



Fresno Metropolitan Flood Control District

Capturing Stormwater since 1956

DATE: July 31, 2020

SUBJECT: **NOTICE OF SUBSEQUENT PROJECT WITHIN THE SCOPE OF THE SUBSEQUENT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR THE 2016 DISTRICT SERVICES PLAN UPDATE: BASIN “CF” GROUNDWATER RECHARGE AND FLOOD CONTROL PROJECT (SCN: 1999111132)**

PROJECT LOCATION: **Fresno County, California (Peach Ave & Central Ave)**

COMMENT PERIOD: **July 31, 2020 to September 14, 2020**

The Fresno Metropolitan Flood Control District (District) has determined, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15177, that the Basin “CF” Groundwater Recharge Flood Control Project is a subsequent project within the scope of the Subsequent EIR for the 2016 District Services Plan Update, certified by the District as a lead agency on December 13, 2017, and that no additional environmental review for the project is required. The District has prepared an Initial Study for the project and has determined that the project would not result in any additional significant environmental effect not previously analyzed in the Subsequent EIR. No new additional mitigation measures or alternatives are required.

The Basin “CF” Groundwater Recharge Flood Control Project includes constructing a pump station at an existing District stormwater basin, Basin “CF”, internal basin pipelines, and a relief connection pipeline and intertie structure to the Fresno Irrigation District Washington Colony Canal. The project is the construction master planned facilities identified in the 2016 District Services Plan Update.


Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15087(c)(6), the District is providing notice that approximately 150 feet of pipeline will be constructed on a site listed under Section 65962.5 of the Government Code. The site had a leaking underground storage tank identified in 1988. According to the State Water Resources Control Board GeoTracker database, the leaking underground storage tank has been resolved since 1996. The Initial Study concluded project related impacts will not have a significant effect on the environment and will create no new effects not identified in the Subsequent EIR.

The Initial Study and Subsequent EIR is available for review on the District’s web site at: <http://www.fresnofloodcontrol.org/>




Fresno Metropolitan Flood Control District

Capturing Stormwater since 1956



LEGEND

- Facilities To Be Constructed
- Existing Facilities
- Future Facilities
- FID Facilities
- Drainage Area Boundary



RELIEF LINE DRAINAGE AREA "CF"

Note: Purpose of figure is to display project location and not project scope.

Comments regarding this project may be submitted to:

Joseph Draper, Staff Analyst II
Fresno Metropolitan Flood Control District
5469 E. Olive Avenue
Fresno, CA 93727
(559) 456-3292, Fax (559) 456-3194
josephd@fresnofloodcontrol.org

Basin “CF” Groundwater Recharge and Flood Control Project

Revisions to the Initial Study

October 2, 2020

The Initial Study for the Basin “CF” Groundwater Recharge and Flood Control Project (Project) was circulated for public comment from July 31, 2020 to September 14, 2020. The Fresno Metropolitan Flood Control District (District) received no comments on the proposed project or the Initial Study.

After the Initial Study comment period, staff determined that the project alignments will be modified from the project alignments circulated in the Initial Study. The revised project alignment is attached to this document as Exhibit “A”.

The revisions to the Initial Study do not affect the adequacy of the environmental analysis or conclusions in the Initial Study. Because the changes presented below would not result in any new significant impacts or an increase in impact significance from what was identified in the Initial Study, recirculation of the Initial Study is not required (CEQA Guidelines Section 15073.5).


Based on staff initiated changes on the Initial Study prepared for the proposed Project (released for public review on July 31, 2020 to September 14, 2020), the following revisions have been made to the Initial Study.

1. Page 1 of the Initial Study in reference to Land Uses and Setting is modified as follows:







Fresno County is located approximately in the center of the San Joaquin Valley, stretching approximately 100 miles from the Coastal Range foothills to the eastern slope of the Sierra Nevada. A regional map listed as Exhibit No. 1 illustrates the projects location on a regional scale within the County of Fresno. A Vicinity Map listed as Exhibit No. 2 illustrates the project location near the City of Fresno Sphere of Influence and District Boundary. Exhibit No. 2 does not illustrate the proposed pipelines but shows the location of Basin “CF” which is near where the pipelines are proposed. The Project diagrams on Exhibit “A” ~~Exhibit No. 3 and No. 4 show~~ illustrates the location of the proposed pump station, pipelines and canal intertie.

2. Pages 5 and 6 of the Initial Study, which include Exhibit’s No. 3 and 4, are replaced with Exhibit “A”. Exhibit “A” is attached to this document.

NOTE: THIS MAP IS SCHEMATIC.
 DISTANCES, AMOUNT OF CREDITABLE
 FACILITIES, AND LOCATION OF INLET
 BOUNDARIES ARE APPROXIMATE.



LEGEND

-  Pump Station To Be Constructed
-  Facilities To Be Constructed
-  Existing Facilities
-  Future Facilities
-  FID Facilities
-  Drainage Area Boundary



1" = 300'

**PUMP STATION &
 CANAL INTERTIE
 DRAINAGE AREA "CF"**

EXHIBIT "A"



FRESNO METROPOLITAN FLOOD CONTROL DISTRICT

Prepared by: danielg

Date: 7/29/2019

Path: K:\Autocad\DWGS\0EXHIBIT\GRANTS\UPPER KINGS IRWM\CF Pump Station & Intertie_ALT.mxd

Basin “CF” Groundwater Recharge and Flood Control Project

Fresno, California

Initial Study

July 27, 2020

Prepared by:
Joseph Draper
Staff Analyst II
Josephd@fresnofloodcontrol.org

*Prepared pursuant to the
California Environmental Quality Act*



**Fresno Metropolitan
Flood Control District**

Table of Contents

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM.....	1
Project Title.....	1
Lead Agency Name and Address.....	1
Contact Person and Phone Number	1
Project Location	1
General Plan Designation & Zoning.....	1
Description of Project.....	1
Land Uses and Setting.....	1
Previous Analysis.....	1
Other Public Agencies Whose Approval Is Required.....	2
Exhibit 1: Regional Map	3
Exhibit 2: Vicinity Area Map.....	4
Exhibit 3: Project Diagram.....	5
Exhibit 4: Project Diagram.....	6
Environmental Factors Potentially Affected.....	7
Determination	8
Evaluation of Environmental Impacts	9
1. Aesthetics	10
Discussion	10
2. Agriculture and Forestry Resources.....	11
Discussion	11
3. Air Quality.....	13
Discussion	13
4. Biological Resources	15
Discussion	15
5. Cultural Resources	17
Discussion:	17
6. Energy.....	19
Discussion:	19
7. Geology and Soils	20
Discussion:	21
8. Greenhouse Gas Emissions	22
Discussion:	22
9. Hazards and Hazardous Materials.....	23
Discussion:	24
10. Hydrology and Water Quality	26
Discussion:	27
11. Land Use and Planning.....	28
Discussion:	28
12. Mineral Resources.....	29
Discussion:	29
13. Noise	30
Discussion:	30
14. Population and Housing	31
Discussion:	31

15. Public Services.....	32
Discussion:	32
16. Recreation	33
Discussion:	33
17. Transportation/Traffic	34
Discussion:	34
18. Tribal Cultural Resources	36
Discussion:	36
19. Utilities and Service Systems	38
Discussion:	38
20. Wildfire.....	39
Discussion:	39
21. Mandatory Findings of Significance	40
Discussion:	40
Performance Standards.....	41
Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program	44
Mitigation Measures	45
Names of Persons Who Prepared or Participated in the Initial Study/Environmental Checklist.....	45

Environmental Checklist Form

Project Title

Basin "CF" Groundwater Recharge and Flood Control Project

Lead Agency Name and Address

Fresno Metropolitan Flood Control District
5469 East Olive Avenue
Fresno, CA 93727
<http://www.fresnofloodcontrol.org>

Contact Person and Phone Number

Joseph Draper, Staff Analyst II
josephd@fresnofloodcontrol.org
(559) 456-3292

Project Location

The project is located in the County of Fresno near the unincorporated community of Malaga on Peach Avenue between Central Avenue and the Malaga Avenue alignment.

General Plan Designation & Zoning

The County of Fresno designates APN 331-090-27 as Limited Agricultural (AL-20) and APN 331-100-23 as Heavy Industrial (M-3). The project, however, will not change any general plan designations.

Description of Project

The Basin "CF" Groundwater Recharge Flood Control Project includes constructing a pump station at an existing District stormwater basin (Basin "CF"), internal basin pipelines, a recharge/relief connection pipeline and intertie structure at the Fresno Irrigation District Washington Colony Canal. The project is the construction District master planned facilities identified in the 2016 District Services Plan Update and was studied as a subsequent project in the 2017 Subsequent Environmental Impact Report (SEIR).

Land Uses and Setting

Fresno County is located approximately in the center of the San Joaquin Valley, stretching approximately 100 miles from the Coastal Range foothills to the eastern slope of the Sierra Nevada. A regional map listed as Exhibit No. 1 illustrates the projects location on a regional scale within the County of Fresno. A Vicinity Map listed as Exhibit No. 2 illustrates the project location near the City of Fresno Sphere of Influence and District Boundary. Exhibit No. 2 does not illustrate the proposed pipelines but shows the location of Basin "CF" which is near where the pipelines are proposed. Project diagrams on Exhibit No. 3 and No. 4 show the location of the proposed pump station, pipelines and canal intertie.

Previous Analysis

The Fresno Metropolitan Flood Control District (District) certified a Subsequent Environmental Impact Report (SCN 1999111132) on December 13, 2017 for the 2016 District Services Plan Update (2017 SEIR).

The 2017 SEIR updates the Final Master Environmental Impact Report of the 2004 District Services Plan, certified by the District in 2007 (2007 MEIR).

The 2017 SEIR and 2016 District Services Plan is available on the District website:

<http://www.fresnofloodcontrol.org/documents-and-reports/>

Subsequent projects in the 2017 SEIR are described on page 3-6 of the Draft SEIR. Of the subsequent projects, *Installation of new and ongoing maintenance of existing and future stormwater infrastructure* is an anticipated subsequent project pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15176(b) as a capital outlay described by the District as Master Planned facilities.

The District has reviewed the proposed project and, on the basis of the whole record before it, has determined that the proposed project is an anticipated subsequent project identified and described in the 2017 SEIR and is consistent with the planned infrastructure improvements the District set forth in the District Master Plan Map in the 2016 District Services Plan Update.

The purposes of this Initial Study is to determine if the proposed subsequent project may cause additional significant effect on the environment which was not previously studied in the 2017 SEIR and 2007 MEIR. Discussion sections of environmental impacts may refer to the 2017 SEIR and 2007 MEIR as SEIR and MEIR, respectively, and are the basis for determining whether there are new significant effects.

Other Public Agencies Whose Approval Is Required


None

Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1?




If so, is there a plan for consultation that includes, for example, the determination of significant of impacts to tribal cultural resources, procedures regarding confidentiality, etc.?

In preparation of the 2017 SEIR, the District obtained a Tribal Consultation List from the California Native American Heritage Commission and formally notified California Native American tribes the opportunity to consult pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1. No California Native American tribes requested consultation at that time. Because this proposed project is a subsequent project, no additional environmental document will be filed that requires additional consultation endless new significant effects are identified. Please see the 2017 SEIR for additional information.

NOTE: THIS MAP IS SCHEMATIC.
DISTANCES, AMOUNT OF CREDITABLE
FACILITIES, AND LOCATION OF INLET
BOUNDARIES ARE APPROXIMATE.



LEGEND

-  Fresno County
-  City Of Fresno Limits
-  FMFCD Boundary




BASIN "CF" RECHARGE REGIONAL MAP





EXHIBIT NO. 1 FRESNO METROPOLITAN FLOOD CONTROL DISTRICT

NOTE: THIS MAP IS SCHEMATIC.
DISTANCES, AMOUNT OF CREDITABLE
FACILITIES, AND LOCATION OF INLET
BOUNDARIES ARE APPROXIMATE.



LEGEND

-  City Of Fresno Limits
-  FMFCD Boundary




BASIN "CF" RECHARGE VICINITY MAP








EXHIBIT NO. 2 FRESNO METROPOLITAN FLOOD CONTROL DISTRICT

NOTE: THIS MAP IS SCHEMATIC.
 DISTANCES, AMOUNT OF CREDITABLE
 FACILITIES, AND LOCATION OF INLET
 BOUNDARIES ARE APPROXIMATE.



LEGEND

-  Pump Station To Be Constructed
-  Existing Facilities
-  Future Facilities
-  FID Facilities
-  Drainage Area Boundary




1" = 300'

**PUMP STATION
 DRAINAGE AREA "CF"
 Exhibit No. 3**



FRESNO METROPOLITAN FLOOD CONTROL DISTRICT

NOTE: THIS MAP IS SCHEMATIC.
 DISTANCES, AMOUNT OF CREDITABLE
 FACILITIES, AND LOCATION OF INLET
 BOUNDARIES ARE APPROXIMATE.



LEGEND

- Facilities To Be Constructed
- Existing Facilities
- Future Facilities
- FID Facilities
- Drainage Area Boundary



RELIEF LINE
DRAINAGE AREA "CF"
 Exhibit No. 4



FRESNO METROPOLITAN FLOOD CONTROL DISTRICT

Environmental Factors Potentially Affected

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" unless mitigated, as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.


- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture and Forestry Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Population/Housing |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Geology/Soils | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions | <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities/Service Systems |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology/Water Quality | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> None |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use/Planning | |

Determination

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.


Signature


Date

Alan Hofmann, General Manager – Secretary
Fresno Metropolitan Flood Control District

Evaluation of Environmental Impacts

The following information is presented for each environmental issue addressed in this section:

- A determination of whether the project would have a potentially significant impact, less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated, less than significant impact, or no impact;
- A brief explanation for each determination, including the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question;
- A description of any mitigation measures and how they would reduce an effect to a less significant level; and
- A list of all sources used in preparing the Initial Study is presented at the end of the document.

One of the following determinations is made for each environmental issue:

1. **No impact** determination is made if the impact does not apply to the project or the impact was identified in the 2016 District Services Plan Update Subsequent Environmental Impact Report or 2004 District Services Plan Master Environmental Impact Report. The determination may not be explained if information in the referenced source(s) demonstrates that the impact does not apply. The no impact determination is explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards.
2. **Less than significant impact** determination is made if an effect is clearly less than significant, as documented in the explanation and referenced sources.
3. **Less than significant with mitigation** incorporation determination is made where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from a potentially significant impact to a less than significant impact.
4. **Potentially significant impact** determination is made if an effect is significant or potentially significant, or if the Lead Agency lacks information to make a finding of insignificance. If there are one or more potentially significant impact entries, an EIR is required.

1. Aesthetics

Would the project:

	No Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Potentially Significant Impact
a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	X			
b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	X			
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?	X			
d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	X			

Performance Standards included in MEIR:

- As necessary and possible, hours of operation for light-generating construction equipment would be restricted to between the hours of 7:00 AM to 7:00 PM.

Discussion

Summary of environmental finding in the 2017 SEIR:

On the basis of the Initial Study evaluation prepared for the 2007 MEIR, it was determined that impacts related to aesthetics would have a less than significant impact on the environment. The Initial Study prepared from the 2017 SEIR determined that: 1) the potential impacts of the 2016 District Services Plan Update related to aesthetics will not cause any additional significant effect on the environment not studied in the 2007 MEIR; 2) no new additional mitigation measures or alternatives are required; and 3) no further analysis of this issue is required in the SEIR.

Responses a – d): The proposed project is not located near scenic vistas, resources, trees, rock outcroppings, or historic buildings near a state scenic highway. Additionally, the proposed project is almost entirely below ground with the exception of a pump station at the existing District Basin "CF", which will have no source of light or glare. The proposed project does not include any structures not considered in the 2017 SEIR or 2007 MEIR. Project will have no new impact.

New Mitigation Measures: No new mitigation measures are required.

Applicable mitigation measures from 2017 SEIR and/or 2007 MEIR: There are no applicable mitigation measures.

Determination: The proposed project will have no new impact on the environment.

2. Agriculture and Forestry Resources

In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and the forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:

	No Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Potentially Significant Impact
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?	X			
b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	X			
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))?	X			
d. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	X			
e. Involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	X			

Discussion

Summary of environmental finding in the 2017 SEIR:

The 2017 SEIR studied Agricultural and Forestry Resources as a potentially significant effect. The proposed projects in the 2017 SEIR included obtaining land that was being farmed and have current Williamson Act contracts. However, the 2017 SEIR determined that impacts to Agricultural and Forestry Resource would be less than significant.

Responses a – e): The proposed project does not change existing land uses and does not take place on Prime farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance. The proposed project may require an easement through land currently farmed that may require a half an acre of crops to be removed. The SEIR studied

Agriculture and Forest Land in the SEIR as an effect that may be significant. The proposed project does not create any additional environmental effect not studied in the SEIR and MEIR. No new impact.

New Mitigation Measures: No new mitigation measures are required.

Applicable mitigation measures from 2017 SEIR and/or 2007 MEIR: There are no applicable mitigation measures.

Determination: The proposed project will have no new impact on the environment.

3. Air Quality

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

	No Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Potentially Significant Impact
a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	X			
b. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?	X			
c. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	X			
d. Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?	X			

Performance Standards included in MEIR:

- District contractors and dirt removal permittees would be required to provide dust control and cleanup of loose soils both within and outside of construction sites in accordance with San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District Rule VIII for the control of fine particulate matter. Haul roads would be cleaned and swept as necessary during hauling operations.
- The District would require of its contractors or permittees to properly maintain internal combustion engines used during construction activities. The District would properly maintain all District owned and operated internal combustion engine machinery.
- Any maintenance activities that would cause or have the potential to cause fugitive emissions would be required to implement dust control measures in accordance with the District’s comprehensive Dust Control Plan.
- If objectionable odors originate at a District facility, District staff would investigate the cause of the odor immediately. When the source of the odor is identified, it would be neutralized or removed and properly disposed of in accordance with local, State and federal requirements.

Discussion

The project area is under the jurisdiction of the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD), which administers air quality regulations developed at the federal, state, and local levels. SJVAPCD regulates pollutants in the San Joaquin Valley Air Basin (SJVAB). The predominant air pollutants in the SJVAB are ozone and particulate matter (PM10 and PM2.5). There are many federal, State, and local regulations that pertain to air quality. The District’s draft SEIR on page 4-10 describes air quality and air quality related impacts in greater detail.

Summary of environmental finding in the 2017 SEIR

The District’s 2017 SEIR studied air quality as a potentially significant impact on the environment. An air quality technical study was conducted on the District’s subsequent projects, which include construction of master plan pipelines such as the proposed project. The air quality technical study is Appendix B of the draft SEIR. The air quality technical study used the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) Version 2016.3.1 for

determination of daily construction and operational emissions. Specifically, the air quality technical study determined whether the subsequent projects in the SEIR would:

- Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan.
- Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard.
- Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.
- Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.

The results of the air quality technical study determined that air pollutant emissions related to the subsequent projects in the SEIR would not exceed the significant thresholds established by the SJVAPCD and would not result in significant air quality impacts. The project is an anticipated subsequent project identified and studied in the SEIR, as a result, the proposed project will have no new impact.

Responses a – d):

a. The proposed project would not conflict or obstruct with implementation of an air quality plan. The draft SEIR states on page 4-20 that emissions from the construction phase from subsequent projects would be below SJVAPCD thresholds. Project will have no new impact.

b. The proposed project would contribute minimally to regional local emissions that affect air quality. However, the draft SEIR studied project-related emissions for the entire 2016 District Services Plan Update and found that project-related emissions were below SJVAPCD significance thresholds and are not considered to be cumulatively considerable. Project would have no new impact.

c. There are no sensitive receptors in the project area. Sensitive receptors include hospitals, schools, daycare facilities and residential buildings. Project would have no new impact.

d. The proposed project would not result in other emissions such as odors that could affect a substantial number of people. Project would have no new impact.

New Mitigation Measures: No new mitigation measures are required.

Applicable mitigation measures from 2017 SEIR and/or 2007 MEIR:: (See Mitigation & Monitoring Checklist for more detail)

(MEIR) 4.6-2. Air Quality Requirements During Construction

4. Biological Resources

Would the project:

	No Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Potentially Significant Impact
a. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species?	X			
b. Have a substantially adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U. S. Wildlife Service?	X			
c. Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	X			
d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	X			
e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	X			
f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Conservation Community Plan, or other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan?	X			

Performance Standards included in MEIR:

- Channel maintenance activities would include the removal and control of vegetation and obstructions subject to the specific restrictions and authorizations of the CDFG MOU. Removing non-native species and human-caused debris, and pruning flow-restricting branches are authorized. Removal and control of native vegetation less than 4 inches diameter at breast height (dbh) by mechanical devices, chemical, and hand labor from the bottom half of channel banks and the stream bed from toe-to-toe are authorized. Channel maintenance requiring the removal of native vegetation greater than 4" dbh, would be limited to all of the restrictions for channel restoration projects identified previously. In any one year, vegetation removal for maintenance purposes would be limited to either the bottom half of one channel bank in the affected project reach, or the bottom half of both banks not to exceed a 1,320 linear foot reach.

Discussion

Summary of environmental finding in the 2017 SEIR:

The Biological Resources section of the Initial Study in the Draft SEIR determined that biological impacts of the 2016 District Services Plan Update were less than significant. This determination was primarily based upon the proposed facilities taking place occur on sites previously disturbed with human activity. The Draft SEIR also

included a Biology Resources Report that mostly focused on the proposed basin locations for development. However, the report is useful in understanding the types of habitat present within the urban and rural areas within the District's Boundary. Although, Biological Resources were not studied as a potentially significant effect, biological mitigation measures were adopted based on comments and recommendations from the California Department of Fish and Wildlife.

Responses

A) The project is less than one acre in size and are unlikely to produce lasting impacts to the disturbed area. Additionally, the project's area is limited to an existing stormwater basin, an agricultural farm, and an auto wrecking yard, all of which have limited habitat potential. Mitigation measures adopted from the 2017 SEIR, which are listed below, will be used to ensure there are no construction related impacts to biological resources, including any special status species that may be onsite at the time of construction. Project will have no new impact.

B - C) Current land uses where the project will be constructed are heavily modified by human activity and provide no riparian or wetland features that could be impacted by the project. Project will have no new impact.

D - E) Project would not affect movement of any resident or migratory fish populations. Project is not located in the vicinity of a wildlife corridor, nursery site, or adopted habitat conservation plan. Project could not conflict with any biological ordinance. Project would have no new impact.

New Mitigation Measures: No new mitigation measures.

Applicable mitigation measures from 2017 SEIR and/or 2007 MEIR: (See Mitigation & Monitoring Checklist for more detail)

(SEIR) 4.3-1a: Conduct Preconstruction Surveys for Burrowing Owl.

(SEIR) 4.3-1b: Remove Trees during Nonbreeding Season and Conduct Preconstruction Survey for Nesting Birds.

(SEIR) 4.3-1c: Implement USFWS-Recommended Measures to Protect San Joaquin Kit Fox during Construction.

(SEIR) 4.3-1d: Swainson's Hawk Protection

Determination: The proposed project will have no new impact on the environment.

5. Cultural Resources

Would the project:

	No Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Potentially Significant Impact
a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to in State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5?	X			
b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5?	X			
c. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	X			

Performance Standards included in MEIR:

- Prior to the start of construction, all District contractors and subcontractors for the project would be informed in writing of the potential for discover of important cultural or paleontological resources below the ground surface on the project site and legal consequences for damaging or destroying such resources. If any cultural or paleontological resources were found, the District would stop work within the area in question and a qualified consultant would be retained by the District to evaluate the find and make recommendations for further action.
- If human remains are found during the project activities, the Fresno County Coroner would be notified immediately. The Coroner has two working days to examine the remains and 24 hours to recommend proper treatment or disposition of the remains, following the Native American Heritage Commission guidelines where appropriate.

Discussion:

Summary of environmental finding in the 2017 SEIR:

The District's 2017 SEIR studied impacts to cultural resources as potential significant. Pages 4-42 to 4-49 of the draft SEIR describe cultural resources and the regulatory setting in more detail. The 2017 determined that implementing mitigation measures will reduce project impacts to less than significant. Mitigation measures are described below.

Responses

A - B) The District requested a records search for the proposed project from the California Historical Resources Information System's (CHRIS) Regional Information Centers (ICs) to determine whether historical or archeological resources have been recorded in the project area. No previous cultural resource studies have been conducted in the project area, however, four cultural resources studies have been conducted within a half-mile radius and there are three recorded resources within a one-half mile radius of the project. There are no recorded resources in the project area. The District will implement mitigation measure 4.4-1 to perform a cultural resources survey before ground disturbing activity. The cultural resources survey will determine if there are any historical or archaeological resources present. As discussed in the SEIR, if resources are determined to be eligible for the California Register of Historic Resources (CRHR), and if the impacts of project construction render the resources as ineligible for the CRHR, the alignment shall be moved a minimum of 100 feet. No new impact will occur.

C) A Sacred Lands File Search from the Native American Heritage Commission for the project area was negative. Adopted mitigation measures require stop work procedures if human remains are found during construction. No new impact will occur.

New Mitigation Measures: No new mitigation measures are required.

Applicable mitigation measures from 2017 SEIR and/or 2007 MEIR: (See Mitigation & Monitoring Checklist for more detail)

(SEIR) 4.4-2: Perform Cultural Resources Survey and Move Alignment if Necessary to Avoid Effects on Resources Eligible for the CRHR (California Register of Historical Resources).

(SEIR) 4.4-4: Stop Work and Implement Required Measures if Human Remains are found.

Determination: The proposed project will have no new impact on the environment.

6. Energy

Would the project:

	No Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Potentially Significant Impact
a. Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption or energy resources during project construction or operation?		X		
b. Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?		X		

Performance Standards included in MEIR: None

Discussion:

Summary of environmental findings in the 2017 SEIR

Energy was not studied in the 2017 SEIR.

Responses

A) Project construction is short term and not energy extensive. Once fully constructed, the project will have a pump station that will be used to transport water for groundwater recharge and storage capacity to prevent flooding. These uses would not result in a significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources. This impact is less than significant.

B) The proposed project does not propose to construct buildings or lighting. This project does not conflict with or obstruct any known state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency. This impact is less than significant.

New Mitigation Measures: No new mitigation measures required.

Applicable mitigation measures from 2017 SEIR and/or 2007 MEIR: No applicable mitigation measures.

Determination: The proposed project will have no new impact on the environment.

7. Geology and Soils

Would the project:

	No Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Potentially Significant Impact
a. Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury or death involving:	X			
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.				
ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?				
iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?				
iv. Landslides?				
b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	X			
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 spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	X			
d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-a-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?	X			
e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	X			
f. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resources or site or unique geologic feature?			X	

Performance Standards included in MEIR:

- The District would ensure that construction projects are controlled through standard specifications. In addition, all construction activities would also be subject to City and County grading ordinances, which would control erosion. A "Removal of Borrow Material Permit" would be issued by the District and signed by any one desiring to remove soil from a District facility. Applicable provisions of the contract and permit would ensure the contractor and permittee excavate per the approved design and quantities.

- Basin slopes would be graded and maintained to minimize erosion. Should soil erosion occur, the erosion material would be kept on-site, within the excavation area, and used to repair eroded areas.
- Once construction activities are complete, the slopes would be seeded and vegetation established.
- Erosion control measures (planting, seeding and mulching) would be established where channel restoration activities have disturbed soils which slope toward a channel, before the onset of the next rainy season. If suitable vegetation would not become reasonably established, non-erodible materials would be used.
- The District would repair existing controls (sloping, rocks and gabions) from the toe of slope in the channel to the top of the bank, to stabilize eroded areas.
- Except when flood flows may cause immediate damage, erosion control repairs would be limited to periods when there is no or low stream flow.
- The District would select and implement the most appropriate erosion control BMPs identified in the Construction Site Storm Water Quality Management Guidelines.

Discussion:

Summary of environmental finding in the 2017 SEIR:

The 2017 SEIR Initial Study addressed whether proposed projects in the 2016 District Services Plan Update would result in any new impacts not previously addressed in the 2007 MEIR. On the basis of the Initial Study prepared it was determined that: 1) the potential impacts of the 2016 District Services Plan Update related to geology and soils will not cause any additional significant effect on the environment not examined in the 2007 MEIR; 2) no new additional mitigation measures or alternatives are required.

Responses

a) The proposed project would not cause these effects.

b) The project is less than an acre in size and proposes no impervious area that would result in a loss of top soil or erosion. It is possible that pumping stormwater into the Washington Colony Canal could cause erosion on the canal channel. However, pumping into the canal would be intermittent and only during large storm events. Additionally, the Washington Colony Canal is an improved channel maintained by the Fresno Irrigation District and any pumping would be based on Fresno Irrigation District requirements. As a result, the project will have no significant impact on erosion or loss of top soil.

C -d) The Initial Study determined that geological hazards with landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, and expansive soils are primarily a concern when a project proposed structures or building. The project would convey water into Basin "CF", which has not had any of the mentioned geological hazards. Project would have no new impact.

e) Project does not include septic tanks or other wastewater disposal. Project would have no impact.

f) No known paleontological resources exist in the project area. District performance standards for Cultural Resources include stop work procedures the event paleontological resources are found during construction. This impact is considered less than significant.

New Mitigation Measures: No new mitigation measures are required.

Applicable mitigation measures from 2017 SEIR and/or 2007 MEIR: No applicable Mitigation Measures.

Determination: The proposed project will have no new impact on the environment.

8. Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Would the project:

	No Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Potentially Significant Impact
a. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	X			
b. Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?		X		

Discussion:

Summary of environmental finding in the 2017 SEIR:

The 2017 SEIR studied Greenhouse Gas Emissions as a potential significant effect. Page 4-49 of the Draft SEIR discusses the existing environmental and regulatory conditions related to greenhouse gas emissions. The 2017 SEIR evaluated the subsequent projects GHG emissions impacts with guidance and methodologies recommended by SJVAPCD's Guide for Addressing and Mitigating Air Quality Impacts. SJVAPCD developed thresholds of significance for GHG emissions. Based on the analysis it was determined that the proposed projects impacts would have less than significant effect on the environment. See the 2017 SEIR for more information, including the Appendix B for the Air Quality Technical Study.

Responses

- a) Project was adequately studied in the 2017 SEIR. Project will have no new impacts.
- b) Project was adequately studied in the 2017 SEIR. Project will have no new impacts.

New Mitigation Measures: No new mitigation measures are required.

Applicable mitigation measures from 2017 SEIR and/or 2007 MEIR: No applicable mitigation measures.

Determination: The proposed project will have no new impact on the environment.

9. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Would the project:

	No Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Potentially Significant Impact
a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	X			
b. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the likely release of hazardous materials into the environment?	X			
c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	X			
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 create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?		X		
e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?	X			
f. Impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	X			
g. Expose people or structures either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires?	X			
h. Expose people to productive mosquito breeding habitat by improperly designing and managing large basins of water?	X			

Performance Standards included in MEIR:

- The District would conduct a Phase I Preliminary Site Assessment to determine the presence of any hazardous materials prior to land acquisition.
- The District contractors would be required to notify the District of certain specified conditions relating to hazardous waste, unexpected subsurface or latent conditions, or unknown physical conditions. The District would promptly investigate any such conditions reported to it and take appropriate action to protect public and contractor health and safety.
- The District would immediately begin the cleanup of spills or hazardous materials releases that may occur during construction. The District would notify all applicable responsible agencies as required by law.

- The District contractors would comply with the provisions of the Construction Safety Orders, Tunnel Safety Orders, confined and enclosed spaces and other dangerous atmospheres, and General Safety Orders adopted by the State Division of Industrial Safety, as set forth in Title 8 of the CCR, and applicable worker safety portions of the District or contractor standard specifications.
- Low-flow areas of basins would be designed to maintain ponded water depths that provide for mosquito fish predation on mosquito populations.
- The District would work cooperatively with the Consolidated and Fresno Mosquito and Vector Control Districts to maintain flood control facilities in a manner that discourages mosquito and midge habitat.
- The District would periodically inspect basin facilities to identify District features in need of repair (e.g., fences and pumping stations) and to ensure compliance with District ordinances prohibiting certain activities (e.g., swimming, fishing and golfing).
- The District would implement the Standard Operating Procedures for Monitoring, Maintenance and Disposal of Stormwater Basin Sediment.

Discussion:

Summary of environmental finding in the 2017 SEIR:

On the basis of the Initial Study evaluation prepared for the 2007 MEIR, it was determined that impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials would have a less than significant impact on the environment. As a result, hazards and hazardous material impacts were not evaluated in the 2007 MEIR. Based on the analysis conducted in the 2017 SEIR Initial Study, the subsequent projects in the 2017 SEIR would have either no impact or less than significant impacts on the environment.

Responses

- a) Project was adequately studied in the 2017 SEIR. Project will have no new impacts.
- b) Project was adequately studied in the 2017 SEIR. Project will have no new impacts.
- c) Project was adequately studied in the 2017 SEIR. Project will have no new impacts.
- d) Approximately 150 feet of pipe will be constructed through APN 331-090-27 which is part of Turners Auto Wrecking facility with an address of 4248 S. Willow Ave, Fresno, CA. Turners Auto Wrecking meets the requirements to be placed on the "Cortese List" for a previous leaking underground storage tank. According to the GeoTracker database, the case has been closed as of March 8, 1996. The principal media of concern was gasoline contaminated soil. The project would require excavation of a small amount for the construction of a 150 foot pipeline. The District, as described in the 2017 SEIR, complies with all federal and State regulations, policies, and laws related to routine transport, use, disposal, and reasonably foreseeable accidental release of hazardous materials. The District has adopted performance standards in the case of finding of hazardous materials. Any new effect would be less than significant given the size of the project and performance standards integrated into the project.
- e) Project was adequately studied in the 2017 SEIR. Project will have no new impacts.
- f) Project was adequately studied in the 2017 SEIR. Project will have no new impacts.
- g) Project does not involve creating structures. Project will have no new impacts.
- h) Project does not propose new storm water basins but will increase water available in a District stormwater basin, Basin "CF". Additionally, the District maintains stormwater basins so that they are designed to maintain

ponded water depths that provide for mosquito fish predation on mosquito populations. Project will have no new impacts.

New Mitigation Measures: No new mitigation measures are required.

Applicable mitigation measures from 2017 SEIR and/or 2007 MEIR: No applicable Mitigation Measures.

Determination: The proposed project will have no new impact on the environment.

10. Hydrology and Water Quality

Would the project:

	No Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Potentially Significant Impact
a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?	X			
b. Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	X			
c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner, which would: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site; ii. substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on-or offsite; 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; or iv. impede or redirect flood flows? 	X			
d. In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	X			
e. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	X			

Performance Standards included in MEIR:

- The District would file a Notice of Intent (NOI) for coverage under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) State General Construction Activity Storm Water Permit, as required.
- District contractors would comply with the requirement of the NPDES State General Permit, including implementing a stormwater pollution prevention plan.
- Projects would incorporate applicable BMPs from the District Construction and Post-Construction Stormwater Quality Management Guidelines.
- The maximum depth of any urban stormwater retention basin would provide a minimum 10 feet of vertical separation between the lowest floor of the basin and highest anticipated level of groundwater.

- The District would periodically test and remove soils as generally described in the District Services Plan and specified in the District's Standard Operating Procedures for Monitoring, Maintenance and Disposal of Stormwater Basin Sediment. The District would remove soils from accumulation areas as necessary to maintain less than District Prescribed threshold concentrations of indicator contaminants and to ensure contaminant levels do not exceed hazardous waste levels, as defined in CCR Title 22. The District would adjust the frequency of testing and cleaning as increased data provide improved knowledge of constituent accumulation concentrations and rates.

Discussion:

Summary of environmental finding in the 2017 SEIR:

On the basis of the Initial Study evaluation prepared for the 2007 MEIR, it was determined that impacts to surface water quality as a result of project related operational activities and impacts to groundwater quality and supplies could result in potentially significant impacts. As a result, these issues were evaluated in the 2007 MEIR. Under the 2007 MEIR, these impacts were determined to be less than significant after implementation of appropriate mitigation measures. Based on the analysis conducted in the 2017 SEIR Initial Study, hydrology and water quality impacts related to the subsequent projects would be substantially the same as those presented in the 2007 MEIR. Therefore it was determined that: 1) the potential impacts of the 2016 District Services Plan Update related to water quality and hydrology will not cause any additional significant effects of the environment no examined in the 2007 MEIR; 2) no new additional mitigation measures or alternatives are required; and 3) this issue was not further studied in the 2017 SEIR.

Responses

- a) Project related impacts are adequately evaluated in the 2017 SEIR Initial Study. Project will have no new impacts.
- b) Project related impacts are adequately evaluated in the 2017 SEIR Initial Study. Project will have no new impacts.
- c) Project related impacts are adequately evaluated in the 2017 SEIR Initial Study. Project will have no new impacts.
- d) Project related impacts are adequately evaluated in the 2017 SEIR Initial Study. Project will have no new impacts.
- e) Project would not conflict with any water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater plan. Project has a positive effect on water quality control plans and groundwater sustainability plans in the Fresno-Clovis area.

New Mitigation Measures: No new mitigation measures are required.

Applicable mitigation measures from 2017 SEIR and/or 2007 MEIR:

(MEIR) 4.1-4: Maintain operational intermittent flows during the dry season at rates within defined channel capacity and downstream capture capabilities for recharge. Before implementation, develop a water management plan with Fresno Irrigation District. Keep all flows at a rate lower than bankfull flow or the 2-year storm event. Monitor flow rates to prevent erosion or the alteration of drainage patterns.

Determination: The proposed project will have no new impact on the environment.

11. Land Use and Planning

Would the project:

	No Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Potentially Significant Impact
a. Physically divide an established community?	X			
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?	X			

Discussion:

Summary of environmental finding in the 2017 SEIR:

On the basis of the Initial Study evaluation prepared for the 2007 MER, it was determined that impacts related to land use and planning would have no impacts on the environment. As a result, land use and planning issues were not evaluated in the 2007 MEIR. Based on the analysis conducted for the 2017 SEIR Initial Study, the subsequent projects in the 2017 SEIR would have no impacts with respect to land use and planning issues.

Responses

- a) Project related impacts are adequately evaluated in the 2017 SEIR Initial Study. No new impacts will occur.
- b) Project related impacts are adequately evaluated in the 2017 SEIR Initial Study. No new impacts will occur.

New Mitigation Measures: No new mitigation measures are required.

Applicable mitigation measures from 2017 SEIR and/or 2007 MEIR: No applicable Mitigation Measures.

Determination: The proposed project will have no new impact on the environment.

12. Mineral Resources

Would the project:

	No Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Potentially Significant Impact
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?	X			
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?	X			

Discussion:

Summary of environmental finding in the 2017 SEIR:

On the basis of the Initial Study evaluation prepared for the 2007 MERI, it was determined that impacts related to mineral resources would have no or less than significant impacts on the environment. As a result, mineral resource issues were not evaluated in the 2007 MEIR. Based on the analysis conducted for the 2017 SEIR Initial Study, the subsequent projects in the 2017 SEIR would cause no additional impacts related to mineral resource issues.

Responses

- a) Project related impacts are adequately evaluated in the 2017 SEIR Initial Study. Project will have no new impact.
- b) Project related impacts are adequately evaluated in the 2017 SEIR Initial Study. Project will have no new impact.

New Mitigation Measures: No new mitigation measures are required.

Applicable mitigation measures from 2017 SEIR and/or 2007 MEIR: No applicable Mitigation Measures.

Determination: The proposed project will have no new impact on the environment.

13. Noise

Would the project result in:

	No Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Potentially Significant Impact
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?	X			
b. Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	X			
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?	X			

Performance Standards included in MEIR:

- As necessary, construction operations shall be limited to between 7:00 AM and 7:00 PM.
- All construction equipment would be properly maintained.
- All gas- or diesel-powered construction equipment would be equipped with required control technology.
- Routine maintenance and repair of construction equipment would not be allowed within 300 feet of a residence (except emergency repairs).
- Construction site access would be located away from residences to the extent consistent with traffic safety and efficient site circulation.

Discussion:

Summary of environmental finding in the 2017 SEIR:

On the basis of the Initial Study evaluation prepared for the 2007 MEIR, it was determined that impacts related to noise would have no or less than significant impacts on the environment. As a result, noise issues were not evaluated in the 2007 MEIR. Based on the analysis conducted for the 2017 SEIR Initial Study, the subsequent projects in the 2017 SEIR would cause no additional impacts related to noise issues.

Responses

- a) Project related impacts are adequately evaluated in the 2017 SEIR Initial Study. Project will have no new impact.
- b) Project related impacts are adequately evaluated in the 2017 SEIR Initial Study. Project will have no new impact.
- c) Project related impacts are adequately evaluated in the 2017 SEIR Initial Study. Project will have no new impact.

New Mitigation Measures: No new mitigation measures are required.

Applicable mitigation measures from 2017 SEIR and/or 2007 MEIR: No applicable Mitigation Measures

Determination: The proposed project will have no new impact on the environment.

14. Population and Housing

Would the project:

	No Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Potentially Significant Impact
a. Induce substantial unplanned population growth either in an area, directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	X			
b. Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?		X		

Discussion:

Summary of environmental finding in the 2017 SEIR:

On the basis of the Initial Study evaluation prepared for the 2007 MEIR, it was determined that impacts related to population and housing would have no or less than significant impacts on the environment. As a result, population and housing issues were not evaluated in the 2007 MEIR. Based on the analysis conducted for the 2017 SEIR Initial Study, the subsequent projects in the 2017 SEIR would cause no additional impacts related to population and housing issues.

Responses

- a) Project related impacts are adequately evaluated in the 2017 SEIR Initial Study. Project will have no new impact.
- b) Project related impacts are adequately evaluated in the 2017 SEIR Initial Study. Project will have no new impact.

New Mitigation Measures: No new mitigation measures are required.

Applicable mitigation measures from 2017 SEIR and/or 2007 MEIR: No applicable mitigation measures.

Determination: The proposed project will have no new impact on the environment.

15. Public Services

Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered government facilities or need for new or physically altered government 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:

	No Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Potentially Significant Impact
a. Fire protection?	X			
b. Police protection?	X			
c. Schools?	X			
d. Parks?	X			
e. Other public facilities?	X			

Discussion:

Summary of environmental finding in the 2017 SEIR:

On the basis of the Initial Study evaluation prepared for the 2007 MEIR, it was determined that impacts related to public services would have no or less than significant impacts on the environment. As a result, public service issues were not evaluated in the 2007 MEIR. Based on the analysis conducted for the 2017 SEIR Initial Study, the subsequent projects in the 2017 SEIR would cause no additional impacts related to public service issues.

Responses

a – e) Project related impacts are adequately evaluated in the 2017 SEIR Initial Study. Project will have no new impact.

New Mitigation Measures: No new mitigation measures are required.

Applicable mitigation measures from 2017 SEIR and/or 2007 MEIR: No applicable mitigation measures.

Determination: The proposed project will have no new impact on the environment.

16. Recreation

Would the project:

	No Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Potentially Significant Impact
a. Increase the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	X			
b. Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?		X		

Discussion:

Summary of environmental finding in the 2017 SEIR:

On the basis of the Initial Study evaluation prepared for the 2007 MEIR, it was determined that impacts related to recreation would have no impacts on the environment. As a result, recreation issues were not evaluated in the 2007 MEIR. Based on the analysis conducted for the 2017 SEIR Initial Study, the subsequent projects in the 2017 SEIR would have no impacts with respect to recreation issues.

Responses

- a) Project related impacts are adequately evaluated in the 2017 SEIR Initial Study. Project will have no new impact.
- b) Project related impacts are adequately evaluated in the 2017 SEIR Initial Study. Project will have no new impact.

New Mitigation Measures: No new mitigation measures are required.

Applicable mitigation measures from 2017 SEIR and/or 2007 MEIR: No applicable mitigation measures.

Determination: The proposed project will have no new impact on the environment.

17. Transportation/Traffic

Would the project:

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

Performance Standards included in MEIR:

- Appropriate traffic control measures, including flagged controls, designated construction traffic routes, and signage would be utilized during construction activities to provide a safe and smooth flow of traffic. Traffic obstructions would be minimized, and free passage of traffic would be maintained whenever possible. Closure of any intersecting streets or roads would only occur with the approval of the traffic authority of the governmental unit having jurisdiction. District contractors would notify the appropriate police and fire departments of the location of the work in advance of any road closing.
- As necessary, construction-related truck movement would be limited to between 7:00 AM and 7:00 PM, Monday through Saturday.
- Vehicle access would be provided and maintained in good condition for residences and businesses affected by construction activities. Pedestrian access to all properties along the line of work would be provided whenever possible and necessary, with construction fencing placed as necessary to provide pedestrian safety.
- The District would perform pre- and post-construction visual inspections along haul routes of major projects to determine road conditions.

Discussion:

Summary of environmental finding in the 2017 SEIR:

On the basis of the Initial Study evaluation prepared for the 2007 MEIR, it was determined that impacts related to transportation/traffic would have no or less than significant impacts on the environment. As a result, transportation/traffic issues were not evaluated in the 2007 MEIR. Based on the analysis conducted for the 2017 SEIR Initial Study, the subsequent projects in the 2017 SEIR would cause no additional impacts related to transportation/traffic issues.

Responses

- a) Project does not modify any roadways or attract traffic. No impact would occur.

- b) Project is not a land use or transportation project and will not meaningfully impact traffic.
- c) Project related impacts are adequately evaluated in the 2017 SEIR Initial Study. No new impact will occur.
- d) Project related impacts are adequately evaluated in the 2017 SEIR Initial Study. No new impact will occur.

New Mitigation Measures: No new mitigation measures are required.

Applicable mitigation measures from 2017 SEIR and/or 2007 MEIR: No applicable mitigation measures.

Determination: The proposed project will have no new impact on the environment.

18. Tribal Cultural Resources

Would the project:

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

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 whether 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:

X

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

ii. A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. in applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.

Performance Standards included in MEIR:

Discussion:

Summary of environmental finding in the 2017 SEIR:

Tribal Cultural Resources were not studied in the 2017 SEIR directly as a topic in the Initial Study. However, the District's 2017 SEIR studied impacts to cultural resources as potentially significant. Pages 4-42 to 4-49 of the draft SEIR describe cultural resources and the regulatory setting in more detail. The 2017 SEIR determined that implementing mitigation measures will reduce project impacts to less than significant. The 2017 SEIR evaluation of Cultural Resources included Tribal Cultural Resources but not in separate sections.

Responses

a) Implementing adopted mitigation measures for cultural resources identified in 2017 SEIR will cause no new project related impacts. During the 2017 SEIR adoption, the District complied with AB52: Tribal Cultural Resources consultation and will additionally mail notice of this subsequent project to California Native American Tribes from an updated list from the California Native American Heritage Commission. Project will have no new impact.

New Mitigation Measures: No new mitigation measures are required.

Applicable mitigation measures from 2017 SEIR and/or 2007 MEIR:

(SEIR) 4.4-2: Perform Cultural Resources Survey and Move Alignment if Necessary to Avoid Effects on Resources Eligible for the CRHR (California Register of Historical Resources).

(SEIR) 4.4-4: Stop Work and Implement Required Measures if Human Remains are Found.

Determination: The proposed project will have no new impact on the environment.

19. Utilities and Service Systems

Would the project:

	No Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Potentially Significant Impact
a. Require or result in 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?	X			
b. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years?	X			
c. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which services 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?	X			
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?	X			
g. Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	X			

Discussion:

Summary of environmental finding in the 2017 SEIR:

On the basis of the Initial Study evaluation prepared for the 2007 MEIR, it was determined that impacts related to the construction of new utilities and service systems were determined to be potentially significant and were evaluated in the 2007 MEIR and found to be less than significant. Utilities and service system impacts other than those associated with construction of stormwater facilities were determined to be less than significant and were not evaluated in the 2007 MEIR. Based on the analysis in the 2017 SEIR Initial Study, the subsequent projects in the 2017 SEIR would have no impacts or less than significant impacts related to utilities and services systems and impacts related to stormwater facilities were determined to have potentially significant impacts but will not cause additional significant effects on the environment not examined in the 2007 MEIR.

Responses

a – g) Project related impacts are adequately evaluated in the 2017 SEIR Initial Study. No new impact will occur.

New Mitigation Measures: No new mitigation measures are required.

Applicable mitigation measures from 2017 SEIR and/or 2007 MEIR: No applicable mitigation measures.

Determination: The proposed project will have no new impact on the environment.

20. Wildfire

If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:

	No Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Potentially Significant Impact
a. Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	X			
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?	X			
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?	X			
d. Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?	X			

Performance Standards included in MEIR:

Discussion:

Summary of environmental finding in the 2017 SEIR:

Wildfire was not studied in the 2017 SEIR or 2007 MEIR.

Responses

a) Project would not impact an adopted emergency response plan or evacuation plan. Project would have no impact.

b) Project does not have project occupants. Project would have no impact.

c) Project would not require installation or maintenance of infrastructure that may exacerbate fire risk. Project would have no impact.

d) Project would not exposure people to significant risks described. Project would have no impact.

New Mitigation Measures: No new mitigation measures are required.

Applicable mitigation measures from 2017 SEIR and/or 2007 MEIR: No applicable mitigation measures.

Determination: The proposed project will have no new impact on the environment.

21. Mandatory Findings of Significance

	No Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Potentially Significant Impact
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?	X			
b. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means 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)?	X			
c. Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	X			

Discussion:

Summary of environmental finding in the 2017 SEIR:

On the basis of the Initial Study evaluation prepared for the 2007 MEIR, it was determined that cumulative impacts would have a less than significant impact on the environment. Based on the analysis conducted for the 2017 SEIR Initial Study, cumulative impacts related to agricultural resources, air quality, cultural resources, greenhouse gas emissions, could be potential significant. However, in the Draft 2017 SEIR, further analysis of those impacts revealed that they were all less than significant impacts.

Responses

- a) Project related impacts are adequately evaluated in the 2017 SEIR Initial Study. No new impact will occur.
- b) Project related impacts are adequately evaluated in the 2017 SEIR Initial Study. No new impact will occur.
- c) Project related impacts are adequately evaluated in the 2017 SEIR Initial Study. No new impact will occur.

New Mitigation Measures: No new mitigation measures are required.

Applicable Mitigation Measures from 2017 SEIR and 2007 MEIR: No applicable mitigation measures.

Determination: The proposed project will have no new impact on the environment.

Performance Standards

FMFCD has developed various performance standards that are routinely implemented during the construction and operation of FMFCD projects, as applicable. Therefore, the standards are considered to be part of the project, rather than mitigation measures. The performance standards that are applicable to the project are as follows:

- As necessary and possible, hours of operation for light-generating construction equipment would be restricted to between the hours of 7:00 AM to 7:00 PM.
- District contractors and dirt removal permittees would be required to provide dust control and cleanup of loose soils both within and outside of construction sites in accordance with San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District Rule VIII for the control of fine particulate matter. Haul roads would be cleaned and swept as necessary during hauling operations.
- The District would require of its contractors or permittees to properly maintain internal combustion engines used during construction activities. The District would properly maintain all District owned and operated internal combustion engine machinery.
- Any maintenance activities that would cause or have the potential to cause fugitive emissions would be required to implement dust control measures in accordance with the District's comprehensive Dust Control Plan.
- If objectionable odors originate at a District facility, District staff would investigate the cause of the odor immediately. When the source of the odor is identified, it would be neutralized or removed and properly disposed of in accordance with local, State and federal requirements.
- Channel maintenance activities would include the removal and control of vegetation and obstructions subject to the specific restrictions and authorizations of the CDFG MOU. Removing non-native species and human-caused debris, and pruning flow-restricting branches are authorized. Removal and control of native vegetation less than 4 inches diameter at breast height (dbh) by mechanical devices, chemical, and hand labor from the bottom half of channel banks and the stream bed from toe-to-toe are authorized. Channel maintenance requiring the removal of native vegetation greater than 4" dbh, would be limited to all of the restrictions for channel restoration projects identified previously. In any one year, vegetation removal for maintenance purposes would be limited to either the bottom half of one channel bank in the affected project reach, or the bottom half of both banks not to exceed a 1,320 linear foot reach.
- Prior to the start of construction, all District contractors and subcontractors for the project would be informed in writing of the potential for discover of important cultural or paleontological resources below the ground surface on the project site and legal consequences for damaging or destroying such resources. If any cultural or paleontological resources were found, the District would stop work within the area in questions and a qualified consultant would be retained by the District to evaluate the find and make recommendations for further action.
- If human remains are found during the project activities, the Fresno County Coroner would be notified immediately. The Coroner has two working days to examine the remains and 24 hours to recommend proper treatment or disposition of the remains, following the Native American Heritage Commission guidelines where appropriate.
- The District would ensure that construction projects are controlled through standard specifications. In addition, all construction activities would also be subject to City and County grading ordinances, which would control erosion. A "Removal of Borrow Material Permit" would be issued by the District and signed by any one desiring to remove soil from a District facility. Applicable provisions of the contract and permit would ensure the contractor and permittee excavate per the approved design and quantities.
- Basin slopes would be graded and maintained to minimize erosion. Should soil erosion occur, the erosion material would be kept on-site, within the excavation area, and used to repair eroded areas.

- Once construction activities are complete, the slopes would be seeded and vegetation established.
- Erosion control measures (planting, seeding and mulching) would be established where channel restoration activities have disturbed soils which slope toward a channel, before the onset of the next rainy season. If suitable vegetation would not become reasonably established, non-erodible materials would be used.
- The District would repair existing controls (sloping, rocks and gabions) from the toe of slope in the channel to the top of the bank, to stabilize eroded areas.
- Except when flood flows may cause immediate damage, erosion control repairs would be limited to periods when there is no or low stream flow.
- The District would select and implement the most appropriate erosion control BMPs identified in the Construction Site Storm Water Quality Management Guidelines.
- The District would conduct a Phase I Preliminary Site Assessment to determine the presence of any hazardous materials prior to land acquisition.
- The District contractors would be required to notify the District of certain specified conditions relating to hazardous waste, unexpected subsurface or latent conditions, or unknown physical conditions. The District would promptly investigate any such conditions reported to it and take appropriate action to protect public and contractor health and safety.
- The District would immediately begin the cleanup of spills or hazardous materials releases that may occur during construction. The District would notify all applicable responsible agencies as required by law.
- The District contractors would comply with the provisions of the Construction Safety Orders, Tunnel Safety Orders, confined and enclosed spaces and other dangerous atmospheres, and General Safety Orders adopted by the State Division of Industrial Safety, as set forth in Title 8 of the CCR, and applicable worker safety portions of the District or contractor standard specifications.
- Low-flow areas of basins would be designed to maintain ponded water depths that provide for mosquito fish predation on mosquito populations.
- The District would work cooperatively with the Consolidated and Fresno Mosquito and Vector Control Districts to maintain flood control facilities in a manner that discourages mosquito and midge habitat.
- The District would periodically inspect basin facilities to identify District features in need of repair (e.g., fences and pumping stations) and to ensure compliance with District ordinances prohibiting certain activities (e.g., swimming, fishing and golfing).
- The District would implement the Standard Operating Procedures for Monitoring, Maintenance and Disposal of Stormwater Basin Sediment.
- The District would file a Notice of Intent (NOI) for coverage under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) State General Construction Activity Storm Water Permit, as required.
- District contractors would comply with the requirement of the NPDES State General Permit, including implementing a stormwater pollution prevention plan.
- Projects would incorporate applicable BMPs from the District Construction and Post-Construction Stormwater Quality Management Guidelines.
- The maximum depth of any urban stormwater retention basin would provide a minimum 10 feet of vertical separation between the lowest floor of the basin and highest anticipated level of groundwater.
- The District would periodically test and remove soils as generally described in the District Services Plan and specified in the District's Standard Operating Procedures for Monitoring, Maintenance and Disposal of Stormwater Basin Sediment. The District would remove soils from accumulation areas as necessary to maintain less than District Prescribed threshold concentrations of indicator contaminants and to ensure contaminant levels do not exceed hazardous waste levels, as defined in CCR Title 22. The District would adjust the frequency of testing and cleaning as increased data provide improved knowledge of constituent accumulation concentrations and rates.
- As necessary, construction operations shall be limited to between 7:00 AM and 7:00 PM.
- All construction equipment would be properly maintained.

- All gas- or diesel-powered construction equipment would be equipped with required control technology.
- Routine maintenance and repair of construction equipment would not be allowed within 300 feet of a residence (except emergency repairs).
- Construction site access would be located away from residences to the extent consistent with traffic safety and efficient site circulation.
- Appropriate traffic control measures, including flagged controls, designated construction traffic routes, and signage would be utilized during construction activities to provide a safe and smooth flow of traffic. Traffic obstructions would be minimized, and free passage of traffic would be maintained whenever possible. Closure of any intersecting streets or roads would only occur with the approval of the traffic authority of the governmental unit having jurisdiction. District contractors would notify the appropriate police and fire departments of the location of the work in advance of any road closing.
- As necessary, construction-related truck movement would be limited to between 7:00 AM and 7:00 PM, Monday through Saturday.
- Vehicle access would be provided and maintained in good condition for residences and businesses affected by construction activities. Pedestrian access to all properties along the line of work would be provided whenever possible and necessary, with construction fencing placed as necessary to provide pedestrian safety.
- The District would perform pre- and post-construction visual inspections along haul routes of major projects to determine road conditions.

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

In accordance with Section 21081.6 of the Public Resources Code and Section 15097 of the State CEQA Guidelines, this Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program ("MMRP") is adopted by the FMFCD to ensure that the mitigation measures adopted for the project and the applicable performance standards are implemented.

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Coordinator

The FMFCD Environmental Resources Manager or his/her designee shall act as the Project Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Coordinator ("Coordinator") for the project. The Coordinator shall be responsible for ensuring that the project mitigation measures and applicable performance standards are complied with during the project's development, operational, and maintenance phases.

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Procedures

The Coordinator shall provide a copy of the mitigation measures, performance standards and MM&RP to the project engineer and contractor for incorporation in the project plans, construction specifications, permits, and contracts, as appropriate.

Prior to commencement of construction activities, the Coordinator shall ensure that all mitigation measures under the FMFCD's control and applicable performance standards have been incorporated into the project plans, construction specifications, and contracts, as appropriate.

The Coordinator shall inspect the project area no less often than monthly during the construction period to ensure the project complies with all mitigation measures and applicable performance standards.

If the Coordinator notes any mitigation measure or performance standard is not being followed, or if any responsible member of the public reports to the FMFCD that any measure or standard is not being followed, the General Manager-Secretary of the FMFCD shall be notified immediately. The General Manager-Secretary shall make a determination as to whether work shall cease and shall provide direction for compliance with the mitigation measure or performance standard.

Mitigation Measures

See attached Mitigation and Monitoring Checklist.

Names of Persons Who Prepared or Participated in the Initial Study/Environmental Checklist

FMFCD Staff

FMFCD staff that participated in preparing and reviewing the Initial Study/Environmental Checklist included:

Joseph Draper, Staff Analyst II

Jared Shuman, Environmental Resources Manager

Alan Hofmann, General Manager-Secretary

**FRESNO METROPOLITAN FLOOD CONTROL DISTRICT
CEQA MITIGATION & MONITORING CHECKLIST**

Project: Basin "CF" Groundwater Recharge and Flood Control Project

Date: 07/23/2020

Following is a combined mitigation and monitoring checklist from the 2004 District Services Plan Master Environmental Impact Report (MEIR) SCN 199911132 and 2016 District Services Plan Subsequent Environmental Impact Report (SEIR) as applied to the project above.

NOTE: Numbers in mitigation measures refer to the respective section the MEIR or SEIR.

MITIGATION MEASURE	WHEN IMPLEMENTED	COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY	A	B	C
Hydrology and Water Quality					
<p>(MEIR) 4.1-4. Implementation of the 2004 District Services Plan could affect surface water hydrology and stream/channel geomorphology through year-round, restoration of intermittent channel flows.</p> <p>Maintain operational intermittent flows during the dry season at rates within defined channel capacity and downstream capture capabilities for recharge. Before implementation, develop a water management plan with Fresno Irrigation District. Keep all flows at a rate lower than bankfull flow or the 2-year storm event. Monitor flow rates to prevent erosion or the alteration of drainage patterns.</p>	<p>During operations and maintenance</p>	<p>Facilities Department</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Biological Resources					
<p>(MEIR) 4.2-2. Implementation of the 2004 District Services Plan could result in the loss and/or alteration of vernal pools, seasonal wetlands and other waters of the U.S. under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.</p> <p>(a) The FMFCD shall conduct preliminary investigations on undeveloped lands outside of highly urbanized areas. These investigations shall examine wetland hydrology, vegetation and soil types. These preliminary investigations shall be the basis for making a determination on whether or not more in-depth wetland studies shall be necessary. If the proposed project site does not exhibit wetland hydrology, support a prevalence of wetland vegetation and wetland soil types then no further action is required. Perform wetland assessment, and if necessary a wetland delineation.</p>	<p>Prior to construction</p>	<p>Environmental Department</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**FRESNO METROPOLITAN FLOOD CONTROL DISTRICT
CEQA MITIGATION & MONITORING CHECKLIST**

Project: Basin "CF" Groundwater Recharge and Flood Control Project

Date: 07/23/2020

MITIGATION MEASURE	WHEN IMPLEMENTED	COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY	A	B	C
<p>(b) Where proposed activities could have an impact on areas verified by the Corps as jurisdictional wetlands or waters of the U.S., (urban and rural streams, seasonal wetlands, and vernal pools) FMFCD shall obtain the necessary Clean Water Act, Section 404 permits for activities where fill materials shall be placed in a wetland, obstruct the flow or circulation of waters of the U.S., impair or reduce the reach of such waters (as part of the District's CDFG MOU, Section 404 and 401 permits would be obtained from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and Regional Water Quality Control Board for any activity involving filling of jurisdictional waters). At a minimum, to meet "no net policy", the permits shall require replacement of wetland habitat at a 1:1 ratio. If delineation is required, the delineation report shall be submitted to the Corps for verification. The Corps then issues a verification letter. After FMFCD prepares and submits a permit application, the Corps issues a permit.</p> <p>(c) Where proposed activities could have an impact on areas verified by the Corps as jurisdictional wetlands or waters of the U.S., (urban and rural streams, seasonal wetlands, and vernal pools), FMFCD shall submit and implement a wetland mitigation plan based on the wetland acreage verified by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. The wetland mitigation plan shall be prepared by a qualified biologist or wetland scientist experienced in wetland creation, and shall include the following or equally effective elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Specific location, size, and existing hydrology and soils within the wetland creation area. ii. Wetland mitigation techniques, seed source, planting specifications, and required buffer setbacks. In addition, the mitigation plan shall ensure adequate water supply is provided to the created wetlands in order to maintain the proper hydrologic regimes required by the different types of wetlands created. Provisions to ensure the wetland water supply is maintained in perpetuity shall be included in the plan. iii. A monitoring program for restored, enhanced, created and preserved wetlands on the project site. A monitoring program is required to meet three objectives; 1) establish a wetland creation success criteria to be met, 2) to specify monitoring methodology, 3) to identify as far as is possible, specific remedial actions that will be required by FMFCD in order to achieve the success criteria, and 4) to document the degree of success achieved in establishing wetland vegetation. <p>Mitigation plan submitted to the Corps. The Corps approved the plan, or returns for revisions. If returned, mitigation plan is resubmitted with changes. Corps approves the plan. Ensure mitigation plan is consistent with CDFG MOU.</p>	<p>Prior to construction</p>	<p>Environmental Department</p>	<p align="center"><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p align="center"><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p align="center"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>

**FRESNO METROPOLITAN FLOOD CONTROL DISTRICT
CEQA MITIGATION & MONITORING CHECKLIST**

Project: Basin "CF" Groundwater Recharge and Flood Control Project

Date: 07/23/2020

MITIGATION MEASURE	WHEN IMPLEMENTED	COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY	A	B	C
<p>(d) A monitoring plan shall be developed and implemented by a qualified biologist to monitor results of any on-site wetland restoration and creation for five years. The monitoring plan shall include specific success criteria, frequency and timing of monitoring, and assessment of whether or not maintenance activities are being carried out and how these shall be adjusted if necessary. If monitoring reveals that success criteria are not being met, remedial habitat creation or restoration should be designed and implemented by a qualified biologist and subject to five years of monitoring as described above. Monitoring plan submitted to the Corps. The Corps approves plan, or returns for revision and re-submittal. FMFCD prepares and submits periodic monitoring reports for submittal to Corps and CDFG. Ensure monitoring plan is consistent with CDFG MOU.</p> <p>(e) In lieu of developing a mitigation plan that outlines the avoidance, purchase or creation of wetlands, the FMFCD could purchase mitigation credits through a Corps approved Mitigation Bank. Submit documentation that mitigation credits were purchased to the Corps.</p>	<p>Prior to construction and during operations and maintenance</p>	<p>Environmental Department</p>	<p align="center"><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p align="center"><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p align="center"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>

**FRESNO METROPOLITAN FLOOD CONTROL DISTRICT
CEQA MITIGATION & MONITORING CHECKLIST**

Project: Basin "CF" Groundwater Recharge and Flood Control Project

Date: 07/23/2020

MITIGATION MEASURE	WHEN IMPLEMENTED	COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY	A	B	C
<p>(MEIR) 4.2-3. Implementation of the 2004 District Services Plan could result in the loss of special- status plant species.</p> <p>(a) During facility design and prior to initiation of ground disturbing activities in areas that support seasonal wetlands or vernal pools, the FMFCD shall conduct a preliminary rare plant assessment. The assessment will determine the likelihood on whether or not the project site could support rare plants. If it is determined that the project site would not support rare plants then no further action is required. However, if the project site has the potential to support rare plants; then a rare plant survey shall be conducted by qualified biologists in accordance with the most current CDFW/USFWS guidelines or protocols and shall be conducted at the time of year when the plants in questions are identifiable. Ensure rare plant assessment, and if necessary, conduct a rare plant survey.</p> <p>(b) Based on the results of the survey, prior to design approval, the FMFCD shall coordinate with CDFG and/or implement a Section 7 consultation with the USFWS, shall determine whether the project facility would result in a significant impact to any special-status plant species. Evaluation of project impacts shall consider the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The status of the species in question (e.g., officially listed by the State or Federal Endangered Species Acts). • The relative density and distribution of the on-site occurrence versus typical occurrences of the species in question. • The habitat quality of the on-site occurrence relative to historic, current or potential distribution of the population. <p>Consult with CDFG or USFWS as applicable on loss of special-status plant impacts.</p> <p>(c) Prior to design approval, the FMFCD in consultation with the CDFG and/or the USFWS, shall prepare and implement a mitigation plan, in accordance with any applicable State and/or Federal statutes or laws, that reduces impacts to a less-than-significant level. Obtain approval of mitigation plan from CDFG or USFWS as applicable. Ensure mitigation plan is consistent with CDFG MOU.</p>	<p>Prior to Construction</p>	<p>Environmental Department</p>	<p align="center"><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p align="center"><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p align="center"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>

**FRESNO METROPOLITAN FLOOD CONTROL DISTRICT
CEQA MITIGATION & MONITORING CHECKLIST**

Project: Basin "CF" Groundwater Recharge and Flood Control Project

Date: 07/23/2020

MITIGATION MEASURE	WHEN IMPLEMENTED	COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY	A	B	C
<p>(MEIR) 4.2-4. Implementation of the 2004 District Services Plan could result in the loss of federally listed vernal pool invertebrate crustaceans.</p> <p>(a) During facility design and prior to initiation of ground disturbing activities in areas that support seasonal wetlands or vernal pools, the FMFCD shall conduct a preliminary survey to determine the presence of listed vernal pool crustaceans. Ensure vernal pool crustacean assessment is conducted.</p> <p>(b) If potential habitat (vernal pools, seasonally inundated areas) or fairy shrimp exist within areas proposed to be disturbed, FMFCD shall complete the first and second phase of fairy shrimp presence or absence surveys. If an absence finding is determined and accepted by the USFWS, then no further mitigation shall be required for fairy shrimp.</p> <p>(c) If fairy shrimp are found to be present within vernal pools or other areas of inundation to be impacted by the implementation of storm drainage facilities, FMFCD shall mitigate impacts on fairy shrimp habitat in accordance with the USFWS requirements of the Programmatic Biological Opinion. This shall include on-site or off-site creation and/or preservation of fairy shrimp habitat at ratios ranging from 3:1 to 5:1 depending on the habitat impacted and the choice of on-site or off-site mitigation. Or mitigation shall be the purchase of mitigation credit through an accredited mitigation bank. Based on permit applications USFWS issues incidental take permit.</p>	Prior to Construction	Environmental Department	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Prior to Construction	Environmental Department	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>(MEIR) 4.2-5. Implementation of the 2004 District Services Plan could result in the loss of suitable habitat for the valley elderberry longhorn beetle (VELB).</p> <p>(a) During facility design and prior to initiation of construction activities, the FMFCD shall conduct a project-specific survey for all potential VELB habitats (elderberry shrubs). Ensure VELB surveys are conducted.</p> <p>(b) The FMFCD shall avoid and protect all potential identified VELB habitat where feasible. Implement avoidance measures in accordance with USFWS requirements.</p> <p>(c) Where avoidance is infeasible, develop and implement a VELB mitigation plan in accordance with the most current USFWS mitigation guidelines for unavoidable take of VELB habitat pursuant to either Section 7 or Section 10(a) of the Federal Endangered Species Act. The mitigation plan shall include, but might not be limited to, an assessment of historic or current VELB habitat, relocation of elderberry shrubs, planting of elderberry shrubs, and monitoring of relocated and planted elderberry shrubs. Obtain approval of mitigation plan from USFWS. Ensure mitigation plan is consistent with CDFG MOU.</p>	Prior to Construction	Environmental Department	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**FRESNO METROPOLITAN FLOOD CONTROL DISTRICT
CEQA MITIGATION & MONITORING CHECKLIST**

Project: Basin "CF" Groundwater Recharge and Flood Control Project

Date: 07/23/2020

MITIGATION MEASURE	WHEN IMPLEMENTED	COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY	A	B	C
<p>(SEIR) 4.3-1a: Conduct Preconstruction Surveys for Burrowing Owl. The District shall conduct preconstruction surveys for burrows and owls no less than 14 days and no more than 30 days before the beginning of ground disturbance over the entire project site and in areas within 150 meters (approximately 500 feet) of the project impact zone in accordance with the California Burrowing Owl Consortium's Burrowing Owl Survey Protocol and Mitigation Guidelines (CBOC, 1993). If a burrowing owl burrow is discovered during the preconstruction survey the District shall perform three surveillance surveys during daylight hours three weeks apart during peak breeding season (April 15 to July 15), and if in the event burrowing owls are detected occupied burrows shall be avoided in accordance with the following table unless a qualified biologist approved by CDFW verifies through non-invasive methods that either: 1) the birds have not begun egg laying and incubation; or 2) that juveniles from the occupied burrows are foraging independently and are capable of independent survival. If avoidance is not possible the District shall coordinate with CDFW and establish a burrow exclusion zone consistent with Table 4-2 Exclusion Distance for Active Burrowing Owl Nest Sites.</p>	<p>Prior to Construction</p>	<p>Environmental Department</p>	<p align="center"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p align="center"><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p align="center"><input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>Table 4-2 Exclusion Distance for Active Burrowing Owl Nest Sites.</p>					
<p>Location</p>	<p>Time of Year</p>	<p>Level of Disturbance</p>			
		<p>Low</p>	<p>Med</p>	<p>High</p>	
<p>Nesting sites</p>	<p>April 1–Aug 15</p>	<p>200 m*</p>	<p>500 m</p>	<p>500 m</p>	
<p>Nesting sites</p>	<p>Aug 16–Oct 15</p>	<p>200 m</p>	<p>200 m</p>	<p>500 m</p>	
<p>Nesting sites</p>	<p>Oct 16–Mar 31</p>	<p>50 m</p>	<p>100 m</p>	<p>500 m</p>	
<p>meters (m)</p>					

**FRESNO METROPOLITAN FLOOD CONTROL DISTRICT
CEQA MITIGATION & MONITORING CHECKLIST**

Project: Basin "CF" Groundwater Recharge and Flood Control Project

Date: 07/23/2020

MITIGATION MEASURE	WHEN IMPLEMENTED	COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY	A	B	C
<p>(SEIR) 4.3-1b: Remove Trees during Nonbreeding Season and Conduct Preconstruction Survey for Nesting Birds. To protect migratory birds during proposed projects in areas where suitable habitat exists, the following measures shall be implemented:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trees scheduled to be removed during project implementation shall be removed during the nonbreeding season (late September to the end of February). • Ten (10) days before construction, but not more than 14 days before grading, demolition, or site preparation activities, a qualified biologist shall conduct a preconstruction nesting survey to determine the presence of nesting raptors. Activities taking place outside the breeding season (typically February 15–August 31) do not require a survey. If active raptor nests are present in or within 250 feet of the construction zone, temporary exclusion fencing shall be erected at a distance of 250 feet around the nest site. Clearing and construction operations within this area shall be postponed until juveniles have fledged and there is no evidence of a second nesting attempt determined by the biologist. • To avoid impacts on common and special-status migratory birds pursuant to the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and the California Fish and Game Code, a nesting survey shall be conducted before construction activities if the work is scheduled between March 15 and August 31. If migratory birds are identified nesting within the construction zone, a 100-foot buffer around the nest site shall be designated. No construction activity may occur within this buffer until a qualified biologist has determined that the young have fledged. A qualified biologist may modify the size of the buffer based on site conditions and the bird's apparent acclimation to human activities. If the buffer is modified, the biologist shall monitor stress levels of the nesting birds for at least 1 week after construction commences to ensure that project activities would not cause nest site abandonment or loss of eggs or young. The biologist shall have the right to implement the full 100-foot buffer at any time if stress levels are elevated to the extent that nests could be abandoned and/or eggs or young could be lost. If the preconstruction nesting survey determines the presence of nesting raptor the District shall consult with DFW before removal of any trees. • If construction activities take place during the normal bird breeding season (February 1 through September 15), a qualified wildlife biologist shall conduct surveys for nesting Tricolored Blackbird no more than 10 days prior to the start of implementation to evaluate potential impacts of tiered projects. In the event that a Tricolored Blackbird nesting colony is detected during surveys, The District shall consult with CDFW to discuss how to implement the project and avoid take, or if avoidance is not feasible, to acquire an Incidental Take Permit, pursuant to Fish and Game Code Section 2081(b), prior to any ground-disturbing activities. 	<p>Prior to Construction</p>	<p>Environmental Department</p>	<p align="center"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p align="center"><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p align="center"><input type="checkbox"/></p>

**FRESNO METROPOLITAN FLOOD CONTROL DISTRICT
CEQA MITIGATION & MONITORING CHECKLIST**

Project: Basin "CF" Groundwater Recharge and Flood Control Project

Date: 07/23/2020

MITIGATION MEASURE	WHEN IMPLEMENTED	COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY	A	B	C
<p>(SEIR) 4.3-1c: Implement USFWS-Recommended Measures to Protect San Joaquin Kit Fox during Construction. The following measures are summarized from the USFWS <i>Standardized Recommendations for Protection of the Endangered San Joaquin Kit Fox Prior to or During Ground Disturbance</i> (USFWS 2011). These measures shall be implemented to reduce impacts on SJKF entering the area during construction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The District shall conduct pre-activity surveys for SJKF at project sites no less than 14 days and no more than 30 days prior to beginning of ground disturbing activities related to capital projects, in accordance with the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) recommendations (USFWS 2011). If SJKF are detected consultation with CDFW is warranted to discuss how to implement the project and avoid take or, if avoidance is not feasible, to acquire an Incidental Take Permit (ITP) prior to any ground-disturbing activities to comply with CESA. • An employee education program shall be conducted. The program shall consist of a brief presentation by a qualified wildlife biologist. The program shall include a description of the SJKF and its habitat needs; a report of SJKF occurrence in the project area; an explanation of the status of the species and its protection under the FESA; and a list of measures being taken to reduce impacts on the species during project construction. A fact sheet conveying this information shall be prepared for distribution to construction personnel. • A representative shall be appointed to be the contact for any employee or contractor who might inadvertently kill or injure a kit fox or who finds a dead, injured, or entrapped kit fox. The representative shall be identified during the employee education program and his or her name and telephone number shall be provided to USFWS and CDFW. • Project-related vehicles shall observe a daytime speed limit of 15 mph throughout the project site, except on state and federal highways; after dark, the speed limit shall be reduced to 10 mph. Off-road traffic outside of designated areas shall be prohibited. • Work at night shall not be allowed. • To prevent inadvertent entrapment of kit foxes or other animals during construction, all excavated, steep-walled holes or trenches more than 2 feet deep shall be covered with plywood or similar materials at the end of each work day. If the trenches cannot be closed, one or more escape ramps constructed of earthen fill or wooden planks shall be installed. Before such holes or trenches are filled, they shall be inspected for trapped animals. 	<p>Prior to Construction</p>	<p>Environmental Department</p>	<p align="center"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p align="center"><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p align="center"><input type="checkbox"/></p>

**FRESNO METROPOLITAN FLOOD CONTROL DISTRICT
CEQA MITIGATION & MONITORING CHECKLIST**

Project: Basin "CF" Groundwater Recharge and Flood Control Project

Date: 07/23/2020

MITIGATION MEASURE	WHEN IMPLEMENTED	COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY	A	B	C
<p>(SEIR) 4.3-1c: Implement USFWS-Recommended Measures to Protect San Joaquin Kit Fox during Construction continued.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All construction pipes, culverts, or similar structures with a diameter of 4 inches or greater that are stored at a construction site for one or more overnight periods shall be thoroughly inspected for kit foxes before the pipe is subsequently buried, capped, or otherwise used or moved in any way. If a kit fox is discovered inside a pipe, that section of pipe shall not be moved until USFWS or CDFW has been consulted. If necessary, and under the direct supervision of the biologist, the pipe may be moved only once to remove it from the path of construction activity, until the fox has escaped. Holes or trenches more than 8 feet deep shall be covered or fenced at the end of the day. All food-related trash items such as wrappers, cans, bottles, and food scraps shall be disposed of in securely closed containers and removed at least once a week from the project site. Firearms shall not be allowed on the project site. To prevent harassment, mortality of kit foxes, or destruction of dens, no pets shall be permitted on the project site. Rodenticides and herbicides shall not be used on the project site except to control invasive plant species. Upon completion of the project, all areas subject to temporary ground disturbance, including staging areas, temporary roads, and borrow sites, shall be recontoured if necessary and revegetated to promote restoration of the area to pre-project conditions. Any death, injury, or entrapment of SJKF shall be reported to USFWS and CDFW staff immediately. Written reports shall be submitted within 3 working days of the event. 	<p>Prior to Construction</p>	<p>Environmental Department</p>	<p align="center"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p align="center"><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p align="center"><input type="checkbox"/></p>

**FRESNO METROPOLITAN FLOOD CONTROL DISTRICT
CEQA MITIGATION & MONITORING CHECKLIST**

Project: Basin "CF" Groundwater Recharge and Flood Control Project

Date: 07/23/2020

MITIGATION MEASURE	WHEN IMPLEMENTED	COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY	A	B	C
<p>(SEIR) 4.3-1d: Swainson's Hawk Protection: The District shall conduct pre-construction surveys for nesting raptors in rural settings following the survey methodology developed by the SWHA Technical Advisory Committee (SWHA TAC, 2000) prior to any project initiation. Specifically, the survey should be conducted for a 500 foot radius around all proposed project activities. If active nesting is identified within the 500 foot radius, consultation with DFW is required.</p> <p>Before ground disturbing activities related to capital projects take place the District shall perform species-specific focused surveys in order to evaluate if possible impacts to special status species including but not limited to American badger.</p> <p>In addition, trees scheduled for removal shall be surveyed whether they currently support or have previously supported nesting Swainson's hawk. The District shall avoid Swainson's hawk nesting trees or if not feasible the trees shall be replaced with an appropriate native tree species, planted at a ratio of 3:1, in an area that will be protected in perpetuity.</p>	<p>Prior to Construction</p>	<p>Environmental Department</p>	<p align="center"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p align="center"><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p align="center"><input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>(MEIR) 4.2-8. Implementation of the 2004 District Services Plan could affect migratory salmonids in the San Joaquin River.</p> <p>(a) FMFCD shall not conduct instream activities in the San Joaquin River between October 15 and April 15. If this is not feasible, FMFCD shall consult with the National Marine Fisheries Service and CDFG on the appropriate measures to be implemented in order to protect listed salmonids in the San Joaquin River. Obtain approval from NMFS and CDFG if construction is to occur during migration season.</p> <p>(b) Riparian vegetation on the levee shading the main channel that is removed or damaged as a result of levee raising shall be replaced at a ratio and quantity sufficient to maintain the existing shading of the channel. The location of replacement trees on or within the levees, detention ponds or channels shall be approved by the FMFCD and State Reclamation Board. Obtain approval for replanting plan from FMFCD and State Reclamation Board.</p>	<p>Prior to Construction</p>	<p>Environmental Department</p>	<p align="center"><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p align="center"><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p align="center"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>

**FRESNO METROPOLITAN FLOOD CONTROL DISTRICT
CEQA MITIGATION & MONITORING CHECKLIST**

Project: Basin "CF" Groundwater Recharge and Flood Control Project

Date: 07/23/2020

MITIGATION MEASURE	WHEN IMPLEMENTED	COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY	A	B	C
Recreation/Trails					
<p>(MEIR) 4.4-1. Implementation of the 2004 District Services Plan could result in incompatibilities with adopted existing or planned trails and associated recreational facilities within the District service area.</p> <p>(a) Prior to final design approval of all elements of the District Services Plan, the District shall consult with Fresno County, City of Fresno, and City of Clovis to determine if any element would temporarily disrupt or permanently displace adopted existing or planned trails and associated recreational facilities as a result of the proposed District Services Plan. If the proposed project would not temporarily disrupt or permanently displace adopted existing or planned trails, no further mitigation is necessary. If the proposed project would have an effect on the trails and associated facilities, the District shall implement mitigation measure 4.4-1(b) or (c). Coordinate with agencies to identify existing or planned trails or recreational facilities that could be affected by District improvements.</p>	Prior to Construction	Environmental Department	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>(b) If short-term disruption of adopted existing or planned trails and associated recreational facilities occur, the District shall consult and coordinate with Fresno County, City of Fresno, and City of Clovis to temporarily re-route the trails and associated facilities. Prepare drawings that illustrate where disruptions could occur. Consult with agency staff to identify alternative facility design to remedy temporary disruptions. Work with agency staff to ensure appropriate signage to facility users indicating duration of construction and detours.</p>	Prior to Construction	Environmental Department	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>(c) If permanent displacement of the adopted existing or planned trails and associated recreational facilities occur, the appropriate design modifications to prevent permanent displacement shall be implemented in the final project design or the District shall replace these facilities. Coordinate with affected service provider to identify appropriate redesign, and obtain agency approval of design and to construct replacement facility. Ensure all appropriate building or grading permits are obtained.</p>	Prior to Construction	Environmental Department	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**FRESNO METROPOLITAN FLOOD CONTROL DISTRICT
CEQA MITIGATION & MONITORING CHECKLIST**

Project: Basin "CF" Groundwater Recharge and Flood Control Project

Date: 07/23/2020

MITIGATION MEASURE	WHEN IMPLEMENTED	COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY	A	B	C
Cultural Resources					
<p>(SEIR) 4.4-2: Perform Cultural Resources Survey and Move Alignment if Necessary to Avoid Effects on Resources Eligible for the CRHR. Before ground disturbance activities, a qualified professional archaeologist retained by the District shall perform a cultural resources survey of the area to determine whether cultural resources are present. The testing shall be performed before the start of any construction.</p>	<p>Prior to Construction</p>	<p>Environmental Department</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>(SEIR) 4.4-4: Stop Work and Implement Required Measures if Human Remains Are Found during Construction. If human remains or bones of unknown origin are found during any future project construction, all work shall stop in the vicinity of the find and the Fresno County coroner shall be contacted immediately. If the remains are determined to be Native American, the coroner shall notify the NAHC. The NAHC shall notify the person considered to be the most likely descendant. The most likely descendant shall work with the District to develop a program for the reinterment of the human remains and any associated artifacts. No additional work shall take place within the immediate vicinity of the find until the identified appropriate actions have been completed.</p>	<p>Prior to Construction</p>	<p>Environmental Department</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

**FRESNO METROPOLITAN FLOOD CONTROL DISTRICT
CEQA MITIGATION & MONITORING CHECKLIST**

Project: Basin "CF" Groundwater Recharge and Flood Control Project

Date: 07/23/2020

MITIGATION MEASURE	WHEN IMPLEMENTED	COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY	A	B	C
<p align="center">Air Quality</p> <p>(MEIR) 4.6-2. Construction and operation of the project could exceed the SJVAPCD annual threshold of significance for NO_x.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Minimize idling time of construction equipment vehicles to no more than ten minutes, or require the engines be shut off when not in use. (b) Construction shall be curtailed as much as possible when the Air Quality Index (AQI) is above 150. AQI forecasts can be found on the SJVAPCD web site. (c) Off-road trucks should be equipped with on-road engines if possible. (d) Construction equipment should have engines that meet the current off-road engine emission standard (as certified by CARB), or be repowered with an engine that meets this standard. <p>Ensure construction contracts include requirements. Perform site inspections to evaluate conformance and document findings. Identify and implement corrective action if needed.</p>	<p>During Construction</p>	<p>Facilities Department</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Basin "CF" Groundwater Recharge and Flood Control Project Mailing List

FirstName	LastName	Company Name	Street	Street2	City	State	PostalCode	EmailAddress
Michael	Prandini	Building Industry Association of Fresno and Madera Counties	420 Bullard Ave., Ste. 105		Clovis	CA	93612	mikep@biafm.org
David	Bunn	California Department of Conservation	Division of Land Resource Protection	801 K Street, MS 18-01	Sacramento	CA	95814-3528	drlrp@conservation.ca.gov
Julie	Vance	California Department of Fish and Wildlife	1234 East Shaw Avenue		Fresno	CA	93710	reg4assistant@wildlife.ca.gov
Jose	Robledo	State Water Resources Control Board	Division of Drinking Water	265 W Bullard Ave, Suite 101	Fresno	CA	93704	
CEQA		California Department of Water Resources	PO Box 942836		Sacramento	CA	94236	
CEQA		California Department of Toxic Substances	1515 Tollhouse Road		Clovis	CA	93611-0522	
Sharri	Bender Ehlert	California Department of Transportation	PO Box 12616		Fresno	CA	93778-2616	
Scott	Hatton	California Regional Water Quality Control Board	Central Valley Region	1685 E Street	Fresno	CA	93706	scott.hatton@waterboards.ca.gov
James	Herota, Sr.	Central Valley Flood Protection Board	3310 El Camino Ave, Room 151		Sacramento	CA	95821	james.herota@water.ca.gov
Wilma	Quan-Schecter	City of Fresno - City Manager	2600 Fresno Street, Room 2064		Fresno	CA	93721	citymanager@fresno.gov
Jennifer	Clark	City of Fresno - Development and Resource Management Director	2600 Fresno Street, Room 3065		Fresno	CA	93721	jennifer.clark@fresno.gov
Scott	Mozier	City of Fresno - Public Works	2600 Fresno Street		Fresno	CA	93721-3604	scott.mozier@fresno.gov
Tony	Boren	Fresno Council of Governments	2035 Tulare St, Suite 201		Fresno	CA	93721	tboren@fresnocog.org
		County of Fresno - Agriculture Commissioner	1730 S. Maple Ave		Fresno	CA	93702	
David	Pomaville	County of Fresno - Department of Public Health	1221 Fulton Street		Fresno	CA	93721	dpomaville@co.fresno.ca.us
Bernard	Jimenez	County of Fresno - Public Works & Planning	2220 Tulare Street, Suite 600		Fresno	CA	93721	bjimenez@co.fresno.ca.us
Steven	White	County of Fresno - Public Works & Planning	2220 Tulare Street, Suite 600		Fresno	CA	93721	swhite@co.fresno.ca.us
Ryan	Jacobsen	Fresno County Farm Bureau	1274 West Hedges		Fresno	CA	93728	ryanj@fcfb.org
Bill	Stretch	Fresno Irrigation District	2907 North Maple Avenue		Fresno	CA	93706	wstretch@fresnoirrigation.com
David E.	Fey, AICP	Fresno LAFCo	2607 Fresno Street, Suite B		Fresno	CA	93721	dfey@co.fresno.ca.us
Ryan	McNeil	Fresno Mosquito & Vector Control District	2338 E. McKinley Ave		Fresno	CA	93703	office@fresnomosquito.org
Paul	Peschel	Kings River Conservation District	4886 East Jensen Avenue		Fresno	CA	93725	ppeschel@krcd.org
CEQA		California Native American Heritage Commission	1550 Harbor Blvd., Suite 100		West Sacramento	CA	95691	nahc@nahc.ca.gov
CEQA		Office of Historic Preservation	1725 23rd Street, Suite 100		Sacramento	CA	95816	calshpo.ohp@parks.ca.gov
CEQA		San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District	1990 East Gettysburg Avenue		Fresno	CA	93726	ceqa@valleyair.org
Michael	Jackson	US Bureau of Reclamation	1243 "N" Street		Fresno	CA	93727	
David	Durham	Natural Resources Conservation Service	4625 West Jennifer, Suite 125		Fresno	CA	93722	david.durham@ca.usda.gov
Jennifer	Ahl	Malga County Water District	3580 S. Frank Street		Fresno	CA	93725	
Stan	Alec	Kings River Choinumni Farm Tribe	3515 East Fedora Ave		Fresno	CA	93726	
Robert	Ledger SR	Dumna Wo-Wah Tribal Government	2191 West Pico Ave		Fresno	CA	93705	ledgerrobert@gmail.com
Leo	Sisco	Santa Rosa Rancheria Tachi Yokut Tribe	PO Box 8		Lemoore	CA	93245	
Leanne	Walker-Grant	Table Mountain Rancheria	PO Box 410		Friant	CA	93626	
Bob	Pennell	Table Mountain Rancheria	PO Box 410		Friant	CA	93626	rpennell@tmr.org
Kenneth	Woodrow	Wuksache Indian Tribe/Eshom Valley Band	1179 Rock Haven Ct.		Salinas	CA	93906	kwood8934@aol.com
Elizabeth D.	Kipp	Big Sandy Rancheria of Western Mono Indians	PO Box 337		Auberry	CA	93602	lkipp@bsrnat.com
Carol	Bill	Cold Springs Rancheria	PO Box 209		Tollhouse	CA	93667	coldspretribe@netptc.net
Ron	Goode	North Fork Mono Tribe	13396 Tollhouse Road		Clovis	CA	93619	rwgoode911@hotmail.com
Benjamin	Charlev Jr.	Dunlap Band of Mono Indians	PO Box 14		Dunlap	CA	93621	ben.charley@yahoo.com
Dirk	Charlev	Dunlap Band of Mono Indians	5509 E. McKenzie Ave		Fresno	CA	93727	dcharley2016@gmail.com
David	Alvarez	Traditional Choinumni Tribe	2415 E. Houston Ave		Fresno	CA	93720	davealvarez@sbcglobal.net
Rick	Osborne	Traditional Choinumni Tribe	2415 E. Houston Ave		Fresno	CA	93720	