the sewer and water system extensions have been adequately analyzed.	None.
c. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	Less Than Significant.	No. The project would not require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities.	No. The project would not require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities.	No. The project would not require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities.	None.
d. Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or	Less Than Significant Impact.	No. The project would not generate	No. The project would not generate excess solid waste.	No. The project would not generate excess solid waste.	None.

Environmental Issue Area	Adopted IS/MND Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Adopted IS/MND Mitigation Measures
otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?		excess solid waste.			
e. Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statues and regulations related to solid waste?	Less Than Significant Impact.	No. The project would comply with applicable statues and regulations related to solid waste.	No. The project would comply with applicable statues and regulations related to solid waste.	No. The project would comply with applicable statues and regulations related to solid waste.	None.

DISCUSSION

The previously adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration determined that the proposed Project would have less than significant impacts on utilities and service systems. There are no changes to the Project description that would cause an increase in impacts beyond what was previously analyzed. Therefore, the Project impact remains less than significant.

FINAL IS/MND MITIGATION MEASURES

None.

CONCLUSION

The conclusions from the IS/MND remain unchanged.

XX. WILDFIRE

Environmental Issue Area	Adopted IS/MND Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Adopted IS/MND Mitigation Measures
<i>If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project: :</i>					
a. Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	Not evaluated.	No. The City has reviewed the site plan and has determined that there will be no impairment of emergency plans.	No. The City has reviewed the site plan and has determined that there will be no impairment of emergency plans.	No. The City has reviewed the site plan and has determined that there will be no impairment of emergency plans.	None.
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?	Not evaluated.	No. The project would not exacerbate wildfire risks.	No. The project would not exacerbate wildfire risks.	No. The project would not exacerbate wildfire risks.	None.
c. Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?	Not evaluated.	No. The project does not require installation of infrastructure that exacerbates wildfire risks.	No. The project does not require installation of infrastructure that exacerbates wildfire risks.	No. The project does not require installation of infrastructure that exacerbates wildfire risks.	None.
d. Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding	Not evaluated.	No. There are no substantial slopes or flooding risk	No. There are no substantial slopes or flooding risk in the area and	No. There are no substantial slopes or flooding risk in the area and	None.

<p>or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?</p>		<p>in the area and therefore there is no increased risk due to post-fire impacts.</p>	<p>therefore there is no increased risk due to post-fire impacts.</p>	<p>therefore there is no increased risk due to post-fire impacts.</p>	
--	--	---	---	---	--

DISCUSSION

This topic was not included in the Original IS/MND. Therefore, it is being included in the environmental evaluation within this Addendum. The heavily disturbed nature of the site and the vicinity precludes the possibility of impact from or impacts to wildfires. Additionally, the site is not located within or near a state responsibility area and it is not within a fire hazard severity zone. There is no impact.

FINAL IS/MND MITIGATION MEASURES

None.

CONCLUSION

The conclusions from the IS/MND remain unchanged.

XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Environmental Issue Area	Adopted IS/MND Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Adopted IS/MND Mitigation Measures
<i>Would the project:</i>					
<p>a. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, 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?</p>	<p>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation.</p>	<p>No. The project would not 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.</p>	<p>No. The project would not 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.</p>	<p>No. The project would not 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.</p>	<p>None.</p>
<p>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</p>	<p>Less Than Significant.</p>	<p>No. The project would not have cumulatively considerable impacts.</p>	<p>No. The project would not have cumulatively considerable impacts.</p>	<p>No. The project would not have cumulatively considerable impacts.</p>	<p>None.</p>

Environmental Issue Area	Adopted IS/MND Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Adopted IS/MND Mitigation Measures
with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?					
c. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation.	No. The project would not have cumulatively considerable impact.	No. The project would not have cumulatively considerable impact.	No. The project would not have cumulatively considerable impact.	None.

RESPONSES

The previously adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration determined that the proposed Project would have less than significant impacts with mitigation incorporated on mandatory findings of significance. There are no changes to the Project description that would cause an increase in impacts beyond what was previously analyzed. Therefore, the Project impact remains less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

FINAL IS/MND MITIGATION MEASURES

None.

CONCLUSION

The conclusions from the IS/MND remain unchanged.