

APPENDIX G/INITIAL STUDY FOR A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

Environmental Checklist Form for:

Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 6379 (T-6379)

1.	Project title: Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 6379
2.	Lead agency name and address: City of Fresno Planning and Development Department 2600 Fresno Street Fresno, CA 93721
3.	Contact person and phone number: Rob Holt, Planner III City of Fresno Planning and Development Department (559) 621-8056
4.	Project location: <i>2122 South Peach Avenue: Northwest corner of South Peach and East Florence Avenues.</i> (481-020-31 and 481-020-47).

<p>5.</p>	<p>Project sponsor's name and address:</p> <p>Bonique Emerson Precision Civil Engineering, Inc. 1234 O Street Fresno, CA 93721</p>
<p>6.</p>	<p>General & Community plan land use designation:</p> <p>General Plan: Current, Residential – Medium Density Proposed, no change. Community Plan: Roosevelt Community Plan</p>
<p>7.</p>	<p>Zoning:</p> <p>Current: RS-5/UGM (5-12 du/ac) Proposed: no change</p>
<p>8.</p>	<p>Description of project:</p> <p>Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 6379 was filed by Bonique Emerson of Precision Civil Engineering, Inc., on behalf of KB Homes. The applicant proposes to develop a new 200-unit single-family residential development and associated improvements on an approximately sized 38-acre project site. The following components are included in the Project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction of internal roads and the associated improvements, as well as a pedestrian trail. • Development of a trail along the northern site boundary and a 15,865 square foot pocket park at the center of the development. • Improve all streets in or adjacent to the subdivision, in accordance with Article 38, Improvements and Security, of the Fresno Land Divisions Development Code. • Easements and specified outlots will be landscaped in compliance with the City of Fresno’s landscape design standards.

- A tentative subdivision map has been developed in accordance with Article 33, Tentative Parcel and Tentative Map Filing and Processing, of the Fresno Land Divisions Development Code (see Attachment A)

Construction of a 6-foot, 8-inch block wall along the site boundary near the San Joaquin Valley Railroad (SJVR) frontage and a 6-foot block wall along the site boundary on S. Peach Avenue.

9. **Surrounding land uses and setting:**

	Planned Land Use	Existing Zoning	Existing Land Use
North	Urban Neighborhood (16-30 D.U./acre), Medium Low Density (3.5-6 D.U./acre)	RM-2 (Residential Multi-family, Urban Neighborhood), RS-4 (Residential Single-Family, Medium Low Density), AL-20, Limited Agricultural District, 20-Acre Minimum (Fresno County)	Residential, Agricultural
East	Community Park, Medium Density (5.0-12 D.U./acre)	RS-1 (Residential Single-Family, Extremely Low Density), RS-5 (Residential Single-Family, Medium Density)	Vacant, Residential
South	Medium Density (5.0-12 D.U./acre)	RS-5 (Residential Single-Family, Medium Density)	Residential
West	Park, Medium Density (5.0-12 D.U./acre)	AL-20, Limited Agricultural District, 20-Acre Minimum (Fresno County)	Vacant

10. **Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement):**

Planning and Development Department, Building and Safety Services Division, Department of Public Works, Department of Public Utilities, Fire Department, Fresno Metropolitan Flood Control District, County of Fresno Department of Community

	Health, County of Fresno Department of Public Works and Planning, and San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District.
11.	<p>Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 21080.3.1? If so, has consultation begun?</p> <p>The State requires lead agencies to consider the potential effects of proposed projects and consult with California Native American tribes during the local planning process for the purpose of protecting Traditional Tribal Cultural Resources through the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines. Pursuant to PRC Section 21080.3.1, the lead agency shall begin consultation with the California Native American tribe that is traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographical area of the proposed project. Such significant cultural resources are either sites, features, places, cultural landscapes, sacred places, and objects with cultural value to a tribe which is either on or eligible for inclusion in the California Historic Register or local historic register, or, the lead agency, at its discretion, and support by substantial evidence, choose to treat the resources as a Tribal Cultural Resources (PRC Section 21074(a)(1-2)). According to the most recent census data, California is home to 109 currently recognized Indian tribes. Tribes in California currently have nearly 100 separate reservations or Rancherias. Fresno County has a number of Rancherias such as Table Mountain Rancheria, Millerton Rancheria, Big Sandy Rancheria, Cold Springs Rancheria, and Squaw Valley Rancheria. These Rancherias are not located within the city limits.</p> <p>Conducting consultation early in the CEQA process allows tribal governments, lead agencies, and project proponents to discuss the level of environmental review, identify and address potential adverse impacts to tribal cultural resources, and reduce the potential for delay and conflict in the environmental review process. (See PRC Section 21083.3.2.) Information may also be available from the California Native American Heritage Commission’s Sacred Lands File per PRC Section 5097.96 and the California Historical Resources Information System administered by the California Office of Historic Preservation. Please also note that PRC Section 21082.3(c) contains provisions specific to confidentiality.</p> <p>Currently, the Table Mountain Rancheria Tribe and the Dumna Wo Wah Tribe have requested to be notified pursuant to Assembly Bill 52 (AB 52) A certified letter was mailed to the above-mentioned tribes on December 17, 2021. The 30-day comment</p>

	period ended on January 17, 2022 . Both tribes did not request consultation.
--	---

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" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

<input type="checkbox"/>	Aesthetics	<input type="checkbox"/>	Agriculture and Forestry Resources
<input type="checkbox"/>	Air Quality	<input type="checkbox"/>	Biological Resources
<input type="checkbox"/>	Cultural Resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	Energy
<input type="checkbox"/>	Geology/Soils	<input type="checkbox"/>	Greenhouse Gas Emissions
<input type="checkbox"/>	Hazards and Hazardous Materials	<input type="checkbox"/>	Hydrology/Water Quality
<input type="checkbox"/>	Land Use/Planning	<input type="checkbox"/>	Mineral Resources
<input type="checkbox"/>	Noise	<input type="checkbox"/>	Population/Housing
<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Services	<input type="checkbox"/>	Recreation
<input type="checkbox"/>	Transportation	<input type="checkbox"/>	Tribal Cultural Resources
<input type="checkbox"/>	Utilities/Service Systems	<input type="checkbox"/>	Wildfire
<input type="checkbox"/>	Mandatory Findings of Significance		

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

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.
<u>X</u>	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 (EIR) 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 EIR 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.



Planner III

April 8, 2022

Planner Name, Title

Date

EVALUATION OF ADDITIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS NOT ASSESSED IN PROGRAM ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT SCH NO. 2019050005 PREPARED FOR THE APPROVED FRESNO GENERAL PLAN (GP PEIR):

1. For purposes of this Initial Study, the following answers have the corresponding meanings:
 - a. "No Impact" means the specific impact category does not apply to the project, or that the record sufficiently demonstrates that project specific factors or general standards applicable to the project will result in no impact for the threshold under consideration.
 - b. "Less Than Significant Impact" means there is an impact related to the threshold under consideration, but that impact is less than significant.
 - c. "Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation" means there is a potentially significant impact related to the threshold under consideration, however, with the mitigation incorporated into the project, the impact is less than significant. For purposes of this Initial Study "mitigation incorporated into the project" means mitigation originally described in the GP PEIR and applied to an individual project, as well as mitigation developed specifically for an individual project.
 - d. "Potentially Significant Impact" means there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant related to the threshold under consideration.
2. A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
3. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
4. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination

is made, an EIR is required.

5. "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from, "Earlier Analyses," as described in (6) below, may be cross-referenced).
6. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, Program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a. Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b. Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in the PEIR or another earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c. Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
7. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
8. Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
9. The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a. The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b. The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance.

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. AESTHETICS – Except as provided in PRC Section 21099, would the project:				
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 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 which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?		X		

DISCUSSION

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

No Impact. A scenic vista is defined as a viewpoint that provides expansive views of highly valued landscape for the benefit of the general public. The Sierra Nevada Mountains are the only natural and visual resource in the Project area. Views of these distant mountains are afforded only during clear conditions due to poor air quality in the valley. Distant views of these mountains would largely be unaffected by the development of the Project because of the nature of the Project, distance and limited visibility of these features. The City of Fresno does not identify views of these features as required to be “protected.”

The Project site is within an urbanized area of southeast Fresno. There are no scenic vistas or other protected scenic resources on or near the site. Visual character of the site is addressed further in Response c) below.

There are no scenic highways near the proposed site, therefore, the Project has *no significant impact* on scenic vistas or designated scenic resources or highways.

b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?

No Impact. As discussed in Impact a) above, there are no protected scenic resources on or near the Project. There is *no impact*.

c) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed Project would alter the existing visual character of public views of the site from vacant land to fully developed with single-family tract homes. The Project design is subject to the City’s Design Guidelines adopted for the City’s General Plan and Municipal Code which apply to site layout, building design, landscaping, interior street design, lighting, parking and signage. Detailed architectural plans, color palettes and building materials as well as

landscaping plans will be submitted by the Project developer to the City of Fresno Planning and Development Department. The plans shall be required prior to issuance of any building permits. The review shall be substantially based on the building plans and elevations illustrated within this document.

The Project will require removal of minimal vegetation in the vacant field. Landscaping easements and additional landscaping, masonry sound walls, fences and a pedestrian trail are incorporated into the project design.

The improvements such as those proposed by the Project are typical of large City urban areas and are generally expected from residents of the City. These improvements would not substantially degrade the visual character of the area and would not diminish the visual quality of the area, as they would be consistent with the existing visual setting. The Project itself is not visually imposing against the scale of the existing adjacent residential buildings and nature of the surrounding area.

Therefore, the Project would have *less than significant impacts* on the visual character of the area.

d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. The subject site currently has no on-site sources of lighting. The Project will introduce new lighting that will be typical of residential developments, such as streetlights, residential lights and vehicle lights. Additional night lighting sources on the Project site, especially any unshielded light, could result in spillover light that could impact surrounding adjacent residential uses. This would create new sources of light that could potentially have a significant impact on nighttime light levels in the area. During the entitlement process, staff will ensure that lights are located in areas that will minimize light sources to the neighboring properties. Further, Mitigation Measure (MM) AES-4.1 from the General Plan PEIR requires lighting systems for street and parking areas be shielded to direct the light to the roadway surfaces and parking areas. It also requires vertical shields to be used to direct light away from adjacent residences. In addition, MM AES-4.5 requires use of non-reflective building materials to reduce glare impacts. Implementation of mitigation measures will reduce potential impacts to *less than significant* with regards to light and glare.

Mitigation Measures

1. The proposed project shall implement and incorporate, as applicable, the aesthetic related mitigation measures as identified in the attached Project Specific Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program dated April 8, 2022.

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>II. 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 forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:</p>				
<p>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?</p>				X
<p>b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?</p>				X

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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

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

No Impact. The California Department of Conservation, Important Farmland Finder Program considers the Project site to be Farmland of Local Importance, and as such, there is no potential for the conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance. There is *no impact*.

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

No Impact. The site is not zoned for agriculture nor is it in a Williamson Act contract. There is *no impact*.

c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?

No Impact. As the site is on the Valley floor, there is no forest or timberland on the proposed Project site. There is *no impact*.

d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

No Impact. As described in Impact c) above, there is no forest land on the Project site. There is *no impact*.

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?

No Impact. As discussed in Impact a) above, there is no potential for the conversion of agricultural land with Project implementation. The proposed Project will not involve new other changes in the existing environment that could result in conversion of Farmland.

Mitigation Measures

None are required.

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>III. 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:</p>				
<p>a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan (e.g., by having potential emissions of regulated criterion pollutants which exceed the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control Districts (SJVAPCD) adopted thresholds for these pollutants)?</p>			X	
<p>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 (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?</p>			X	
<p>c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?</p>			X	

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?			X	

DISCUSSION

a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?

Less Than Significant Impact. The CEQA Guidelines note that if the project clashes with or obstructs the implementation of the relevant air quality plan, there will be a substantial impact. Although the GAMAQI does not have clear guidelines or an overview of how to determine air quality plan consistency, the following criteria were utilized to determine level of significance:

1. Will the project comply with General Plan policies and related PEIR mitigation measures intended to mitigate air quality impacts?
2. As determined by comparison to the thresholds identified by the Air District for Regional and Local Air Pollutants will the project result in an increase in existing air quality violations or cause or contribute to new violations of emission reductions specified in an air quality plan (AQP)?
3. Will the project comply with applicable rules and control measures in the AQP? The primary control measures applicable to development projects is Regulation VIII—Fugitive PM10 Prohibitions and Rule 9510 Indirect Source Review.

General Plan Policies

The project will be consistent with the General Plan policies, implementing actions, and mitigation measures as defined in Tables 1 and 2 below.

Table 1: Consistency with General Plan Policies

General Plan Policy	Project Consistency
<p>Objective RC-4. In cooperation with other jurisdictions and agencies in the San Joaquin Valley Air Basin, take necessary actions to achieve and maintain compliance with State and federal air quality standards for criteria pollutants.</p>	<p>The project will comply with all applicable policies and rules related to air quality and will thus comply with this policy. The Applicant has submitted an ISR/AIA to the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution control district and is awaiting approval.</p>
<p>RC-4-b Conditions of Approval. Develop and incorporate air quality maintenance requirements, compatible with Air Quality Attainment and Maintenance Plans, as conditions of approval for General Plan amendments, community plans, Specific Plans, neighborhood plans, Concept Plans, and development proposals.</p>	<p>The City of Fresno Development Code incorporates relevant general plan policies, including this policy, into development code requirements. Given that the City will ensure all development code requirements are met during the review of the proposed project, the project will comply with this policy.</p>
<p>RC-4-c Evaluate Impacts with Models. Continue to require the use of computer models used by SJVAPCD to evaluate the air quality impacts of plans and projects that require such environmental review by the City.</p>	<p>CalEEMod was used to analyze air quality impacts of this project. As provided in Tables 3 and 4, Project-generated emissions are less than significance thresholds. The findings of this model run are included as Appendix A.</p>
<p>RC-4-d Forward Information. Forward information regarding proposed General Plan amendments, community plans, Specific Plans, neighborhood plans, Concept Plans, and development proposals that require air quality evaluation, and amendments to development regulations to the SJVAPCD for their review of potential air quality and health impacts.</p>	<p>The proposed project was routed by the City to the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District and the District provided a comment letter dated December 29, 2021. In addition, the applicant submitted an ISR/AIA to the District and is awaiting District approval.</p>

Table 2: Compliance with General Plan PEIR Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure	Project Compliance
<p>AIR-2.1: Prior to future discretionary project approval, development project applicants shall prepare and submit to the Director of the City</p>	<p>CalEEMod, in conformance with SJVAPCD methodology, was utilized to estimate</p>

Mitigation Measure	Project Compliance
<p>Planning and Development Department, or designee, a technical assessment evaluating potential project construction phase-related air quality impacts. The evaluation shall be prepared in conformance with SJVAPCD methodology for assessing construction impacts. If construction related air pollutants are determined to have the potential to exceed the SJVAPCD adopted threshold of significance, the Planning and Development Department shall require that applicants for new development projects incorporate mitigation measures into construction plans to reduce air pollutant emissions during construction activities. The identified measures shall be included as part of the Project Conditions of Approval. Possible mitigation measures to reduce construction emissions include but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Install temporary construction power supply meters on site and use these to provide power to electric power tools whenever feasible. If temporary electric power is available on site, forbid the use of portable gasoline- or diesel-fueled electric generators. • Use of diesel oxidation catalysts and/or catalyzed diesel particulate traps on diesel equipment, as feasible. • Maintain equipment according to manufacturers' specifications. • Restrict idling of equipment and trucks to a maximum of 5 minutes (per California Air Resources Board [CARB] regulation). • Phase grading operations to reduce disturbed areas and times of exposure. • Avoid excavation and grading during wet weather. • Limit on-site construction routes and stabilize construction entrance(s). • Remove existing vegetation only when absolutely necessary. • Sweep up spilled dry materials (e.g., cement, mortar, or dirt track-out) immediately. Never attempt to wash them 	<p>potential construction emissions generated by project implementation and are included as Appendix A of this document. As provided in Tables 3 and 4, Project-generated emissions are less than significance thresholds.</p>

Mitigation Measure	Project Compliance
<p>away with water. Use only minimal water for dust control.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Store stockpiled materials and wastes under a temporary roof or secured plastic sheeting or tarp. 	
<p>AIR-2.2: Prior to future discretionary project approval, development project applicants shall prepare and submit to the Director of the City Planning and Development Department, or designee, a technical assessment evaluating potential project operation-related air quality impacts. The evaluation shall be prepared in conformance with SJVAPCD methodology in assessing air quality impacts. If operation-related air pollutants are determined to have the potential to exceed the SJVAPCD-adopted thresholds of significance, the Planning and Development Department shall require that applicants for new development projects incorporate mitigation measures to reduce air pollutant emissions during operational activities. The identified measures shall be included as part of the Project Conditions of Approval. Possible mitigation measures to reduce long-term emissions include but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For site-specific development that requires refrigerated vehicles, the construction documents shall demonstrate an adequate number of electrical service connections at loading docks for plugging in the anticipated number of refrigerated trailers to reduce idling time and emissions. • Applicants for manufacturing and light industrial uses shall consider energy storage (i.e., battery) and combined heat and power (CHP, also known as cogeneration) in appropriate applications to optimize renewable energy generation systems and avoid peak energy use. • Site-specific developments with truck delivery and loading areas and truck parking spaces shall include signage as a 	<p>CalEEMod, in conformance with SJVAPCD methodology, was utilized to estimate potential operation emissions generated by project implementation and are included as Appendix A of this document. As provided in Tables 3 and 4, Project-generated emissions are less than significance thresholds.</p>

Mitigation Measure	Project Compliance
<p>reminder to limit idling of vehicles while parked for loading/unloading in accordance with CARB Rule 2845 (13 California Code of Regulations [CCR] Chapter 10, Section 2485).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Require that 240-volt electrical outlets or Level 3 chargers be installed in parking lots that would enable charging of neighborhood electric vehicles (NEVs) and/or battery powered vehicles. • Maximize use of solar energy including solar panels; installing the maximum possible number of solar energy arrays on building roofs throughout the city to generate solar energy. • Maximize the planting of trees in landscaping and parking lots. • Use light-colored paving and roofing materials. • Require use of electric or alternatively fueled street-sweepers with HEPA filters. • Require use of electric lawn mowers and leaf blowers. • Utilize only Energy Star heating, cooling, and lighting devices, and appliances. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Use of water-based or low volatile organic compound (VOC) cleaning products. 	
<p>AIR-3.2: Locate sensitive land uses (e.g., residences, schools, and daycare centers) to avoid incompatibilities with recommended buffer distances identified in the most current version of the CARB Air Quality and Land Use Handbook: A Community Health Perspective (CARB Handbook). Sensitive land uses that are within the recommended buffer distances listed in the CARB Handbook shall provide enhanced filtration units or submit a Health Risk Assessment (HRA) to the City. If the HRA shows that the project would exceed the applicable SJVAPCD thresholds, mitigation</p>	<p>This Mitigation Measure is not applicable because the residential development is not located within the recommended buffer distances described in the CARB Air Quality and Land Use Handbook, Table 1-1.</p>

Mitigation Measure	Project Compliance
measures capable of reducing potential impacts to an acceptable level must be identified and approved by the City.	
<p>AIR-4.1: Require developers of projects with the potential to generate significant odor impacts as determined through review of SJVAPCD odor complaint history for similar facilities and consultation with the SJVAPCD, to prepare an odor impact assessment and to implement odor control measures recommended by the SJVAPCD or the City as needed to reduce the impact to a level deemed acceptable by the SJVAPCD. The City's Planning and Development Department shall verify that all odor control measures have been incorporated into the project design specifications prior to issuing a permit to operate.</p>	<p>The Project includes the development of 200 single family residences, which are not sources of significant odor generation. Not applicable.</p>

Air District Thresholds

Regional Emissions

Emissions of air pollution have global effects, and localized effects. This study measures the geographic effects of the pollutant emission requirements of the project compared with SJVAPCD levels of importance for short-term construction activities and long-term project activity. Localized emissions from project construction and operation are often evaluated using concentration-based thresholds that specify if the project will result in a localized excess of any ambient air quality standards or would contribute cumulatively to an established excess. The primary pollutants of concern during project construction and operation are ROG, NOx, PM10, and PM2.5. The SJVAPCD GAMAQI adopted in 2015 contains thresholds for CO, NOx, ROG, SOx, PM10, and PM2.5. Ozone is a secondary pollutant that can be produced miles from the emission source, through the absorption of sunlight reactions of ROG and NOx. Hence ROG and NOx are considered precursors of ozone. Air basin also meets national and state ozone levels. Therefore, if a large quantity of ozone precursors are emitted by the project, the project could contribute to exceeding the ozone standards. The Air Basin also meets PM10 and PM2.5 air quality standards; thus, significant

project emissions will lead to these pollutants being exceeded. The annual emission standards used by the District for the project describe the substantial contribution to both operational and construction emissions as follows:

- 100 tons per year CO
- 10 tons per year NOx
- 10 tons per year ROG
- 27 tons per year SOx
- 15 tons per year PM10
- 15 tons per year PM2.5

The project does not include sources which would generate large quantities of SO2 emissions during construction and operation. Project modeling shows that SO2 emissions are far below the SJVAPCD GAMAQI threshold, as shown in the modeling results in Appendix A. No further SO2 analysis is needed.

Construction Emissions

As shown in Table 3, the emissions in each construction year are below the significance thresholds (modeling assumptions are provided in Appendix A). Consequently, the emissions on a Project basis are *less than significant*.

Table 3: Construction Air Pollutant Emissions

Year	Emissions (tons per year)				
	ROG	NOx	CO	PM10	PM2.5
2021	0.0484	0.4722	0.3294	0.0251	0.0221
2022	0.3929	3.9455	3.0926	1.0532	0.5695
2023	0.2415	2.1093	2.3591	0.1846	0.1114
2024	0.2278	1.9986	2.3487	0.1747	0.1015
2025	0.2114	1.8603	2.3120	0.1628	0.0906
2026	0.2084	1.8458	2.2931	0.1614	0.0900
2027	3.4206	0.3491	0.6025	0.0253	0.0179

Significance threshold (tons/year)	10	10	100	15	15
Exceed threshold—significant impact?	No	No	No	No	No
<p>Notes:</p> <p>PM10 and PM2.5 emissions are from the mitigated output to reflect compliance with Regulation VIII – Fugitive PM10 Prohibitions. ROG = reactive organic gases NOx = nitrogen oxides PM10 and PM2.5 = particulate matter</p> <p>Source: Appendix A Modeling Results.</p>					

Operational Emissions

Operational emissions occur during the project's lifespan and come from two major sources: Region sources and motor vehicles or mobile sources. Construction is expected to finish in phases, starting 2021 and finishing 2027. When all units will be finished in 2027, operations were modelled. When making important determinations, the SJVAPCD considers building and operating emissions separately; in any case, the annual operating emissions together with the annual building emissions will not exceed the relevant SJVAPCD thresholds.

Please note that these findings include the benefits of compliance with required regulations not yet implemented in CalEEMod and the design and location of projects using the mitigation portion CalEEMod. Such steps and regulations are considered part of the project baseline; however, the results are presented in the mitigated model performance of CalEEMod and are not considered mitigation appropriate for compliance with CEQA.

Reductions from land use and transportation measures relating to the location, site design and proximity of the project to alternative modes of transport are measured by CalEEMod and are based on the methodology provided in the 2010 report of the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA), Quantifying Gas Mitigation Measures. As shown in Table 4, the emissions are below the SJVAPCD significance thresholds, and therefore, would result in a *less than significant* impact.

Table 4: Operational Air Pollutant Emissions

Source	Emissions (tons per year)				
	ROG	NOx	CO	PM10	PM2.5
Area	1.7974	0.0919	1.5172	0.0143	0.0143
Energy	0.0278	0.2372	0.1009	0.0192	0.0192
Mobile	0.5687	5.5521	6.1318	2.1065	0.5793
Total	2.3938	5.8812	7.7499	2.1399	0.6127
Significance threshold	10	10	100	15	15
Exceed threshold—significant impact?	No	No	No	No	No
<p>Notes: ROG = reactive organic gases NOx = nitrogen oxides PM10 and PM2.5 = particulate matter</p> <p>Area source emissions include emissions from natural gas, landscape, and painting.</p> <p>Source: Appendix A.</p>					

Air District Rules

The project complies with or will comply with all rules and regulations administered by the Air District, including, but not limited to, the following:

Regulation VIII – Fugitive PM10 Prohibitions. Rules 8011-8081 are intended to minimize human-generated PM10 emissions (predominantly dust / dirt), including building and demolition activities, road construction, storage of bulk materials, paved and unpaved roads, carry-out and track-out, etc. All construction projects involving soil disruption are subject to at least one clause of the rules set out in Regulation VIII.

Rule 9510 – Indirect Source Review. This law decreases the effects of increasing NOx and PM10 pollution within the Air Basin. The law sets implementation and emission reduction standards for construction projects that meet applicability criteria to minimize

emissions by on-site mitigation, district-administered projects off-site or a combination of the two. This project must comply with Rule 9510 because it would develop more than 50 residential dwelling units. The applicant of the proposed project has already submitted the application required to comply with Rule 9510.

As discussed above, the proposed Project will comply with all relevant air quality plans and policies and thus the project's impact will be *less than significant*.

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?

Less Than Significant Impact. The Air Basin is in non-attainment for ozone, PM10, and PM2.5, which means that certain pollutants' exposure levels are often higher than the normal air quality requirements. The air quality standards have been set to protect public health, particularly the health of vulnerable people. Therefore, if the concentration of those contaminants exceeds the norm, some susceptible individuals in the population are likely to experience health effects, as described in Attachment A. The health effects are therefore a factor in the dose-response curve. Concentration of the pollutant in the air, the length of time exposed and the individual's reaction are factors that affect the extent and nature of the health effects. As shown in Table 3 and Table 4, the regional construction and operational emission analysis shows that the Project does not surpass the substantial thresholds of the District and that the Project is compliant with the Air Quality Attainment Plan applicable. Therefore, the Project would not result in significant cumulative health impacts. Impacts are *less than significant*.

c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

Less Than Significant Impact. Sensitive receptors include the following uses: residences, schools, day-care centers, extended-care facilities, and hospitals. There are sensitive receptors (residential uses) immediately adjacent to the site to the north, south and east. Although the proposed Project itself is a sensitive receptor and is being proposed adjacent to a railway, which has the potential to expose the proposed sensitive receptors to a higher level of pollution concentrations, for the purposes of

CEQA, we only consider the impact of the project on the environment and not the impact of the environment on the project.

Impacts to On-site Workers

The Project is not a commercial or manufacturing venture which would have employees on-site. Therefore, a health risk assessment is not needed or recommended for the construction workers.

Construction: NO_x, PM₁₀, PM_{2.5}

As demonstrated in Table 3 – Construction Air Pollutant Emissions, emissions during construction will not reach the thresholds of significance and would not be anticipated to result in concentrations that reach ambient standards or significantly add to a current excess of an ambient air quality level.

Operation: PM₁₀, PM_{2.5}, CO, NO₂

As stated in Impact a) above, localized PM₁₀, PM_{2.5}, CO and NO₂ concentrations will not surpass the ambient air quality requirements. Residential development is an insignificant source of these pollutants except for projects which permit wood burning devices emitting PM₁₀, PM_{2.5} in wood smoke. The Project should therefore not expose susceptible receptors to significant air pollutant concentrations during service. Impacts to sensitive receptors will be *less than significant*.

d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?

Less Than Significant Impact. Land uses which are usually known as sources of unacceptable odors include landfills, transfer stations, sewage treatment plants, wastewater pump stations, composting plants, feed lots, coffee roasters, asphalt batch plants and rendering plants. The proposed Project includes the development of a residential neighborhood and as such, will not be a source of unacceptable odors during operations.

The numerous diesel-powered vehicles and machinery that are in use on site will produce localized odors during construction. These odors would be temporary and would therefore not be visible outside the site limits of the project for extended periods

of time. The capacity for impacts of diesel odors is therefore less than significant. Impacts resulting from creating objectionable odors are *less than significant*.

Mitigation Measures

None are required.

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES – Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?		X		
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?				X

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?		X		
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?		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 Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?				X

DISCUSSION

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

Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. A due diligence report was prepared for the proposed Project by H.T. Harvey & Associates on February 9, 2021, the results of which are summarized herein. The complete report is provided in Appendix B.

The site is currently a vacant field and was historically used for agricultural purposes with rural residences on site. There are two mature palm trees at the northeast corner of the site and the site has been regularly disked and cultivated. The immediate vicinity consists of land developed with agriculture, residences, roadways and a railroad. The highly disturbed nature of the area suggests that the vegetation on site is unlikely to follow natural vegetation patterns, and thus unlikely to support native wildlife.

A review of California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB 2021) and other resources was performed. The search determined that a total of seven special status species have the potential to occur in the Project site's vicinity. Two of the seven species occurrences are for Swainson's hawk (*Buteo swainsoni*). The site falls within the extent of a Swainson's hawk occurrence mapped over Fresno that has not been reconfirmed since 1956. The other Swainson's hawk occurrence is based on observations from 2016 and is located 3.5 miles (mi.) southwest of the project site. In addition, there are two occurrences of burrowing owls (*Athene cunicularia*), one located 4.2 mi. to the north at Fresno Yosemite International Airport and another located 4.0 mi. to the northwest in Clovis. Also, double-crested cormorant (*Phalacrocorax auritus*) was documented at a collection of ponds 4.8 mi. to the north-northwest in 2012. The remaining records for least Bell's vireo (*Vireo bellii pusillus*) and western yellow-billed cuckoo (*Coccyzus americanus occidentalis*) are both over 3.5 mi. away from the site and have not been reconfirmed within the last 108 years.

Numerous small mammal burrows occur on the Project site. Several active pocket gopher burrows were found scattered across the site. The site also currently supports

a large population of California ground squirrels. Their burrows were abundant at the edge and along the slopes of the detention pond and were moderately abundant throughout the rest of the site. The California ground squirrel remains were located within 1 ft. of burrows of this species and represent predation and/or scavenging, perhaps by red-tailed hawks or other raptors. No signs of mammalian predators (e.g. coyotes [*Canis latrans*]) were observed. All animal species observed directly on or near (i.e. within 0.25 mi.) the project site are listed in Appendix B.

Many of the California ground squirrel burrows are large (about 3-5 inches in diameter), with large, unvegetated aprons, and thus are potentially suitable for use by burrowing owls, which is listed as Species of Special Concern by the State of California. No burrowing owls or signs of this species (e.g. pellets, feathers, or wash) were observed. However, the survey was conducted during conditions of light to moderately heavy rain in the middle of a rain event lasting several days. Any owls present would have been underground in their burrows, and their wash would have been rinsed away. The occurrence of potentially suitable burrows suggests that burrowing owls might be present.

No direct evidence of special-status animal or plant species was observed and the site provides little or no value to sensitive plant and wildlife species with the exception of burrowing owl. The presence of burrowing owls on the property could constrain the development of the parcel or result in project delays. Burrowing owls, and their nests are protected under state laws and regulations, including the California Fish and Game Code Section 3503.5. Based on our understanding of burrowing owl distribution in the Central Valley, burrowing owls are unlikely to occupy this site. The size of the parcel and the adjacent similar parcel east of Peach Avenue combined with the number of suitable burrows on the site, however, warrant a cautious approach. Implementation of Impact BIO-1 in the MMRP dated April 8, 2022, which includes surveys in accordance with the Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation, will ensure potential impacts to burrowing owl remain *less than significant with mitigation incorporated*.

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

No Impact. The site consists of loose, recently-disked soil, except for an approximately 1-acre stormwater detention pond at the western border comprised of bare, compacted soil. Approximately 11 acres in the southwest corner and along the central part of the southern border have been disked since the spring 2020 growing season and are sparsely vegetated. The remainder of the site also shows signs of recent disking, but currently is approximately 95% covered in vegetation, with the remainder consisting of bare soil. Garbage is relatively abundant, especially in the detention pond and the northwest corner. Overall, the site conditions are currently unsuitable for special-status plant species. Vegetation on the site is comprised mostly of grasses, but some low-growing forbs are also present. Plant height is currently low, with grasses and forbs 1-6 inches tall. The site can be characterized as annual grassland in the process of re-establishment. As a result of past ground disturbance, the project site is highly suitable for nonnative invasive plants.

The site is not expected to support native vegetation, due to regular agricultural activities and disking. There is *no impact*.

- 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?**

Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. According to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service National Wetlands Inventory (NWI), a freshwater pond is mapped along the central western border of the Project site. Mitigation Measure (MM) BIO-3.1 from the General Plan PEIR requires a formal wetland delineation to be conducted to determine the extent of wetlands on a project site. Acquisition of permits from the USACE for potential wetlands fill would ensure a “no net loss” of wetland habitat. Additionally, MM BIO-3.2 from the General Plan PEIR includes Best Management Practices to ensure that no pollutants or siltation drain into a federally protected wetland. Potential impacts would be *less than significant with mitigation incorporated*.

- d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?**

Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. The annual grassland

in the Project area potentially provides habitat for common, rural and urban-adapted wildlife species, such as ground-foraging and -nesting birds, California ground squirrels (*Otospermophilus beecheyi*), pocket gophers (*Thomomys bottae*), and desert cottontail (*Sylvilagus audobonii*). Wildlife directly observed on the project site consisted of common bird species and the remains of two California ground squirrels. Several individuals of each of four common bird species (mourning dove [*Zenaida macroura*], California scrub-jay [*Aphelocoma californica*], dark-eyed junco [*Junco hyemalis*], and European starling [*Sturnus vulgaris*]) were observed perched on and flying around the line of trees on the southern border of the Project site. Construction activities, such as excavating, trenching, and grading that disturb a nesting bird on the Project site or immediately adjacent to the construction zone could constitute a significant effect, as migratory birds are protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MTBA).

Implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-1.4 from the General Plan Program EIR will ensure that the Project will not adversely affect federally protected bird species or other species of special status. Any impacts to native species movement would be *less than significant with mitigation incorporated*.

e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?

Less Than Significant Impact. The City's General Plan Parks, Open Space and Schools Element contain several objectives and policies pertaining to the protection of biological resources. Most of the policies pertain to general long-term protection and preservation of biological resources including providing buffers for natural areas, implementing habitat restoration where applicable, protection/enhancement of the San Joaquin River area, and other similar policies. There are two mature palm trees located at the northeast site corner that will be removed as a part of the Project. The trees are considered "Protected Trees" since they have a diameter of larger than 12 inches, per the Fresno Municipal Code (FMC) 15-2308(c). As such, the Project developer will remove these trees per Section 13-305 of the FMC.

Since the Project is located in a highly disturbed area with minimal biological resources and does not include significant impacts to protected plant or animal species, per the

Biological report provided in Appendix B, the Project does not conflict with any adopted policies pertaining to biological resources. Impacts are *less than significant*.

f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?

No Impact. The Project site is not subject to any adopted habitat conservation plan, natural community conservation plan or other conservation plan, as there are no adopted plans. Therefore, there is *no impact*.

Mitigation Measures

1. The proposed project shall implement and incorporate, as applicable, the biological related mitigation measures as identified in the attached Project Specific Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program dated April 8, 2022.

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES – Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5?		X		
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?		X		

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?		X		

DISCUSSION

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?

Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. A prehistoric and historic site records and literature search was conducted for the Project area through the Southern San Joaquin Valley Archaeological Information Center of the California Historical Resources Information System on November 12, 2021 (File RS#21-440) and is provided in Appendix C. There have been no previous cultural resource studies performed in the Project area; however, eight cultural resource studies fall in the one-half mile radius, FR-00296, 01800, 02000, 02126, 02127, 02194, 02217, 02972. Records indicated that there are no known sites within the Project area. Four recorded resources fall within the one-half mile radius, P-10-003930, 004677, 005120, & 005305. These resources consist of historic railroads, canals, and historic properties. A review of the Sacred Lands Inventory by the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) was also performed, and the results were negative.

Prior to ground disturbance activities, it is recommended that a qualified, professional consultant conduct a field survey to determine if cultural resources are present.

Although no cultural or archaeological resources, paleontological resources or human remains have been identified in the project area, the possibility exists that such resources or remains may be discovered during Project site preparation, excavation and/or grading activities. Mitigation Measure CUL-1.1 of the General Plan Program EIR, which requires construction activities to stop if unknown cultural resources are

discovered during land moving activities, shall be implemented to reduce potential impacts to *less than significant*.

b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?

Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. As discussed in Impact a) above, no surface or recorded evidence of sensitive cultural resources were evident on the Project site. However, the possibility exists that such resources or remains may be discovered during Project site preparation, excavation and/or grading activities. Mitigation Measure CUL-1.1 of the General Plan Program EIR, which requires construction activities to stop if unknown cultural resources are discovered during land moving activities, shall be implemented to reduce potential impacts to *less than significant*.

c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. Although no cultural or archaeological resources, paleontological resources or human remains have been identified in the project area, the possibility exists that such resources or remains may be discovered during Project site preparation, excavation and/or grading activities. Mitigation Measure CUL-3 of the General Plan Program EIR, which requires construction activities to stop if human remains are unearthed during land moving activities, shall be implemented to reduce potential impacts to *less than significant*.

Mitigation Measures

1. The proposed project shall implement and incorporate, as applicable, the cultural resource related mitigation measures as identified in the attached Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program dated April 8, 2022.

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VI. ENERGY – Would the project:				
a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of 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	

DISCUSSION

a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed Project includes construction and operation of a 200-unit single-family residential tract, on approximately 38 acres. The Project would introduce energy usage on a site that is presently demanding minimal energy.

During construction, the Project would consume energy in two general forms: (1) the fuel energy consumed by construction vehicles and equipment; and (2) bound energy in construction materials, such as asphalt, steel, concrete, pipes, and manufactured or processed materials such as lumber and glass. Title 24 Building Energy Efficiency Standards provide guidance on construction techniques to maximize energy conservation and it is expected that contractors and owners have a strong financial

incentive to use recycled materials and products originating from nearby sources in order to reduce materials costs. As such, it is anticipated that materials used in construction and construction vehicle fuel energy would not involve the wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy.

Operational Project energy consumption would occur for multiple purposes, including but not limited to, building heating and cooling, refrigeration, lighting and electronics. Operational energy would also be consumed during each vehicle trip associated with the proposed use. CalEEMod was utilized to generate the estimated energy demand of the proposed Project, and the results are provided in Table 5 and in Appendix A.

Table 5 – Annual Project Energy Consumption

Land Use	Electricity Use in kWh/year	Natural Gas Use in kBTU/year
Single-Family Residential	1,718,810	5,146,740

The proposed Project would be required to comply with Title 24 Building Energy Efficiency Standards, which provide minimum efficiency standards related to various building features, including appliances, water and space heating and cooling equipment, building insulation and roofing, and lighting. Implementation of Title 24 standards significantly increases energy savings, and it is generally assumed that compliance with Title 24 ensures projects will not result in the inefficient, wasteful, or unnecessary consumption of energy.

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

Any impacts are *less than significant*.

b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?

Less Than Significant Impact. As discussed previously, the proposed Project would be required to implement and be consistent with existing energy design standards at the local and state level. The Project would be subject to energy conservation requirements in the California Energy Code and CALGreen. Impacts are *less than significant*.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS – Would the project:				
a) Directly or Indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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.			X	
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?			X	
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?			X	
iv) Landslides?			X	
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	

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?			X	
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?				X
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?			X	

DISCUSSION

a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

- i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.**

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed Project site is not located in an earthquake fault zone as delineated by the 1972 Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map Act. No active faults have been mapped within the Project

boundaries. The nearest known potentially active fault is the Clovis Fault, located approximately 14 miles northeast of the site. Any impacts would be *less than significant*.

ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?

Less Than Significant Impact. It is anticipated that the proposed Project site would be subject to some ground acceleration and ground shaking associated with seismic activity during its design life. The Project site would be engineered and constructed in strict accordance with the earthquake-resistant design requirements contained in the latest edition of the California Building Code (CBC) for seismic zone III, as well as Title 24 of the California Administrative Code, and therefore would avoid potential seismically induced hazards on planned structures. The impact of strong seismic ground shaking on the Project would be *less than significant*.

iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

Less Than Significant Impact. The potential for soil liquefaction within the City of Fresno ranges from very low to moderate due to the variable density of the subsurface soils and the presence of shallow groundwater (PEIR SCH No. 2019050005). The proposed Project will be subject to policies in the Fresno Municipal Code, including Sections 11-101, 12-1022 and 12-1023, which would reduce potential settlement and lateral spread impacts to *less than significant* levels.

iv. Landslides?

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed Project site is not located in an earthquake fault zone as delineated by the 1972 Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map Act. The nearest known potentially active fault is the Clovis Fault, located approximately 14 miles northeast of the site. No active faults have been mapped within the Project boundaries, so there is no potential for fault rupture. It is anticipated that the proposed Project site would be subject to some ground acceleration and ground shaking associated with seismic activity during its

design life. The Project site would be engineered and constructed in strict accordance with the earthquake resistant design requirements contained in the latest edition of the California Building Code (CBC) for seismic zone III, as well as Title 24 of the California Administrative Code, and therefore would avoid potential seismically induced hazards on planned structures. The impact of seismic hazards on the Project would be *less than significant*.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. Construction activities associated with the Project involves ground preparation work for the residential development and the associated improvements. These activities could expose barren soils to sources of wind or water, resulting in the potential for erosion and sedimentation on and off the Project site. During construction, nuisance flow caused by minor rain could flow off-site. The City and/or contractor would be required to employ appropriate sediment and erosion control BMPs as part of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) that would be required in the California National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES). In addition, soil erosion and loss of topsoil would be minimized through implementation of the SVJAPCD fugitive dust control measures (See Section III). Once construction is complete, the Project would not result in soil erosion or loss of topsoil. Adherence to local and state requirements will ensure that any impacts are *less than significant*.

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?

Less Than Significant Impact. As discussed in Impact a) above, the site is not at significant risk from earthquakes, ground shaking, liquefaction, or landslide and is otherwise considered geologically stable. Subsidence is typically related to over-extraction of groundwater from certain types of geologic formations where the water is partly responsible for supporting the ground surface. However, the City of Fresno is

not recognized by the U.S. Geological Service as being in an area of subsidence.¹ Impacts are considered *less than significant*.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. According to the Geotechnical Investigation Report (see Appendix F), the subsurface exploration performed for this project indicated the native soil profile generally consisted of laterally discontinuous layers of silty sand, sandy silt, and relatively clean sand extending to the maximum depth explored of approximately 21 feet below the existing ground surface. The relative consistency of the granular soils ranged from medium dense to dense, while the relative consistency of the fine-grained soils ranged from stiff to hard. At Borings B-4, B-5, and B-7, loose zones of sand were encountered between approximately 7 and 17 feet.

The soils encountered in the test borings are related to alluvial deposits that have been deposited in the central San Joaquin Valley over the past several thousand years. The encountered soils indicate near surface soils have a low expansion potential (Expansion Index ≤ 50). Any impacts are *less than significant*.

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

No Impact. The Project does not include the construction, replacement, or disturbance of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems. The Project will be required to tie into existing sewer services (See Utilities section for more details). Therefore, there is *no impact*.

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

¹ U.S. Geological Service. Areas of Land Subsidence in California. https://ca.water.usgs.gov/land_subsidence/california-subsidence-areas.html. Accessed January 2022.

Less Than Significant Impact. As identified in the previous cultural study performed for the project site (see Appendix C), there are no known paleontological resources on or near the site. (See Section V. for more details). Mitigation measures CUL-1.1 and CUL-3 have been added that will protect unknown (buried) resources during construction, including paleontological resources. There are no unique geological features on site or in the area. Therefore, there is a *less than significant impact*.

Mitigation Measures

None are required.

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS – Would the project:				
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

a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?

Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation. The development of the proposed Project will generate GHG emissions both in construction and operation. The California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) was utilized to estimate emissions from the proposed Project, including GHG emissions. Output files showing the modeling assumptions are provided in Appendix A.

Construction

The SJVAPCD does not recommend assessing the significance of construction-related emissions; however, other jurisdictions, such as the SCAQMD and the SMAQMD have concluded that construction emissions should be included since they may remain in the atmosphere for years after construction is complete. In order to account for the construction emissions, amortizations of the total emissions generated during construction were based on the life of the development (30 years) and added to the operational emissions. Construction-related GHG emissions are provided in Table 6.

Table 6: Construction Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Year	MTCO2E per year
2021	52.92
2022	567.97
2023	434.10
2024	434.61
2025	430.24
2026	425.49
2027	87.10
Total	2,432.43
<i>Amortized over 30 years</i>	81.10

Operation

Operational or long-term emissions occur over the life of the project. Sources of emissions may include motor vehicles and trucks, energy usage, water usage, waste generation, and area sources, such as landscaping activities and residential wood burning. Operational GHG emissions are provided in Table 7.

Table 7: Operational Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Source	MTCO2E per year
Area	89.64
Energy	276.28
Mobile	3,063.18
Waste	119.96
Water	17.74
Amortized Construction Emissions	81.10
Total	3,647.90

As required by the City of Fresno Greenhouse Gas Reduction Plan, adopted in 2014, the proposed Project is required to comply with all applicable General Plan policies for ministerial and discretionary actions. Implementation of Impact GHG-1 in the MMRP dated April 8, 2022, which includes compliance with the City of Fresno’s 2014 GHG Reduction Plan, will ensure the Project will not generate greenhouse gas emissions that may have a significant effect on the environment. Impacts are *less than significant with mitigation incorporation*.

b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

Less Than Significant Impact. The City of Fresno has adopted local plans that promote renewable energy and energy efficiency. Fresno Green—The City of Fresno’s Strategy for Achieving Sustainability— was adopted in 2007 (Fresno Green).

One strategy of Fresno Green is for Fresno to become a leader in renewable energy use and creation of related innovative technology and new business enterprises. Fresno Green was the City's first effort to improve sustainability. The City of Fresno General Plan Update and Greenhouse Gas Reduction Plan (GHG Plan) build on this initial effort. The project's consistency with applicable GHG policies from the GHG Reduction Plan policies is assessed below.

- **Policy RC-2-a Link Land Use to Transportation.** Promote mixed-use, higher density infill development in multi-modal corridors. Support land use patterns that make more efficient use of the transportation system and plan future transportation investments in areas of higher-intensity development. Discourage investment in infrastructure that would not meet these criteria.

Consistent. The project will provide density consistent with the RS-5 zone district, at 5-12 dwelling units per acre. There is currently no transit route in the immediate vicinity; however, the site is substantially surrounded by other residential development and would be considered infill development. The project provides a development densities conducive to future service with transit connections.

- **Objective UF-12 Locate roughly one-half of future residential development in infill areas**—defined as being within the City on December 21, 2012—including the Downtown core area and surrounding neighborhoods, mixed-use centers and transit-oriented development along major BRT corridors, and other non-corridor infill areas, and vacant land.

Consistent. The project site is substantially surrounded by urban development and is already designated for urban development in the Fresno General Plan. Additionally, the site is within the Roosevelt Community Plan.

- **Policy LU-2-b Infill Development for Affordable Housing.** Consider a priority infill incentive program for residential infill development of existing vacant lots and underutilized sites within the City as a strategy to help to meet the affordable housing needs of the community.

Not Applicable. The project will provide market-rate single-family housing in an area substantially surrounded by urban development. Although not

classified as “affordable housing,” development of the project would provide housing that helps the City meet the needs of the community.

- **Policy LU-5-f High Density Residential Uses.** Promote high-density residential uses to support Activity Centers and BRT corridors, affordable housing and walkable access to transit stops.

Not Applicable. The project is not within a designated Activity Center or BRT corridor.

- **Policy UF-14-a Design Guidelines for Walkability.** Use design guidelines and standards for a walkable and pedestrian-scaled environment with a network of streets and connections for pedestrians and bicyclists, as well as transit and autos.

Consistent. The project will comply with the City Development Code, which requires appropriate pedestrian infrastructure in new development projects. The project connects to the existing street network that includes sidewalks with pedestrian friendly street crossings.

- **Policy MT-6-a Link Residences to Destinations.** Design a pedestrian and bicycle path network that links residential areas with Activity Centers, such as parks and recreational facilities, educational institutions, employment centers, cultural sites, and other focal points of the city environment.

Consistent. The project will provide pedestrian infrastructure connecting to neighboring development and connecting to the on-site pocket park. The project also includes a trail along the northern site boundary which will connect to the existing trail system.

- **Objective RC-8** Reduce the consumption of non - renewable energy resources by requiring and encouraging conservation measures and the use of alternative energy sources.

Consistent. The project will comply with Title 24 Energy Efficiency Standards and CalGreen Code requirements for solar panels, electric vehicle charging, and water conservation. The 2019 Title 24 Standards include a solar photovoltaic systems requirement for new low-rise residential homes.

- **Policy RC-8-a Existing Standards and Programs.** Continue existing beneficial energy conservation programs, including adhering to the California Energy Code in new construction and major renovations.

Project Consistency: Consistent. The project will comply with all applicable energy standards such as Title 24 Building Energy Standards and home appliance purchased for the homes will comply with Title 20 Appliance Standards.

- **Policy RC-8-b Energy Reduction Targets.** Strive to reduce per capita residential electricity use to 1,800 kWh per year and nonresidential electricity use to 2,700 kWh per year per capita by developing and implementing incentives, design and operation standards, promoting alternative energy sources, and cost - effective savings.

Project Consistency: Consistent. The project will comply with the Title 24 energy standards in effect at the time building permits are processed for approval. With the new solar panel requirements, homes are expected to meet or exceed this target.

The proposed project would comply with federal, State, and local regulations aimed at reducing energy consumption. Local regulations have been developed in accordance with federal and State energy regulations, such as the California Energy Code Building Energy Efficiency Standards (CCR Title 24, Part 6), the CALGreen Code (CCR Title 24, Part 11), and SB 743, which are also aimed at reducing energy consumption.

The proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency. The impact would be *less than significant*.

Mitigation Measures

None are required.

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIAL – Would the project:				
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 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 it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?			X	

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>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</p> <p>a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?</p>			X	
<p>f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</p>			X	
<p>g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?</p>				X

DISCUSSION

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

Less Than Significant Impact. Construction of the Project would require the use and transport of hazardous materials, including fuels, oils, and other chemicals (e.g., paints, lead, adhesives, etc.) typically used during construction. It is likely that these hazardous materials and vehicles would be stored by the contractor(s) on-site during

construction activities. Improper use and transportation of hazardous materials could result in accidental releases or spills, potentially posing health risks to workers, the public, and the environment. However, all materials used during construction would be contained, stored, and handled in compliance with applicable standards and regulations established by the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC), the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA). In addition, a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) is a State requirement and shall include emergency procedures for incidental hazardous materials releases. The SWPPP also includes Best Management Practices which includes requirements for hazardous materials storage.

A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA), dated March 15, 2021, was performed on behalf of the proposed Project and is provided as Appendix D. The assessment revealed that while the site has had two documented instances of leaks, spills, or releases of environmental contaminants, due to the California Regional Water Quality Control Board and WEC indicating no further action required, it is concluded that the site is not a recognized environmental condition (REC). The Phase I ESA recommended that prior to development, the site be tested for agricultural pesticides and any trash/debris be removed from the area.

The subsequent Soil Sampling Investigation revealed concentrations of some organochlorine pesticides in the samples that were well below their respective screening levels. Although arsenic concentrations were above the screening levels, the concentrations detected appeared to be generally consistent with naturally occurring concentrations in the area. Based on these results, no further investigation is warranted at the subject site at this time.

Thus, the use of hazardous materials would be confined to the Project construction period. The Project itself, once constructed, will not contain, use or produce any hazardous materials. Any impacts are *less than significant*.

b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?

Less Than Significant. The proposed Project includes the development of 200 single family residential units. As discussed in Impact a) above, the use of hazardous materials would be confined to the Project construction period and those materials would be contained, stored, and handled in compliance with applicable standards and

regulations. As the Project itself, once constructed, will not contain, use or produce any hazardous materials, there are *less than significant impacts* regarding the release of hazardous materials into the environment.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. No schools are located within 0.25 miles of the Project site. This condition precludes the possibility of activities associated with the proposed Project exposing schools within a 0.25-mile radius of the project site to hazardous materials. Storey Elementary School is approximately 0.5 miles southeast of the Project site, and Phoenix Secondary School is 0.8 miles to the southeast. Any impacts would be *less than significant*.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. A database search was conducted to identify recorded hazardous materials incidents in the Project area as described in the Phase I ESA (see Attachment D). The search included reviews in the Historical Underground Storage Tank (HIST UST), Statewide Environmental Evaluation and Planning System (SWEEPS UST), California Facility Inventory (CA FID UST), Leaking Underground Storage Tanks (LUST), Historical "Cortese" Hazardous Waste & Substances Sites (HIST CORTESE) and Certified Unified Program Agency (CUPA) listings and other federal, state, and local agency databases. The database search found records for 2122 South Peach Avenue (APN 481-020-47) indicating that during the demolition of an above ground concrete structure, a heavy tar-like substance was encountered. The owners, the John Ohanesian Estate, requested an investigation due to this discovery. Willbanks Environmental Consulting, Inc. (WEC) performed 16 soil borings: four on June 26, 2015 and 12 on September 14, 2015. Soil samples were taken and tested for benzene, ethylbenzene, naphthalene, toluene, total xylenes, p- & m- xylenes, o-xylenes, and crude oil. Constituents such as BTEX and naphthalene that display higher human health risk were not detected. The average concentrations of crude oil are less than the 10,000 mg/kg TPH_{mo}, which is the Environmental Screening Level (ESL) for human health risk in a commercial setting. Subsequently, the California

Regional Water Quality Control Board issued a letter on December 23, 2015 indicating no further action was required (see Appendix E).

In addition, documents provided by KB Home Central California indicate in 2018 Pacific Gas & Electric (PG&E) hired contractors to perform horizontal borings on or near 2121 South Willow Avenue (APN 481-020-01). One of the contractors dumped drilling spoils on the property without permission. PG&E hired a testing lab, HydroChem PSC, to test the soils and characterize them for disposal. The soil was removed and clean fill was brought back on to the property in place of the removed soils. Prior to removal, the drilling spoils were analyzed for California Assessment Metals (CAM 17) and Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons as referenced to diesel, gasoline, and motor oil (TPH-d, TPH-g, and TPH-mo, respectively). The test results indicated that the drilling spoils were within the Tier 2 ESLs for a residential subdivision, with the exception of one sample for TPH-d. A review of the HydroChem PSC documents by WEC found that the incident required no further action as the soils were removed and clean fill was brought in.

Ten off-site facilities in the Project vicinity were listed within the regulatory databases. Based on the information provided, the Phase I ESA found that all ten facilities do not require further action, and therefore are not considered to be recognized environmental conditions (RECs) with respect to the subject site (See Appendix D for full list and further information). These sites are not expected to have a negative impact on the Project. There would be *a less than significant impact*.

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

Less than Significant Impact. There are no private airstrips in the Project vicinity. The Fresno Yosemite International Airport is located approximately 3.5 miles northeast of the site. According to the Fresno County *Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan*, the proposed site is located outside the airport's airport influence area and safety zones.² In addition, the proposed Project requires an FAA determination of no hazard

² Fresno County Comprehensive Airport Land Use Plan. December 2018. https://www.fresnocog.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/01/fresno-final-alucp-113018-r_part2.pdf Accessed November 2021.

to air navigation and has filed for that analysis. Thus, any impacts are *less than significant*.

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

Less Than Significant. The City has consulted with its police, fire and ambulance service providers to determine that the proposed Project provides adequate emergency access to the Project site and surrounding areas. The City will also provide specific construction schedules and pertinent Project information so that adequate access is maintained at all times. Therefore, the Project will have *a less than significant impact*.

g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires?

No Impact. Implementation of the Project would not change the degree of exposure to wildfires because there are no wildlands in the Project vicinity, thus precluding the possibility of wildfires. Therefore, there is *no impact*.

Mitigation Measures

None are required.

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY – Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?			X	

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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:		X		
i) Result in a substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;		X		
ii) Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site:		X		

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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		X		
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	

DISCUSSION

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?

Less Than Significant Impact. The Project has the potential to impact water quality standards and/or waste discharge requirements during construction (temporary impacts) and operation. Impacts are discussed below.

Construction

Although the proposed Project site is relatively small in scale, grading, excavation and loading activities associated with construction activities could temporarily increase runoff, erosion, and sedimentation. Construction activities also could result in soil compaction and wind erosion effects that could adversely affect soils and reduce the revegetation potential at construction sites and staging areas.

Three general sources of potential short-term construction-related stormwater pollution associated with the proposed project are: 1) the handling, storage, and disposal of construction materials containing pollutants; 2) the maintenance and operation of construction equipment; and 3) earth moving activities which, when not controlled, may generate soil erosion and transportation, via storm runoff or mechanical equipment. Generally, routine safety precautions for handling and storing construction materials may effectively mitigate the potential pollution of stormwater by these materials. These same types of common sense, “good housekeeping” procedures can be extended to non-hazardous stormwater pollutants such as sawdust and other solid wastes.

Poorly maintained vehicles and heavy equipment leaking fuel, oil, antifreeze, or other fluids on the construction site are also common sources of stormwater pollution and soil contamination. In addition, grading activities can greatly increase erosion processes. Two general strategies are recommended to prevent construction silt from entering local storm drains. First, erosion control procedures should be implemented for those areas that must be exposed. Secondly, the area should be secured to control offsite migration of pollutants. These Best Management Practices (BMPs) would be required in the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) to be prepared prior to commencement of Project construction. When properly designed and implemented, these “good-housekeeping” practices are expected to reduce short-term construction-related impacts to less than significant.

In accordance with the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Stormwater Program, the Project will be required to comply with existing regulatory requirements to prepare a SWPPP designed to control erosion and the loss of topsoil to the extent practicable using BMPs that the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) has deemed effective in controlling erosion, sedimentation, runoff during construction activities. The specific controls are subject to the review and approval by the RWQCB and are an existing regulatory requirement.

Therefore, any impacts are *less than significant*.

- b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?**

Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation. The proposed Project includes the development of 200 single family residential units and associated improvements. Water service would be provided to the Project by the City of Fresno. Based on the assumptions in the City's UWMP, the Project would not negatively impact water supplies or otherwise deplete groundwater supplies. Moreover, the proposed Project is not anticipated to interfere with groundwater recharge efforts being implemented by the City. The City's UWMP contains a detailed evaluation of existing sources of water supply, anticipated future water demand, extensive conservation measures, and the development of new water supplies (recycled water, increased recharge, surface water treatment, etc.). Measures contained in the UWMP as well as the City's General Plan are intended to reduce demands on groundwater resources by augmenting supply and introducing conservation measures and other mitigation strategies. Implementation of PEIR Mitigation Measure HYD – 2.1, which states that the City shall continue to be an active participant in the North Kings Groundwater Sustainability Agency to ensure that the Kings Subbasin has balanced levels of pumping and recharge will ensure that any impacts remain *less than significant with mitigation incorporated*.

- 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:**

- i. Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?**

Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation. The Project includes changes to the existing stormwater drainage pattern of the area through the installation of asphalt, residences, driveways, landscaping, curb, gutter and sidewalks. The Project has been reviewed by the Fresno Metropolitan Flood Control District and conditions and requirements of the Project pertaining to storm drain facilities have been provided to the Project developer. The Project developer will be required to prepare a drainage / grading plan as identified in Mitigation

Measure HYD – 1 of the Project MMRP dated April 8, 2022 (preparation of a drainage / grading plan). Therefore, the Project will have a *less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated*.

- ii. **Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner, which would result in flooding on- or off-site?**

Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation. As discussed in Impact c)i. above, the proposed Project developer will be required to prepare a drainage/grading plan as identified in Mitigation Measure HYD – 1 of the Project MMRP dated April 8, 2022 to reduce impacts resulting from surface runoff to *less than significant* with mitigation incorporated.

- iii. **Create or contribute runoff water, which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?**

Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation. The proposed Project will connect to the City of Fresno’s existing storm-drain system and pay drainage fees pursuant to the Drainage Fee Ordinance. Implementation of Project Specific Mitigation Measure HYD – 1 dated April 8, 2022 will limit the generation of polluted runoff to *less than significant* with mitigation incorporated.

- iv. **Impede or redirect flood flows?**

Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation. As described in Impact c)ii and c)iii above, the proposed Project developer will be required to prepare a drainage/grading plan (Project Specific Mitigation Measure HYD – 1 dated April 8, 2022) and will connect to the City of Fresno’s existing storm-drain system. Both of those items will ensure that the proposed Project will be *less than significant with mitigation incorporated* regarding impeding or redirecting flood flows.

d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?

Less Than Significant Impact. The Project is outside of any Special Flood Hazard Areas and Other Areas of Flood Hazard, as identified by the Federal Emergency Management Agency, Flood Map 06019C2130H, effective 2/18/2009. The Project will not conflict with any water quality control plans or sustainable groundwater management plan. As mentioned in Impact c) above, all new development within the City of Fresno Planning Area must conform to standards and plans detailed by the Fresno Metropolitan Flood Control District. By conforming to all standards and policies as outlined, any impacts will remain *less than significant*.

e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed Project will be in compliance with all water quality control plans and other hydrological requirements set forth by the City of Fresno. Any impacts are *less than significant*.

Mitigation Measures

1. The proposed project shall implement and incorporate HYD – 1 as identified in the attached Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program dated April 8, 2022.

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING – Would the project:				
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

a) Physically divide an established community?

Less Than Significant Impact. The immediate vicinity of the proposed project site is comprised of residential neighborhoods, vacant land, and agricultural lands and roadways. The proposed Project includes the development of a residential subdivision and will not divide an existing community. Any impacts are *less than significant*.

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?

Less Than Significant Impact. Based upon compliance with the goals, objectives and policies referenced herein below, the proposed Project is determined to be consistent with the Fresno General Plan goals and objectives related to land use and the urban form:

Goal No. 1 of the Fresno General Plan: Increase opportunity, economic development, business and job creation.

The project will provide temporary construction jobs and will provide housing for 614 members of the growing local work force.

Goal No. 7 of the Fresno General Plan: Provide for a diversity of districts, neighborhoods, housing types (including affordable housing), residential densities, job

opportunities, recreation, open space, and educational venues that appeal to a broad range of people throughout the City.

This Goal contributes to the establishment of a comprehensive city-wide land use planning strategy to meet economic development objectives, achieve efficient and equitable use of resources and infrastructure, and create an attractive living environment in accordance with Objective LU-1 of the Fresno General Plan.

Goal No. 8 of the Fresno General Plan: Develop Complete Neighborhoods and districts with an efficient and diverse mix of residential densities, building types, and affordability which are designed to be healthy, attractive, and centered by schools, parks, and public and commercial services to provide a sense of place and that provide as many services as possible within walking distance.

The project includes a trail, is near public schools, and is in an area planned for additional residential development.

Goal No. 12 of the Fresno General Plan: Resolve existing public infrastructure and service deficiencies, make full use of existing infrastructure, and invest in improvements to increase competitiveness and promote economic growth.

The Project will tie into existing infrastructure (water, sewer and storm water) located in the project vicinity.

Implementing Policies LU-1-a and LU-2-a of the Fresno General Plan: Promote development of vacant, underdeveloped, and re-developable land within the Existing City Limits as of December 31, 2012 where urban services are available.

The proposed Project will be constructed in an area planned for residential development where existing infrastructure is available.

Implementing Policy LU-5-c of the Fresno General Plan: Promotes medium density residential uses to maximize efficient use of residential property through a wide range of densities.

The proposed Project is located in an area that is planned for medium density residential development.

The Project will not conflict with any conservation plans since it is not located within any conservation plan areas.

Fresno County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan: On December 3, 2018, the Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) adopted the Fresno County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan. The proposed Project is outside the Airport Influence Area of the nearest airport, Fresno Yosemite International Airport. The ALUCP restrictions on density and open land for the TPZ are not expected to be an issue for the proposed Project.

Therefore, it is determined that the proposed Project is consistent with respective general plan objectives and policies and will not significantly conflict with applicable land use plans, policies or regulations of the City of Fresno. Furthermore, the proposed Project, including the design and improvement of the subject property, is found; (1) To be consistent with the goals, objectives and policies of the applicable Fresno General Plan; (2) To be suitable for the type and density of development; (3) To be safe from potential cause or introduction of serious public health problems; and, (4) To not conflict with any public interests in the subject property or adjacent lands.

There are no aspects of this Project that will result in impacts to land use and planning beyond those analyzed in the PEIR SCH No. 2012111015 for the Fresno General Plan.

The Project would have a *less than significant impact*.

Mitigation Measures

None are required.

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XII. MINERAL RESOURCES – Would the project:				

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No 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

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

No Impact. There are no known mineral resources in the proposed Project area and none are identified in the City’s General Plan near the Project site. Therefore, there is *no impact*.

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

No Impact. As discussed in Impact a) above, there are no known mineral resources identified in the City’s General Plan in the proposed Project area. There is *no impact*.

Mitigation Measures

None are required.

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIII. NOISE – Would the project result in:				
a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?			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	

DISCUSSION

- 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 in other applicable local, state, or federal standards?**

Less Than Significant Impact.

Short-term (Construction) Noise Impacts

Proposed Project construction related activities will involve temporary noise sources. Typical construction related equipment include graders, trenchers, small tractors and excavators. During the proposed Project construction, noise from construction related activities will contribute to the noise environment in the immediate vicinity. Activities involved in construction will generate maximum noise levels, as indicated in Table 6, ranging from 79 to 91 dBA at a distance of 50 feet, without feasible noise control (e.g., mufflers) and ranging from 75 to 80 dBA at a distance of 50 feet, with feasible noise controls.

**Table 6
Typical Construction Noise Levels**

Type of Equipment	dBA at 50 ft	
	Without Feasible Noise Control	With Feasible Noise Control
Dozer or Tractor	80	75
Excavator	88	80
Scraper	88	80
Front End Loader	79	75
Backhoe	85	75
Grader	85	75
Truck	91	75

The distinction between short-term construction noise impacts and long-term operational noise impacts is a typical one in both CEQA documents and local noise ordinances, which generally recognize the reality that short-term noise from construction is inevitable and cannot be mitigated beyond a certain level. Thus, local agencies frequently tolerate short-term noise at levels that they would not accept for permanent noise sources. A more severe approach would be impractical and might

preclude the kind of construction activities that are to be expected from time to time in urban environments. Most residents of urban areas recognize this reality and expect to hear construction activities on occasion.

In addition, construction activities would not occur between the hours of 10:00 PM and 7:00 AM, Monday through Saturday, and not at all on Sundays, in accordance with Fresno Municipal Code Section 10-109, which limits work hours “to between the hours of 7 AM and 10 PM on any day except Sunday.”

Long-term (Operational) Noise Impacts

The primary source of on-going noise from the Project will be from vehicles traveling to and from the site and from traffic traveling along S. Peach Avenue. The Project will generate an increase in traffic on some roadways in the Project area. However, the relatively low number of new trips associated with the Project is not likely to increase the ambient noise levels by a significant amount. Policy H-1-b of the City’s Noise Element addresses significant Project-related increases in ambient noise levels for evaluation of noise impacts. A significant increase is assumed to occur if a project causes the ambient noise level to increase by the following amounts:

Where ambient noise levels are <60 dB : an increase of 5 dB or more

Where ambient noise levels are 60-65 dB: an increase of 3 dB or more

Where ambient noise levels are >65 dB :an increase of 1.5 dB or more

Given the amount of existing vehicular activity in the Project area, the moderate increase in traffic associated with the new residential development is not expected to increase ambient noise levels by more than 1 dB. The area is active with vehicles and residential housing and the proposed Project will not introduce a new significant source of noise that isn’t already occurring in the area. Potential impacts are *less than significant*.

b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed Project includes the construction of a single-family residential development with associated improvements. Typical outdoor sources of perceptible groundborne vibration are construction equipment, steel

wheeled trains, and traffic on rough roads. Increases in groundborne vibration levels attributable to the proposed Project would be through the use of various types of construction equipment, including bulldozers. The use of major groundborne vibration-generating construction equipment, such as pile drivers, would not be required for this Project. There are no aspects of daily operations that would create groundborne vibration. As such, any impacts would be *less than significant*.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. There are no private airstrips in the Project vicinity. The Fresno Yosemite International Airport is located approximately 3.5 miles northeast of the site. According to the Fresno County *Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan*, the proposed site is located outside the airport’s airport influence area and safety zones.³ As such, impacts will remain *less than significant*.

Mitigation Measures:

None are required.

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING – Would the project:				

³ Fresno County Comprehensive Airport Land Use Plan. December 2018. https://www.fresnocog.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/01/fresno-final-alucp-113018-r_part2.pdf Accessed November 2021.

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

DISCUSSION

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

Less Than Significant Impact. There are 200 new homes associated with the proposed Project. The Fresno General Plan Housing Element cites average household size in the City as 3.07 persons per unit. Using this ratio, the project will accommodate approximately 614 persons. This development has been planned for as the site is currently designated Residential – Medium Density and zoned as RS-5/UGM (5-12 du/ac). As such, the increase in population as a result of project development has been anticipated and accounted for in adopted planning and policy documents. There is a *less than significant* impact.

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

No Impact. There are currently no residential units on-site so no people or existing housing will be displaced. There is *no impact*.

Mitigation Measures

None are required.

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XV. PUBLIC SERVICES – Would the project:				
a) Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
Fire protection?			X	
Police protection?			X	
Schools?			X	

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Parks?			X	
Other public facilities?			X	

DISCUSSION

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

i. **Fire protection?**

Less Than Significant Impact. The Project includes construction of 200 single-family residential units which will accommodate approximately 614 persons.

The City of Fresno Fire Department (Fire Department) offers a full range of services including fire prevention, suppression, emergency medical care, hazardous materials, urban search and rescue response, as well as emergency preparedness planning and public education coordination within the Fresno City limit, in addition to having mutual aid agreements with the Fresno County Fire Protection District, and the City of Clovis Fire Departments.

The City of Fresno Fire Department operates its facilities under the guidance set by the National Fire Protection Association in NFPA 1710, the Standard for the Organization and Deployment of Fire Suppression Operations, Emergency Medical Operations, and Special Operation to the Public by Career Fire

Departments. NFPA 1710 sets standards for turnout time, travel time, and total response time for fire and emergency medical incidents, as well as other standards for operation and fire service. The Fire Department has established the objectives set forth in NFPA 1710 as department objectives to ensure the public health, safety, and welfare.

The proposed Project would be served by the current Fire Station 87, which is located at 4706 East Drummond Avenue, approximately 1.5 miles southwest of the Project site. After reviewing the Project, the Fire Department has determined that the Project can be adequately serviced by the current local Fire Facilities and Personnel, consistent with National Fire Protection Association 1710 Objectives.

The Fresno General Plan contains the following objectives and policies:

Objective PU-3: Enhance the level of fire protection to meet the increasing demand for services from an increasing population.

Implementing Policies:

- **PU-3-a** Fire Prevention Inspections. Develop strategies to Fire Prevention Inspections. Enable the performance of annual fire and life safety inspection of all industrial, commercial, institutional, and multi-family residential buildings, in accordance with nationally recognized standards for the level of service necessary for a large Metropolitan Area, including a self-certification program.
- **PU-3-b** Reduction Strategies. Develop community risk Reduction Strategies, such as strategies that target high service demand areas, vulnerable populations (e.g. young children, older adults, non-English speaking residents, persons with disabilities, etc.), and high life hazard occupancies.
- **PU-3-c** Public Education Strategies. Develop strategies to Public Education Strategies. re-establish and enhance routine public education outreach to all sectors of the community.
- **PU-3-d** Review Development Applications. Continue Fire Department review of development applications, provide comments and recommend conditions

of approval that will ensure adequate on-site and off-site fire protection systems and features are provided.

- **PU-3-e Building Codes.** Adopt and enforce amendments to construction and fire codes, as determined appropriate, to systematically reduce the level of risk to life and property from fire, commensurate with the City's fire suppression capabilities.
- **PU-3-f Adequate Infrastructure.** Continue to pursue the provision of adequate water supplies, hydrants, and appropriate property access to allow for adequate fire suppression throughout the City.
- **PU-3-g Cost Recovery.** Continue to evaluate appropriate codes, policies, and methods to generate fees or other sources of revenue to offset the ongoing personnel and maintenance costs of providing fire prevention and response services.
- **PU-3-h Annexations.** Develop annexation strategies to include the appropriate rights-of-way and easements necessary to provide cost effective emergency services.
- **PU-3-i New Fire Station Locations.** Consideration will be given to co-locating new Fire Station facilities with other public property including, but not limited to, police substations, schools, parks, playgrounds, and community centers to create a synergy of participation in the neighborhood with the potential result of less vandalism and promotion of a better sense of security for the citizens using these facilities.

The Project would be required to comply with all applicable fire and building safety codes (California Building Code and Uniform Fire Code) to ensure fire safety elements are incorporated into final Project design. As a result, appropriate fire safety considerations will be included as part of the final design of the Project. Project implementation will result in *less than significant impacts*.

ii. **Police protection?**

Less Than Significant Impact. The Project includes construction of 200 single-family residential units which will accommodate approximately 614 persons. Protection services would be provided to the Project site from the

existing Southeast Police District, approximately two miles to the northwest at 1617 S. Cedar Avenue. The Fresno Police Department provides a full range of police services including uniformed patrol response to calls for service, crime prevention, tactical crime and enforcement (including gang and violent crime suppression), and traffic enforcement/accident prevention. The Project site is located in an area currently served by the Police Department; the Department would not need to expand its existing service area or construct a new facility to serve the Project site. Any impacts are considered *less than significant*.

iii. Schools?

Less Than Significant Impact. The Project includes construction of 200 single-family residential units which will accommodate approximately 614 persons. Educational services for the proposed Project will be provided by the Fresno Unified School District (FUSD) and the Project developer will be required to pay a School Impact Fee as part of the development application process. Any impacts are considered *less than significant*.

iv. Parks?

Less Than Significant Impact. The Project includes construction of 200 single-family residential units which will accommodate approximately 614 persons. The proposed Project also includes the construction of a pedestrian trail along the northern site boundary and a 0.36-acre pocket park in the center of the development. Pocket parks are intended to serve the needs of a smaller, specific neighborhood located within a half-mile radius of the pocket park and typically include amenities such as a tot lot, picnic bench or shade structure. See Section XVI- Recreation for the full evaluation of recreational facilities and impacts.

In addition to the pocket park and trail connection, the Project will be required to pay City Park facility impact fees as part of the development application process. Impacts are considered *less than significant*.

v. Other public facilities?

Less Than Significant Impact. The Project includes construction of 200 single-family residential units which will accommodate approximately 614 persons. Development of the Project will increase the demand for other public

services; however, this has been anticipated and planned for by the City of Fresno as the site is designated and zoned for residential uses. Impacts are *less than significant*.

Mitigation Measures

None are required.

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVI. RECREATION - Would the project:				
a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?			X	
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?			X	

DISCUSSION

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The Project includes a pocket park and connection to the existing pedestrian trail. The increase of 614 persons resulting from the Project would have a relatively small impact on existing recreational facilities. In order to implement the goals and objectives of the City's General Plan, and to mitigate the impacts caused by future development in the City, park facilities must be constructed. The City Council has determined that a Park Facilities Fee is needed in order to finance these public facilities and to pay for each development's fair share of the construction and acquisition costs. The Project Applicant will be required to pay development impact fees as determined by the City of Park Facilities Fees, as such, impacts are considered *less than significant*.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed Project includes the construction of a 0.36-acre pocket park and a pedestrian trail. Environmental impacts associated with constructing the entire 38-acre project site, including the pocket park and trail construction, are discussed within the environmental analysis of this document. For instance, Sections III, VI and VIII (Air Quality, Energy and Greenhouse Gas, respectively) relied on technical data provided in the CalEEMod output files (provided in Appendix A). The default lot acreage was utilized for modeling emissions estimates, which was 64.94 acres and is much larger than the actual 38-acres to be developed as part of the project. As such, potential emissions estimates resulting from constructing the pocket park and trail have been accounted for. The impact determinations that were made within each environmental topic of this document also apply to construction/operation of the pocket park and trail since these components are part of the overall proposed Project. Any impacts are *less than significant*.

Mitigation Measures

None are required.

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVII. TRANSPORTATION – Would the project:				
a) Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?			X	
b) Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines § 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	

DISCUSSION

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed Project includes the development of 200 single family residential units at the northwest corner of Peach and Florence Avenues. Project development would be in accordance with alternative transportation

policies included in the City of Fresno General Plan, the Fresno County Regional Transportation Plan, and any other adopted policies, plans or programs supporting alternative transportation. As such, any impacts are considered *less than significant*.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. Senate Bill (SB) 743 requires that relevant CEQA analysis of transportation impacts be conducted using a metric known as vehicle miles traveled (VMT) instead of Level of Service (LOS). VMT measures how much actual auto travel (additional miles driven) a proposed project would create on California roads. If the project adds excessive car travel onto our roads, the project may cause a significant transportation impact.

The State CEQA Guidelines were amended to implement SB 743, by adding Section 15064.3. Among its provisions, Section 15064.3 confirms that, except with respect to transportation projects, a project's effect on automobile delay shall not constitute a significant environmental impact. Therefore, LOS measures of impacts on traffic facilities is no longer a relevant CEQA criteria for transportation impacts.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3(b)(4) states that “[a] lead agency has discretion to evaluate a project's vehicle miles traveled, including whether to express the change in absolute terms, per capita, per household or in any other measure. A lead agency may use models to estimate a project's vehicle miles traveled and may revise those estimates to reflect professional judgment based on substantial evidence. Any assumptions used to estimate used to estimate vehicle miles traveled and any revision to model outputs should be documented and explained in the environmental document prepared for the project. The standard of adequacy in Section 15151 shall apply to the analysis described in this section.”

On June 25, 2020, the City of Fresno adopted CEQA Guidelines for Vehicle Miles Traveled Thresholds, pursuant to Senate Bill 743 to be effective of July 1, 2020. The thresholds described therein are referred to herein as the City of Fresno VMT Thresholds. The City of Fresno VMT Thresholds document was prepared and adopted consistent with the requirements of CEQA Guidelines Sections 15064.3 and 15064.7. The December 2018 Technical Advisory on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA (Technical Advisory) published by the Governor's Office of Planning and

Research (OPR), was utilized as a reference and guidance document in the preparation of the Fresno VMT Thresholds.

The City of Fresno VMT Thresholds adopted a screening standard and criteria that can be used to screen out qualified projects that meet the adopted criteria from needing to prepare a detailed VMT analysis.

The City of Fresno VMT Thresholds Section 3.0 regarding Project Screening discusses a variety of projects that may be screened out of a VMT analysis including specific development and transportation projects. For development projects, conditions may exist that would presume that a development project has a less than significant impact. These may be size, location, proximity to transit, or trip-making potential. For transportation projects, the primary attribute to consider with transportation projects is the potential to increase vehicle travel, sometimes referred to as “induced travel.”

The proposed project is eligible to screen out because it is located in a low-VMT zone, as designated by the Fresno Council of Governments screening map and Figure 6 of the City of Fresno VMT Thresholds (Section 3.0, Project Screening).⁴ See Appendix F. As such, the Project will result in a *less than significant* VMT impact and is consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3(b).

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed Project has been designed for ease of access, adequate circulation/movement, and is typical of residential developments in the City of Fresno. On-site circulation patterns do not involve high speeds, sharp curves or dangerous intersections. Although there will be an increase in the volume of vehicles accessing the site and surrounding areas, the proposed Project will not present a substantial increase in hazards. Any impacts are considered *less than significant*.

d) Result in inadequate emergency access?

⁴ Fresno Council of Governments. Step 1: Initial Screening. <https://www.fresnocog.org/project/vmt-screening/>. Accessed January 2022.

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed Project does not involve a change to any emergency response plan. Access points to the Project are along Peach Avenue and the site will remain accessible to emergency vehicles of all sizes. As such, potential impacts are *less than significant*.

Mitigation Measures

None are required.

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES – Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in PRC section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:				
i) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in PRC section 5020.1(k), or,			X	

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 PRC section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of PRC section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.			X	

DISCUSSION

a) **Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:**

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

Less Than Significant Impact. As discussed in Section V, Cultural Resources, Impact c), a prehistoric and historic site records and literature search was conducted for the Project area through the Southern San Joaquin Valley Archaeological Information Center of the California Historical Resources

Information System on November 12, 2021 (File RS#21-440). There have been no previous cultural resource studies performed in the Project area; however, eight cultural resource studies fall in the one-half mile radius, FR-00296, 01800, 02000, 02126, 02127, 02194, 02217, 02972. Records indicated that there are no known sites within the Project area. Four recorded resources fall within the one-half mile radius, P-10-003930, 004677, 005120, & 005305. These resources consist of historic railroads, canals, and historic properties. A review of the Sacred Lands Inventory by the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) was also performed and the results were negative. As such, any impacts are *less than significant*.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. In accordance with Assembly Bill (AB) 52 and Senate Bill (SB) 18, potentially affected Tribes were formally notified of this Project and were given the opportunity to request consultation on the Project. The City contacted the Native American Heritage Commission, requesting a contact list of applicable Native American Tribes, which was provided to the City. The City provided letters to the listed Tribes on December 17, 2021, notifying them of the Project and requesting consultation, if desired. The City did not receive any responses from the tribes contacted by the response due date of January 17, 2022. Therefore, there is a *less than significant impact*.

Mitigation Measures

None are required.

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS – Would the project:				
a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effect?			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 waste water treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?			X	

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d) Generate solid waste in excess of state or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?			X	
e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?			X	

DISCUSSION

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

Less Than Significant Impact. Wastewater service, water, electric power, natural gas and telecommunications facilities would all provide service to the proposed Project from their respective existing facilities and as such, would not be required to construct new or expanded facilities. The Project will have a *less than significant impact* to this analysis area.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. Water service would be provided to the Project by the City of Fresno and the City of Fresno Department of Public Utilities Water Division

has determined that no new or expanded water supply facilities are necessary to serve the Project. Project water demand will be determined using the City's adopted 2020 Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) methodologies and are calculated based on 200 single-family residential units and the City's 2020 average daily per capita water use, which was 198 gallons per capita per day (GPCD).⁵

- 200 dwelling units X 3.07 persons per dwelling unit = 614 persons X 198 GPCD = 121,572 total gallons per day X 365 days per year = 44,373,780 gallons per year (or ~136.18 acre/feet/year)

While the Project would increase demand for water resources beyond current levels, the City is far below its 2020 daily per capita water use target of 247 CPDC due to the extensive conservation effort implemented by the City in the past decade.⁶ Based on the assumptions in the City's UWMP, the Project would not negatively impact water supplies or otherwise deplete groundwater supplies. Moreover, the proposed Project is not anticipated to interfere with groundwater recharge efforts being implemented by the City. The City's UWMP contains a detailed evaluation of existing sources of water supply, anticipated future water demand, extensive conservation measures, and the development of new water supplies (recycled water, increased recharge, surface water treatment, etc.). Measures contained in the UWMP as well as the City's General Plan are intended to reduce demands on groundwater resources by augmenting supply and introducing conservation measures and other mitigation strategies.

In addition to adequate water supply, the Project is also subject to minimum water pressure requirements. The City of Fresno Municipal Code Section 6-501 states that estimated peak hour water demands shall be based on 2.12 gallons per minute for single-family residential units. The Fire Protection Water Demand shall be added to the overall Project water demands at 1,500 gallons per minute. The sum of the Peak Hour Water Demands and Fire Protection Demands (in gpm) shall establish the total instantaneous water supply flow required for the project, inclusive of fire protection. The Project Applicant will be required to adhere to these standards and maintain them in perpetuity.

⁵ City of Fresno 2020 Urban Water Management Plan. June 2021. Page ES-4. https://www.fresno.gov/publicutilities/wp-content/uploads/sites/16/2021/06/Fresno-2020-UWMP_Public-Draft_2021-06-29.pdf. Accessed March 2022.

⁶ Ibid.

The proposed Project would not require new or expanded water entitlements and there is sufficient water supply for the Project. Therefore, the impact is *less than significant*.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The Project will result in wastewater from residential units that will be discharged into the City's existing wastewater treatment system. The wastewater will be typical of other urban/residential developments consisting of bathrooms, kitchen drains and other similar features. The Project will not discharge any unusual or atypical wastewater that would violate the City's waste discharge requirements. The City of Fresno Public Works Department has reviewed the Project and determined that it can accommodate the wastewater generated from the project. Therefore, the impact of the Project on wastewater treatment is *less than significant*.

- 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?**

Less Than Significant Impact. The Project will be served by the **City** of Fresno Department of Public Utilities. The Project would be required to comply with the Fresno Municipal Code which outlines requirements and specifications for solid waste collection, including construction recycling. Regarding City of Fresno capacity for solid waste, the City of Fresno currently produces approximately 4,600 tons of material each week.

The City of Fresno's solid waste is primarily landfilled at the American Avenue Landfill in Fresno County, near the City of Kerman. The landfill is permitted to accept 2,200 tons per day and has a permitted capacity of 29.3 million cubic yards. A typical residence disposes of approximately 10 pounds of solid waste each day.⁷ As such, the 200 new residences proposed in this development would generate 2,000 pounds, or approximately 1.2 cubic yards of solid waste daily. The original closure date was 2031; however, due to enhanced recycling efforts, particularly on the part of the City

⁷ City of Fresno. Master Environmental Impact Report, Utilities and Service Systems. <https://www.fresno.gov/darm/wp-content/uploads/sites/10/2016/11/Sec-05-15-UtilitiesMEIR.pdf>. Accessed February 2022.

of Fresno, the closure date has been extended to 2050. Therefore, Project compliance with applicable measures would promote regular collection and encourage the recycling of materials in accordance with the City's current capacity. The proposed Project's impact on solid waste will be *less than significant*.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed Project will be in compliance with federal, state and local management and reduction statutes related to solid waste. Any impacts are *less than significant*.

Mitigation Measures

None are required.

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XX. WILDFIRE – If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:				
a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				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	

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts 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

DISCUSSION

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

No Impact. The proposed Project will be required to be in compliance with any adopted emergency response plan as part of the building permit process. There is *no impact*.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed Project is located in a flat area developed with agricultural and residential land uses, which precludes the risk of wildfire. The area is flat in nature which would limit the risk of downslope flooding and landslides, and limit any wildfire spread. As such, any wildfire risk to the project structures or people would be *less than significant*.

- 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?**

No Impact. The proposed Project is located in an area developed with urban and agricultural uses. There are no aspects of this Project that would exacerbate fire risk. There is *no impact*.

- 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?**

No Impact. As discussed in Impact b) above, the proposed Project is located in an area dominated by urban and agricultural uses and is relatively flat, which precludes the risk of downslope or downstream flooding. There is *no impact*.

Mitigation Measures

None are required.

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIX. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE				

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?</p>		X		
<p>b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?</p>			X	

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?		X		

DISCUSSION

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

Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. The analyses of environmental issues contained in this Initial Study indicate that the proposed Project is not expected to have substantial impact on the environment or on any resources identified in the Initial Study. Mitigation measures have been incorporated as described in each impact area to reduce all potentially significant impacts to *less than significant with mitigation incorporated*.

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

Less than Significant Impact. CEQA Guidelines Section 15064(i) states that a Lead Agency shall consider whether the cumulative impact of a project is significant and whether the effects of the project are cumulatively considerable. The assessment of the significance of the cumulative effects of a project must, therefore, be conducted in connection with the effects of past projects, other current projects, and probable future projects. Due to the nature of the Project and consistency with environmental policies, incremental contributions to impacts are considered less than cumulatively considerable. All Project-related impacts were determined to be either less than significant, or less than significant after mitigation. The proposed Project would not contribute substantially to adverse cumulative conditions, or create any substantial indirect impacts (i.e., increase in population could lead to an increase need for housing, increase in traffic, air pollutants, etc.). Due to buildout of the area and existing land constraints, it is not anticipated that further substantial commercial or residential development will occur in the area in the foreseeable future. As such, Project impacts are not considered to be cumulatively considerable given the lack of proposed new development in the area and the insignificance of Project-induced impacts. The impact is therefore *less than significant*.

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

Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. The analyses of environmental issues contained in this Initial Study indicate that the Project is not expected to have substantial impact on human beings, either directly or indirectly. Mitigation measures have been incorporated as described in each specific impact area which will reduce all potentially significant impacts to *less than significant with mitigation incorporated*.

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM – April 8, 2022

This Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) has been formulated based upon the findings of the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) for Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 6379 (proposed Project). The MMRP lists mitigation measures recommended in the IS/MND for the proposed Project and identifies monitoring and reporting requirements as well as conditions recommended by responsible agencies who commented on the project.

The first column of the Table identifies the mitigation measure. The second column, entitled “Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation,” names the party responsible for carrying out the required action. The third column, “Implementation Timing,” identifies the time the mitigation measure should be initiated. The fourth column, “Party Responsible for Monitoring,” names the party ultimately responsible for ensuring that the mitigation measure is implemented. The last column will be used by the City to ensure that individual mitigation measures have been monitored.

Mitigation Measure	Party responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Implementation Timing	Party responsible for Monitoring	Verification (name/date)
<p>AES-4.1: Lighting for Street and Parking Areas. Lighting systems for street and parking areas shall include shields to direct light to the roadway surfaces and parking areas. Vertical shields on the light fixtures shall also be used to direct light away from adjacent light sensitive land uses such as residences.</p>	Project Applicant and project architect	Lighting systems to be confirmed during plan check, prior to issuance of building permits.	Public Works Department (PW) and Planning and Development Department (PDD)	
<p>AES-4.5: Use of Non-Reflective Materials. Materials used on building facades shall be non-reflective.</p>	Project Applicant and project architect	Lighting systems to be confirmed during plan check, prior to issuance of building permits.	PW & PDD	
<p>BIO-1: Mitigation Measures included in the Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation, prepared by the California Department of Fish and Game in 2012, shall be required.</p>	Project Applicant and qualified biologist	The City shall ensure that this measure is incorporated into project plans prior to project approval.	PDD and CDFW	
<p>BIO-3.1: If a proposed project will result in the significant alteration or fill of a federally protected wetland, a formal wetland delineation conducted according to USACE accepted methodology is required for each project to determine the extent of wetlands on a project site. The delineation shall be used to determine if federal permitting and mitigation strategy are required to reduce project impacts. Acquisition of permits from USACE for the fill of wetlands and USACE approval of a wetland mitigation plan would ensure a “no net loss” of wetland habitat within the Planning</p>	Project Applicant and qualified biologist	Wetland delineation to be completed during environmental review of project and prior to approval of discretionary project. The City shall ensure that project-specific	PDD and CDFW	

Mitigation Measure	Party responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Implementation Timing	Party responsible for Monitoring	Verification (name/date)
Area. Appropriate wetland mitigation/creation shall be implemented in a ratio according to the size of the impacted wetland.		mitigation is incorporated into project plans prior to project approval.		
BIO-3.2: In addition to regulatory agency permitting, Best Management Practices identified from a list provided by the USACE shall be incorporated into the design and construction phase of the project to ensure that no pollutants or siltation drain into a federally protected wetland. Project design features such as fencing, appropriate drainage and incorporating detention basins shall assist in ensuring project-related impacts to wetland habitat are minimized to the greatest extent feasible.	Project Applicant and qualified biologist	The City shall ensure that project-specific BMPs are incorporated into project plans prior to issuance of any grading or construction permits.	PDD and CDFW	
BIO-1.4: Proposed projects within the Planning Area should avoid, if possible, construction within the general nesting season of February through August for avian species protected under Fish and Game Code 3500 and the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA), if it is determined that suitable nesting habitat occurs on a project site. If construction cannot avoid the nesting season, a pre-construction clearance survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist to determine if any nesting birds or nesting activity is observed on or within 500-feet of a project site. If an active nest is observed during the survey, a biological monitor shall be on site to ensure that no proposed project activities would	Project Applicant and qualified biologist	The City shall ensure that pre-construction surveys are conducted within 3 days prior to construction activities, or within a timeframe recommended by a qualified biologist and consistent with applicable regulatory	PDD and CDFW	

Mitigation Measure	Party responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Implementation Timing	Party responsible for Monitoring	Verification (name/date)
<p>impact the active nest. A suitable buffer shall be established around the active nest until the nestlings have fledged and the nest is no longer active. Project activities may continue in the vicinity of the nest only at the discretion of the biological monitor. Prior to commencement of grading activities and issuance of any building permits, the Director of the City of Fresno Planning and Development Department, or designee, shall verify that all proposed project grading and construction plans include specific documentation regarding the requirements of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) and California Fish and Game Code Section 3503, that preconstruction surveys have been completed and the results reviewed by staff, and that the appropriate buffers (if needed) are noted on the plans and established in the field. Specific mitigation measures for direct or incidental impacts to avian species protected under Fish and Game Code 3500 and the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) shall be determined on a case-by-case basis through agency consultation during the review process for discretionary projects, and shall be consistent with survey protocols and mitigations measures recommended by the agency at the time of consultation.</p>		<p>requirements and/or recommendations.</p>		
<p>CUL-1.1: If previously unknown resources are encountered before or during grading activities, construction shall stop in the immediate vicinity of the find and a qualified historical resources specialist shall</p>	<p>Project Applicant and qualified historical</p>	<p>Planning and Development Department to review contract</p>	<p>PDD</p>	

Mitigation Measure	Party responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Implementation Timing	Party responsible for Monitoring	Verification (name/date)
<p>be consulted to determine whether the resource requires further study. The qualified historical resources specialist shall make recommendations to the City on the measures that shall be implemented to protect the discovered resources, including but not limited to excavation of the finds and evaluation of the finds in accordance with Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines and the City's Historic Preservation Ordinance. If the resources are determined to be unique historical resources as defined under Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines, measures shall be identified by the monitor and recommended to the Lead Agency. Appropriate measures for significant resources could include avoidance or capping, incorporation of the site in green space, parks, or open space, or data recovery excavations of the finds.</p> <p>No further grading shall occur in the area of the discovery until the Lead Agency approves the measures to protect these resources. Any historical artifacts recovered as a result of mitigation shall be provided to a City-approved institution or person who is capable of providing long-term preservation to allow future scientific study.</p>	resources specialist	<p>specifications to ensure inclusion of provisions included in project-specific mitigation measure.</p> <p>Following discovery of previously unknown resource, a qualified historical resources specialist shall prepare recommendations and submit to the Planning and Development Department.</p> <p>Timing for recommendations shall be established by project-specific mitigation measure.</p>		
<p>CUL-3: In the event that human remains are unearthed during excavation and grading activities of any future development project, all activity shall cease</p>	Project Applicant and qualified	Planning and Development Department to	PDD	

Mitigation Measure	Party responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Implementation Timing	Party responsible for Monitoring	Verification (name/date)
<p>immediately. Pursuant to Health and Safety Code (HSC) Section 7050.5, no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition pursuant to PRC Section 5097.98(a). If the remains are determined to be of Native American descent, the coroner shall within 24 hours notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). The NAHC shall then contact the most likely descendent of the deceased Native American, who shall then serve as the consultant on how to proceed with the remains. Pursuant to PRC Section 5097.98(b), upon the discovery of Native American remains, the landowner shall ensure that the immediate vicinity, according to generally accepted cultural or archaeological standards or practices, where the Native American human remains are located is not damaged or disturbed by further development activity until the landowner has discussed and conferred with the most likely descendants regarding their recommendations, if applicable, taking into account the possibility of multiple human remains. The landowner shall discuss and confer with the descendants all reasonable options regarding the descendants' preferences for treatment.</p>	<p>historical resources specialist</p>	<p>review construction specifications to ensure inclusion of provisions included in mitigation measure.</p>		
<p>GHG-1: Consistent with the City of Fresno's 2014 GHG Reduction Plan, the Project Applicant shall incorporate the following design features as part of the proposed Project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure that the street and pedestrian design complies with the complete streets concepts. • Review project against Development Code for 	<p>Project Applicant</p>	<p>Planning and Development Department to review construction specifications to ensure inclusion</p>	<p>PDD</p>	

Mitigation Measure	Party responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Implementation Timing	Party responsible for Monitoring	Verification (name/date)
<p>mandatory design features required for the project.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Install alternative energy generation, such as solar. Review water conservation building and landscape design features for compliance with City water conservation standards. • Maintain and enhance connections to regional bikeways and trail system. • Complete the latest version of the Fresno Green Residential Checklist, meet the U.S. Green Building Council's Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) Programs, or qualify for Build It Green's GreenPoint rating system for residential buildings. 		<p>of provisions included in mitigation measure.</p>		
<p>HYD-2.1: The City shall continue to be an active participant in the North Kings Groundwater Sustainability Agency and the implementation of the North Kings Groundwater Sustainability Plan in order to ensure that the Kings Subbasin has balanced levels of pumping and recharge.</p>	<p>Department of Public Utilities</p>	<p>Ongoing. DPU to continue to coordinate with North Kings Groundwater Sustainability Agency as established by a Joint Powers Agreement with member agencies and the City of Fresno as adopted in January 2017.</p>	<p>PDD</p>	

Mitigation Measure	Party responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Implementation Timing	Party responsible for Monitoring	Verification (name/date)
<p>HYD-1: The project proponent shall retain a qualified consultant to prepare a drainage / grading plan prior to the issuance of any grading and/or building permit. The design-level analysis shall be prepared to the satisfaction of the City of Fresno. The developer may either make improvements to the existing pipeline system to provide additional capacity or may use some type of permanent peak reducing facility in order to eliminate adverse impacts on the existing storm drain system.</p>	Project applicant	Prior to issuance of building permits.	PDD	