

APPENDIX G/INITIAL STUDY FOR A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

**Environmental Checklist Form for:
Environmental Assessment No. P22-00958/T-6410**

1.	Project title: Planned Development Permit Application No. P22-00958 and Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 6410 (P22-00771)
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: Robert Holt, Planner III City of Fresno Planning and Development Department (559) 621-8056
4.	Project location: Located on the north side of East Church Avenue, east of South Peach Avenue in the City and County of Fresno, California Site Latitude: 36.71547719227085 Site Longitude: -119.7169014611138 Mount Diablo Base & Meridian, Township 14S, Range 21E, Section 17 Assessor's Parcel Number(s): 481-020-60s
5.	Project sponsor's name and address: Jerome Keene Century Communities 7330 N Palm Avenue, Suite 106 Fresno, CA 93711
6.	General & Community plan land use designation: Medium Low Density Residential and Medium Density Residential (City of Fresno General Plan)
7.	Zoning: RS-4/RS-5/UGM (Residential Single-Family, Medium Low Density/Residential Single-Family, Medium Density/Urban Growth Management)

8. **Description of project:**
 Planned Development Permit Application No. P22-00958 and Tentative Tract Map No. 6410 (P22-00771) was filed by Century Communities. The applicant proposes to subdivide approximately 11.97 acres of property into a 73-lot subdivision to include appurtenant infrastructure consistent with the General Plan designation of Medium Low Density Residential and Medium Density Residential. The Project also includes trail dedication to the City along the north property boundary for future trail connection (Outlots A & B). The applicant also proposes a planned development to allow for a Density Transfer, per Section 15-310.C, which states, "The number of units per acre prescribed in the applicable plans for an existing or proposed zone district shall not be transferred to another existing or proposed zone district, unless a transfer is approved through the processing of a Planned Development Permit which includes all zone districts involved in the proposed transfer."

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

	Planned Land Use	Existing Zoning	Existing Land Use
North	Medium Low Density Residential & Medium Density Residential	RS-4/RS-5/CC/UGM (Residential Single-Family, Medium Low Density/Residential Single-Family, Medium Density/Commercial – Community/Urban Growth Management)	Conventional Single-Family Residential Neighborhood and Vacant Commercial Land
East	Medium Low Density Residential	RS-4/UGM (Residential Single-Family, Medium Low Density/Urban Growth Management)	Conventional Single-Family Residential Neighborhood
South	Public & Institutional - Elementary School	PI/UGM (Public & Institutional/Urban Growth Management)	Elementary School
West	Medium Density Residential	RS-5/UGM (Residential Single-Family, Medium Density/Urban Growth Management)	Conventional Single-Family Residential Neighborhood

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

	<p>Planning and Development Department, Building & Safety Services Division; Department of Public Works; Department of Public Utilities; County of Fresno, Department of Community Health; County of Fresno, Department of Public Works and Planning; City of Fresno Fire Department; Fresno Metropolitan Flood Control District; Fresno Irrigation District; and, San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District.</p>
<p>11.</p>	<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 aforementioned tribes on April 15, 2022. The 30-day comment period ended on May 16, 2022. Both tribes did not request consultation.</p>

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.
—	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.



05/20/2022

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):

Note to preparer: For projects that are consistent with the Fresno General Plan and Zoning (or where the zoning will be changed only for the purposes of achieving consistency with the General Plan), tiering pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15152 may be used. If tiering will be used, please comply with the requirements of Section 15152(g).

For projects that are not completely consistent with the Fresno General Plan and Zoning (i.e., projects that include a General Plan Amendment and/or Rezone), the provisions of CEQA Guidelines Section 15152 do not apply. However, the GP PEIR and its analysis may still be incorporated by reference to provide a basis for the project's initial study, to address regional influences, secondary effects, cumulative impacts, and broad alternatives pursuant to CEQA Guidelines 15168(d).

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 a 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?

The Fresno General Plan Program Environmental Impact Report State Clearinghouse No. 2019050005 (“PEIR”) provides and recognizes that the City has not identified or designated scenic vistas within its General Plan. The River bluffs provide distant views of the San Joaquin River as well as areas north of the River. However, the majority of these views are from private properties. There are limited views of the San Joaquin River from Weber Avenue, Milburn Avenue, McCampbell Drive, Valentine Avenue, Palm Avenue, State Route (SR) 41, Friant Road, and Woodward Park.

The Project site is located within an area designated for residential zoning and land use designation within the City of Fresno and is outside of the San Joaquin River bluffs and not near the Downtown Fresno area. Properties further to the north, east, south, and west of the site have been developed with single-family residential neighborhoods. The subject Project site is currently undeveloped. The existing topography of the Project site is nearly flat. As there are no identified scenic vistas within the Project area, the Project will have *no impact*.

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

Scenic resources include landscapes and features that are visually or aesthetically pleasing and contribute positively to a distinct community or region. The scenic resources within the City include landscaped open spaces, such as parks and golf courses. Additional scenic resources within the City include areas along the San Joaquin River (River) due to the topographic variation in the relatively flat San Joaquin Valley. The River bluffs provide a unique geological feature in the San Joaquin Valley. Historic structures in Downtown Fresno buildings also represent scenic resources because they provide a unique skyline. The Project is devoid of buildings, trees, or rock outcroppings.

The Project site is not within the vicinity of a State designated scenic highway. Therefore, the Project would have no impact associated with substantial damage to scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a State scenic highway. The Project will have *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 a 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?

The Project will not damage nor will it degrade the visual character or quality of the Project site and its surroundings, given that the Project site is primarily vacant, and in an area generally planned for and developed with residential uses. As such, impacts to the visual character or quality of the site would be less than significant due to the development improving the existing character of the site and the surrounding properties being of similar use. The Project will have *less than significant impact*.

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

The Project will introduce new sources of light to the area consistent with the surrounding developed area. The Project site is within an area where development

has already occurred with residential uses, which already affects day and nighttime views in the Project site to a certain degree.

The Project would be subject to the applicable mitigation measures pertaining to light and glare included in PEIR SCH No. 2019050005 (AES-4.1 and AES-4.2). Furthermore, through the entitlement process, staff will ensure that lights are located in areas that will minimize light sources to the neighboring properties in accordance with the mitigation measures of the PEIR.

In conclusion, with PEIR mitigation measures incorporated, the Project will not result in any additional impacts related to aesthetics beyond those analyzed in PEIR SCH No. 2019050005. The Project impacts are considered *less than significant with mitigation incorporated*.

Mitigation Measures

The proposed Project shall implement and incorporate the aesthetic related mitigation measures as identified in the attached Project Specific Mitigation Monitoring Checklist dated May 20, 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
<p>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))?</p>				X
<p>d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?</p>				X

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	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?				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?

Based on the State of California Department of Conservation California Important Farmland Finder, the Project site and the surrounding area is designated “Farmland of Local Importance.” However, the Project area is within an urban developed area and is not currently used for agricultural purposes. Under the current General Plan, the Project site and surrounding areas are designated for residential uses and school facilities. Additionally, the Project site is zoned for Residential use. As such, the City has already accounted for the conversion of this area from agricultural use to residential. Therefore, the proposed Project would have *less than significant impact*.

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

The Project site is not subject to a Williamson Act agricultural land conservation contract. The proposed Project on the subject site will not affect existing agriculturally zoned or Williamson Act contract parcels. Therefore, the proposed Project will have *no impact* on agricultural uses or Williamson Act contracts.

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))?

The Project site is not considered forest land or timberland. Therefore, the proposed Project will not conflict with any forest land or Timberland Production or result in any loss of forest land. Therefore, the Project will have *no impact*.

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

The Project site is not considered forest land and is located within the urban bounds of the City of Fresno and is surrounded by development. Therefore, the proposed Project will not result in the loss of any forest land or result in the conversion of forest land to non-forest uses. The Project will have *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?

The Project site is not within proximity of agricultural uses or farmland. The implementation of the Project would not result in other changes in the existing environment that would impact agricultural land outside of the Project site or Planning Area. Therefore, the Project would result in *no impact* on farmland or forest land involving other changes in the existing environment.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures are required.

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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:				
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)?			X	
b) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?		X		
c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?		X		
d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?			X	

The analysis below is based on a Small Project Analysis Level Assessment (SPAL) prepared for the Project (Trinity Consultants, 2022). The SPAL is attached as Appendix A.

DISCUSSION

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

The Project site is located within the San Joaquin Valley Air Basin (SJVAB), which is regulated by the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD). This region has had chronic non-attainment of federal and State clean air standards for ozone/oxidants and particulate matter due to a combination of topography and climate. The San Joaquin Valley (Valley) is surrounded by mountain ranges, with prevailing winds carrying pollutants and pollutant precursors from urbanized areas to the north (and, in turn, contributing pollutants and precursors to downwind air basins). The Mediterranean climate of this region, with a high number of sunny days and little or no measurable precipitation for several months of the year, fosters photochemical reactions in the atmosphere, creating ozone and particulate matter. Regional factors affect the accumulation and dispersion of air pollutants within the SJVAB.

The SJVAPCD considered basin-wide cumulative impacts to air quality when developing its significance thresholds. The SJVAPCD's air quality significance thresholds represent the maximum emissions from a Project that are not expected to conflict with the SJVAPCD's air quality plans and is not expected to cause or contribute to an exceedance of the most stringent applicable federal or State ambient air quality standards. These are developed based on the ambient concentrations of the pollutant for each source. Because the Project would not exceed the air quality significance thresholds on the project level and would not otherwise conflict with the SJVAPCD's air quality plans, the cumulative emissions would not be a significant contribution to a cumulative impact.

Consistency with Air Quality Plans (AQPs)

A measure for determining if the Project is consistent with the air quality plans is if the Project would not result in an increase in the frequency or severity of existing air quality violations, cause or contribute to new violations, or delay timely attainment of air quality standards or the interim emission reductions specified in the air quality plans. Regional air quality impacts and attainment of standards are the result of the cumulative impacts of all emission sources within the air basin. Individual projects are generally not large enough to contribute measurably to an existing violation of air quality standards.

To meet Federal Clean Air Act (CAA) requirements, the SJVAPCD has multiple air quality attainment plan (AQAP) documents, including:

- 2016 Ozone Plan
- 2007 PM10 Maintenance Plan and Request for Redesignation
- 2016 PM2.5 Plan

As discussed below, emissions of ROG, NOX, PM10, and PM2.5 associated with the construction and operation of the Project would not exceed the District's significance thresholds. As shown in impact (b) below, the Project would not result in CO hotspots

that would violate CO standards. Therefore, the Project would not contribute to air quality violations.

Compliance with Applicable Control Measures

The AQP contains a number of control measures, which are enforceable requirements through the adoption of rules and regulations. A description of rules and regulations that apply to this Project is provided below.

SJVAPCD Rule 9510 - Indirect Source Review (ISR) is a control measure in the 2006 PM10 Plan that requires NOX and PM10 emission reductions from development projects in the San Joaquin Valley. The NOX emission reductions help reduce the secondary formation of PM10 in the atmosphere (primarily ammonium nitrate and ammonium sulfate) and also reduce the formation of ozone. Reductions in directly emitted PM10 reduce particles such as dust, soot, and aerosols. Rule 9510 is also a control measure in the 2016 Plan for the 2008 8-Hour Ozone Standard. Developers of Projects subject to Rule 9510 must reduce emissions occurring during construction and operational phases through on-site measures or pay off-site mitigation fees. The Project is required to comply with Rule 9510.

Regulation VIII - Fugitive PM10 Prohibitions is a control measure that is one main strategy from the 2006 PM10 for reducing the PM10 emissions that are part of fugitive dust. Projects over 10 acres are required to file a Dust Control Plan (DCP) containing dust control practices sufficient to comply with Regulation VIII. The Project is required to prepare a DCP to comply with Regulation VIII.

Other control measures that apply to the Project are Rule 4641 - Cutback, Slow Cure, and Emulsified Asphalt, Paving and Maintenance Operation, which requires reductions in VOC emissions during paving, and Rule 4601 - Architectural Coatings, which limits the VOC content of all types of paints and coatings sold in the San Joaquin Valley. These measures apply at the point of sale of the asphalt and the coatings, so project compliance is ensured.

The Project would comply with all applicable SJVAPCD rules and regulations and applicable control measures of the AQP. The Project complies with this criterion and would not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of the applicable air quality attainment plan. Based on the information above, the impacts are *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?**

Regional Emissions

Air pollutant emissions have both regional and localized effects. This analysis assesses the regional effects of the Project's criteria pollutant emissions compared to SJVAPCD thresholds of significance for short-term construction activities and long-term operation of the Project. Localized emissions from Project construction and operation are assessed under Impact c) below using concentration-based thresholds that determine if the Project would result in a localized exceedance of any ambient air quality standards or would make a cumulatively considerable contribution to an existing exceedance.

The SJVAPCD GAMAQI adopted in 2015 contains thresholds for CO, NOX, ROG, SOX, PM10, and PM2.5. Reduction of these pollutants during any future development construction activities as a result of the approved Project will be required.

Ozone is a secondary pollutant that can be formed miles from the source of emissions through reactions of ROG and NOX emissions in the presence of sunlight. Therefore, ROG and NOX are termed ozone precursors. The Air Basin often exceeds the state and national ozone standards. Therefore, if the Project emits a substantial quantity of ozone precursors, the Project may contribute to an exceedance of the ozone standard. The Air Basin also exceeds air quality standards for PM10 and PM2.5; therefore, substantial Project emissions may contribute to an exceedance for these pollutants. The District's annual emission significance thresholds used for the Project define the substantial contribution for 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 SJVAPCD Air Impact Assessment (AIA) applications for residential development projects include 50 or more dwelling units. Therefore, the proposed 73-unit single-family residential development is subject to District Rule 9510 (Indirect Source Review), and an AIA application is required. Upon further development of the Project, the developer will be required to reduce any project-specific criteria pollutant emissions to have a less than significant impact.

The SJVAPCD Small Project Analysis Level (SPAL) process established review parameters to determine whether a project qualifies as a "small project." A project that is found to be "less than" the established parameters, according to the SPAL review parameters, has "no possibility of exceeding criteria pollutant emissions thresholds (SJVAPCD, 2015)."

As shown in Table 3-1, the proposed Project would not exceed the established SPAL thresholds for single-family units. Trips were estimated using a rate of 9.44 for single-family residences using trip generation rates from the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual (10th Edition) and the ITE Trip Generation Handbook (3rd Edition). Based on the above information, this Project qualifies for a limited air analysis applying the SPAL guidance to determine air quality impacts, and impacts would be *less than significant*.

**Table 3-1
Small Project Analysis Level – Units in Residential**

Land Use Category –Residential	Project Size (dwelling unit)	ATD 1-way
Single Family Threshold	155	800
Proposed Project – Single Family	73	699
SPAL Exceeded?	No	NO

Source: (Trinity Consultants, 2022)

As shown in Table 3-2, the Project’s emissions during temporary construction activities would not exceed thresholds. Therefore, construction emissions were found to be less than significant, and no further evaluation is required.

**Table 3-2
Project Construction Emissions**

Emissions Source	Pollutant					
	ROG	Nox	CO	Sox	PM₁₀	PM_{2.5}
2022 Construction Emissions	0.20	1.89	1.74	0.00	0.21	0.13
2023 Construction Emissions	0.21	1.88	2.19	0.12	0.12	0.09
SJVAPCD Construction Emissions	10	10	100	27	15	15
Thresholds						
Is Threshold Exceeded?	No	No	No	No	No	No

Operation of the Project would also create additional criteria pollutants, particularly as a result of increased mobile emissions in the project area. However, these impacts also would not exceed thresholds as shown in Table 3-3.

**Table 3-3
Total Project Operational Emissions**

Emissions Source	Pollutant					
	ROG	Nox	CO	Sox	PM10	PM2.5
(tons/year)						
Unmitigated						
Operational Emissions	1.40	0.62	7.62	0.02	1.52	0.95
SJVAPCD Operational Emissions	10	10	100	27	15	15
Thresholds						
Is Threshold Exceeded Before Mitigation?	No	No	No	No	No	No
Mitigated						
Operational Emissions	0.90	0.46	2.93	0.01	0.70	0.20
SJVAPCD Operational Emissions	10	10	100	27	15	15
Thresholds						
Is Threshold Exceeded?	No	No	No	No	No	No

The long-term operational emissions associated with the proposed Project would be less than SJVAPCD significance threshold levels and would, therefore, not significantly impact criteria air pollutants.

The PEIR for the Fresno General Plan, MM AIR-2.1, requires applicants for new development projects to incorporate mitigation measures into construction plans to reduce air pollutant emissions during construction activities. The PEIR for the Fresno General Plan, MM AIR-2.2, requires project applicants for new development projects to incorporate mitigation measures to reduce air pollutant emissions during operational activities. By implementing the mitigation measures as identified in the PEIR, the Project impacts would be less than significant with mitigation incorporation. Therefore, by implementing the mitigation measures identified in the PEIR as applicable to the Project, Project impacts are considered to be *less than significant with mitigation incorporation*.

c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

See Impact b, above.

Sensitive Receptors

Those who are sensitive to air pollution include children, the elderly, and persons with pre-existing respiratory or cardiovascular illnesses. SJVAPCD considers a sensitive receptor in a location that houses or attracts children, the elderly, people with illnesses, or others who are especially sensitive to the effects of air pollutants. Examples of sensitive receptors include hospitals, residences, convalescent facilities, and schools.

The closest off-site sensitive receptors are existing residences located adjacent to the Project site to the east, south, and west. The closest schools are Edith B. Storey Elementary, approximately 0.01 miles to the south, Phoenix Secondary School, approximately 0.10 miles southeast, Juan Felipe Herrera Elementary School, approximately 0.28 miles southwest, Terronez Middle School, approximately 0.54 miles west, Oak Park Senior Villas, approximately 0.68 miles southwest, Hillside Swim School, approximately 0.75 miles northeast, James Royal Kids WeeCare, approximately 0.81 miles northeast, Ayer Elementary School, approximately 0.85 miles north, Twilight Haven Senior Living, approximately 0.98 miles northwest, Sunnyside High School, approximately 0.98 miles north, Aynesworth Elementary School, approximately 1.04 miles southwest, David L. Greenberg Elementary School, approximately 1.13 miles northwest, Balderas Elementary School, approximately 1.31 miles west, Convalescent Hospital, approximately 1.39 miles south, Cambridge High School, approximately 1.47 miles northwest, Lane Elementary School, approximately 1.50 miles northwest, Olmos Elementary School, approximately 1.71 miles northwest, Easterby Elementary School, approximately 1.79 miles north, Kings Canyon Middle School, approximately 1.82 miles northwest and Sanger High School – West Campus, approximately 1.89 miles southeast.

Off-site Sensitive Receptors

Impacts to receptors located outside the Project boundaries would occur primarily during Project construction. Construction emissions commence in the year 2022 and continue until Project buildout. Construction activities are expected to occur over several years as the subdivision is gradually built out; however, most emissions are expected to occur during the initial site preparation and grading activities and, to a lesser extent, during ground-up construction. For criteria pollutants, impacts to receptors located outside of the Project are based on emissions during the highest emissions during any construction year. Therefore, this impact would be *less than significant*.

SJVAPCD identifies some common types of facilities that have been known to produce odors in the SJVAB, such as wastewater treatment facilities, sanitary landfills, transfer stations, composting facilities, petroleum refinery, asphalt batch plants, chemical manufacturing plants, fiberglass manufacturing, paint/coating operations, food processing facilities, feed lot/dairy, and rendering plants (SJVAPCD, 2015). These can be used as a screening tool to qualitatively assess a Project's potential to adversely affect area receptors.

On-site Sensitive Receptors

The Project is not a significant source of TAC emissions. Construction activities produce short-term emissions that would not contribute substantially to cancer risk.

The acute (short-term) health effects of workers' direct exposure to asphalt fumes include irritation of the eyes, nose, and throat. Other effects include respiratory tract symptoms and pulmonary function changes. The studies were based on occupational exposure to fumes. Residents are not in the immediate vicinity of the fumes; therefore, they would not be subjected to concentrations high enough to evoke a negative response. In addition, the restrictions that are placed on asphalt in the San Joaquin Valley reduce ROG emissions from asphalt and exposure. The impact to nearby sensitive receptors from ROG during construction would be *less than significant*.

Localized Pollutant Screening Analysis

Emissions occurring at or near the Project have the potential to create a localized impact, also referred to as an air pollutant hotspot. Localized emissions are considered significant if, when combined with background emissions, they would result in the exceedance of any health-based air quality standard. The impact from localized pollutants is based on the impact to the nearest sensitive receptor.

The SJVAPCD's GAMAQI includes screening thresholds for identifying Projects that need detailed analysis for localized impacts. Projects with on-site emission increases from construction activities or operational activities that exceed the 100 pounds per day screening level of any criteria pollutant after compliance with Rule 9510 and implementation of all enforceable mitigation measures would require preparation of an ambient air quality analysis. The criteria pollutants of concern for localized impact in the SJVAB are PM10, PM2.5, NOX, and CO. There is no localized emission standard for ROG, and most types of ROG are not toxic and have no health-based standard; however, ROG was included for informational purposes only.

Operation: ROG

During operation, ROG would be emitted primarily from motor vehicles. Direct exposure to ROG from Project motor vehicles would not result in health effects because the ROG would be distributed across miles and miles of roadway and in the air. The concentrations would not be great enough to result in direct health effects.

Operation: PM10, PM2.5, CO, NO2

As shown in Table 3-3, localized emissions of PM10, PM2.5, CO, and NO2 would not exceed the SJVAPCD screening thresholds at full Project build-out. Residential development is an insignificant source of these pollutants, except for Projects that allow woodburning devices that emit PM10 and PM2.5 in wood smoke. The Project will include only natural gas-fueled fireplaces and inserts that are insignificant sources of PM2.5 and PM10. Therefore, the Project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial criteria air pollutant concentrations during operation.

Carbon Monoxide Hot Spot Analysis

Localized high levels of CO are associated with traffic congestion and idling or slow-moving vehicles. The SJVAPCD provides screening criteria to determine when to quantify local CO concentrations based on impacts to the level of service (LOS) of intersections in the Project vicinity.

A sensitivity analysis using the CALINE4 CO Hotspot model was run for the General Plan PEIR to determine the volume of trips that would be required to exceed the most stringent CO standard. At triple the predicted peak for General Plan buildout of 36,000 peak-hour trips, the hourly concentration was 7.5 ppm and an 8-hour concentration of 6.0 ppm. Based on this analysis, it is extremely unlikely that a CO hotspot will occur in the Plan Area. CO emissions are predicted to continue to decline as old vehicles are retired, and cleaner new motor vehicles take their place.

Therefore, no CO hotspot modeling is required for new projects during General Plan buildout unless intersection volumes exceed 36,000 peak-hour trips, which is not anticipated to occur with the Project as discussed under XVII. TRANSPORTATION.

The PEIR for the Fresno General Plan, MM AIR-3.2, requires applicants for new sensitive land uses to submit a Health Risk Assessment (HRA) to the City. Results of the HRA prepared for the Project indicated that the maximum predicted cancer risk, chronic health hazard, and acute health hazard for residences and on-site/off-site workplaces are below the significance threshold of 10 in one million for cancer risks and 1.0 for non-cancer health risks. Therefore, the Project's health risk impacts are considered *less than significant* (Trinity Consultants, 2022).

According to the analysis provided in Appendix A, the Project would not exceed SJVAPCD localized emission daily screening levels for any criteria pollutant. The Project is not a significant source of TAC emissions during construction or operation. The Project is not in an area with suitable habitat for Valley fever spores and is not in an area known to have naturally occurring asbestos. The proposed Project will implement and incorporate, as applicable, the air quality-related mitigation measures as identified in the City of Fresno PEIR Mitigation Monitoring Checklist adopted September 2021 (AIR-3.2). Therefore, impacts are considered to be *less than significant with mitigation incorporation*.

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

Odor impacts on residential areas and other sensitive receptors, such as hospitals, day-care centers, schools, etc., warrant the closest scrutiny, but consideration should also be given to other land uses where people may congregate, such as recreational facilities, worksites, and commercial areas.

The proposed Project is a residential community located near other residential neighborhoods and public facility land uses. The Project will not generate odorous emissions given the nature or characteristics of the Project. The intensity of an odor source's operations and its proximity to sensitive receptors influence the potential significance of odor emissions. The SJVAPCD has identified some common types of facilities that have been known to produce odors in the SJV Air Basin.

Two situations create a potential for odor impact. The first occurs when a new odor source is located near an existing sensitive receptor. The second occurs when a new sensitive receptor locates near an existing source of odor. According to the CBIA v. BAAQMD ruling (Alameda Superior Court Case No. RG10548693), impacts of existing sources of odors on the Project are not subject to CEQA review (California Building Association v Bay Area Air Quality Management District, 2015). Therefore, the analysis to determine if the Project would locate new sensitive receptors near an existing source of odor is provided for information only. The SJVAPCD has determined the common land use types that are known to produce odors in the Air Basin.

Project as a Generator

Land uses that are typically identified as sources of objectionable odors include landfills, transfer stations, sewage treatment plants, wastewater pump stations, composting facilities, feedlots, coffee roasters, asphalt batch plants, and rendering plants. The Project would not engage in any of these activities. Therefore, the Project would not be considered a generator of objectionable odors during operations.

During construction, the various diesel-powered vehicles and equipment in use on-site would create localized odors. These odors would be temporary and would not likely be noticeable for extended periods of time beyond the Project's site boundaries.

Project as a Receiver

With the CBIA v. BAAQMD ruling, analysis of odor impacts on receivers is not required for CEQA compliance. Therefore, the following analysis is provided for information only.

As a residential development, the Project has the potential to place sensitive receptors near existing odor sources. However, there are no major odor-generating sources within screening distance of the site. During construction, the various diesel-powered vehicles and equipment in use on-site would create localized odors. These odors would be temporary and would not likely be noticeable for extended periods of time beyond the Project's site boundaries. The potential for diesel odor impacts would therefore be *less than significant*.

The Project will not generate odorous emissions given the nature or characteristics of the Project. The intensity of an odor source's operations and its proximity to sensitive

receptors influence the potential significance of odor emissions. The SJVAPCD has identified some common types of facilities that have been known to produce odors in the SJV Air Basin. The types of facilities that are known to produce odors are shown in the discussion above, along with a reasonable distance from the source within which the degree of odors could possibly be significant. Therefore, impacts are considered to be *less than significant*.

Mitigation Measures

The proposed Project shall implement and incorporate the air quality-related mitigation measures as identified in the attached Project Specific Mitigation Monitoring Checklist dated May 20, 2022.

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
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	

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

The analysis below is based on a Biological Resources Evaluation (BRE) prepared for the Project (QK, 2022a) included as Appendix B.

DISCUSSION

A biological reconnaissance survey and database review were completed by qualified biologists to characterize the existing conditions on site and determine the potential for special-status plant and wildlife species and other sensitive biological resources to occur onsite and be impacted by the Project. The Project site and a 250-foot buffer (survey area), when feasible, were surveyed.

Protocol surveys for specific special-status wildlife species were not conducted. Locational data were documented using the Esri ArcGIS Collector application installed on an iPad. Photographs were taken to document the existing landscape and any sensitive biological resources. Plant and wildlife species and current site conditions were recorded while conducting the survey.

General Site Conditions

The Project site is on relatively flat, level terrain at an approximate elevation of 305 feet above mean sea level. Most of the Project site has been previously disturbed by historical agriculture and maintenance activities, and historical aerial imagery shows the land has been farmed and used for agricultural purposes since at least 1962.

- 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?**

The Project site occurs within an area of urban development and has been repeatedly degraded from historical land uses, mainly for agricultural operations and continual disking, and the adjacent lands have been equally disturbed for agricultural and residential uses. The site supports mostly non-native grasses and other ruderal or ornamental species and is predominately surrounded by residential and commercial development.

The literature and database search indicated that there is potential for several special-status species to be present on or in the vicinity of the Project site. An evaluation of each of the potential special-status species, which included habitat requirements, the likelihood of required habitat to occur within the Project vicinity, and a comparison to the CNDDDB records, was conducted. The results of this evaluation concluded that 16 plant species and two wildlife species with special status have a reasonable potential to occur on or near the Project site.

Special-Status Species

Special-Status Plants Species

No special-status plant species were observed within the survey area. Although the field survey did not coincide with the optimum blooming survey period for all sensitive plant species, there is no habitat present on the Project site or within the survey area that would support special-status plant species. The Project site is degraded from historical land uses, mainly for agricultural operations and continual disking, and the adjacent lands have been equally disturbed for agricultural and residential uses.

Special-Status Wildlife Species

No special-status wildlife species or their sign were observed within the survey area. The Project site is highly disturbed and contains no habitat that would support most of the special-status wildlife species.

Some special-status wildlife species could be present at the Project from time to time, but the available habitat only marginally fulfills the requirements of the San Joaquin kit fox, Swainson's hawk, American badger, and western burrowing owl. The potential for these species to occur on the Project site, even as transients, is unlikely, especially because the Project is surrounded by urban development. The kit fox and badger are both unlikely to occur on or near the Project, so Project activities are unlikely to affect these two species. There are no suitable nesting trees for Swainson's hawk in the vicinity of the Project, and although the species may forage from time to time on the Project, loss of this habitat would be minimal, and Project activities are unlikely to affect this species. Ground squirrel burrows scattered on the Project site and in the Central Canal could provide suitable burrowing habitat for burrowing owls. No observations or sign was observed during the site survey of burrowing owls. If

burrowing owls become established, there is a potential to impacts to individual owls. No special-status wildlife species or diagnostic signs of special-status wildlife species were present on the Project site, and the disturbed condition and urban location of the site would tend to preclude special-status wildlife species with the possible exception of burrowing owls.

The San Joaquin kit fox is unlikely to occur on the Project site. The nearest CNDDDB occurrence for San Joaquin kit fox is mapped in Sanger, approximately 8.2 miles east of the Project site, where an injured fox was observed in 1992 (EONDX 70606). The Project site consists of fallow agricultural land that is now vegetated with non-native grasses and forbs. No San Joaquin kit fox or diagnostic signs of the species (e.g., tracks, dens, scat, prey remains) were found during the field survey. Although adequate prey species are present within the BSA, surrounding land use and habitat conditions make it unlikely that the San Joaquin kit fox would be present other than as a transient forager.

The American badger has similar habitat requirements to the San Joaquin kit fox and also is unlikely to occur within the BSA other than a transient. The nearest American badger CNDDDB occurrence is approximately 5.1 miles north of the Project from 1987 (EONDX 56616). Project activities would be very unlikely to affect these species.

The Swainson's hawk is unlikely to occur on the Project. The nearest Swainson's hawk CNDDDB occurrence is from 1956 and is only approximately mapped as "near Fresno" (EONDX 91594). The next nearest Swainson's hawk CNDDDB occurrence is from 2016 and approximately 3.4 miles southwest of the Project site in an active nest located in a pasture (EONDX 106840). Although there is limited foraging habit on the Project site, there are no suitable nesting trees or structures in the immediate vicinity, and the disturbances from human activity in the area further limit the likelihood for nesting Swainson's hawks. California ground squirrels were observed on-site, so there is some potential for the Swainson's hawk to be present from time to time as a transient forager.

There is potential for burrowing owl to occur on or near the Project site. The nearest CNDDDB occurrence is approximately 4.7 miles north of the Project site at the northwest end of the Fresno Yosemite International Airport. Three breeding pairs were observed between 1981 and 1990 (EONDX 103145). No burrowing owls or their sign (whitewash, feathers, pellets) were observed during the survey, and a limited prey base was observed for the species (small mammal burrows, beetles). Because burrowing owls use existing burrows excavated by small mammals, including California ground squirrels, there is a potential for burrowing owls to become established on or near the Project site. There is also potential for burrowing owls to forage or become established in the agricultural property's northwest and southwest and along the Central Canal. The species is not likely to be present on the residential properties or the elementary school on the lands surrounding the Project site.

It was concluded that two special-status species San Joaquin kit fox and American badger, could potentially be present at the Project site, but their potential for occurrence, even as transients, is very unlikely. Project activities would have no effect on these species. No potential nests of the Swainson's hawk were present on the Project site or within the survey area. No special-status wildlife species or diagnostic signs of special-status wildlife species were observed on the Project site, and the degraded condition of the site would tend to preclude those species from occurring.

Therefore, the Project is anticipated to have no impact to special-status wildlife species. However, the Project would be subject to the applicable mitigation measures pertaining to biological resources included in the City of Fresno PEIR Mitigation Monitoring Checklist adopted in September 2021 (BIO-1.1, BIO-1.2, BIO-1.4, and BIO-2.1). These measures will reduce Project impacts to biological resources to a less than significant level. Therefore, impacts are considered to be *less than significant with mitigation incorporation*.

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?

Natural communities of special concern are those that are of limited distribution, distinguished by significant biological diversity, home to special-status plant and animal species, of importance in maintaining water quality or sustaining flows, etc. Examples of natural communities of special concern in the San Joaquin Valley could include open, ruderal/non-native grassland habitat, which is infrequently disturbed, vernal pools, and various types of riparian forest. No natural communities of special concern were identified on the subject site.

There are no riparian habitats or any other sensitive natural communities identified by CDFW or the USFWS located on the Project site. Therefore, the Project will have *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?

The United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) has regulatory authority over the Clean Water Act (CWA), as provided for by the EPA. The USACE has established specific criteria for the determination of wetlands based upon the presence of wetland hydrology, hydric soils, and hydrophilic vegetation. There are no federally protected wetlands or vernal pools that occur within the Project.

No State or federally protected wetlands or other water features are located on the subject site. The National Hydrography database (NHD) and National Wetlands

Inventory (NWI) shows one stream feature, the Central Canal. The canal is a manmade feature and has no hydrologic connection with the Project site. The Project will not impact the Central Canal during construction or operation. Therefore, impacts to wetlands or water features would be *less than significant*.

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?

Wildlife migratory corridors are described as a narrow stretch of land that connects two open pieces of habitat that would otherwise be unconnected. These routes provide shelter and sufficient food supplies to support wildlife species during migration. Movement corridors generally consist of riparian, woodlands, or forested habitats that span contiguous acres of undisturbed habitat and are important elements of resident species' home ranges.

The proposed Project would not interfere 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. Therefore, the Project's impacts would be *less than significant*

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

The Project must comply with the biological Mitigation Measures of the City of Fresno PEIR by a required pre-construction biological survey prior to construction to determine if the Project site supports any special-status species (BIO-2.1). If a special-status species is determined to occupy any portion of a project site, avoidance and minimization measures shall be incorporated into the construction phase of a project to avoid direct or incidental take of a listed species to the greatest extent feasible. The proposed Project shall implement and incorporate, as applicable, the biological resource-related mitigation measures as identified in the PEIR Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program dated September 2021. In addition, the Project will comply with the policies and goals of the General Plan pertaining to protecting biological resources. Therefore, the proposed Project would have *less than significant impact with mitigation incorporation*.

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?

The Project is not located within any Natural Community Conservation Plan or any other local, regional, or State Conservation Plan. The Project site is located within an area covered by the PG&E San Joaquin Valley Operation and Maintenance Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). That HCP only applies to maintenance and operations of

PG&E facilities and does not apply to this Project. The subject site nor the immediate vicinity occur in any other habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans pertaining to natural resources within the region. Therefore, the Project will have *no impact*.

Mitigation Measures

The proposed Project shall implement and incorporate the biological resources related mitigation measures as identified in the attached Project Specific Mitigation Monitoring Checklist dated May 20, 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		
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?		X		

DISCUSSION

The analyses presented in this section are based on a Cultural Resources Technical Memorandum prepared for the Project (QK, 2022b) included as Appendix C.

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

A cultural resources records search (#22-006) was conducted at the Southern San Joaquin Valley Information Center (IC), CSU Bakersfield to determine whether the proposed Project would impact cultural or historical resources. A Sacred Lands File request was also submitted to the Native American Heritage Commission, and a response indicates negative results. The records search indicated that the subject property had previously been surveyed for cultural resources. No cultural resources were identified on the property as a result of that study, and it was recommended that no further cultural resource work was warranted (QK, 2022b).

There are no structures that exist within the Project area that are listed in the National or Local Register of Historic Places, and the subject site is not within a designated historic district.

Four historic cultural resource properties have been recorded within a half-mile of the Project. These include the Central Canal, a portion of which runs along the northern edge of the Project; the Washington Colony Canal; the route of the Southern Pacific

Railroad; and the USDA Horticultural Field Station. However, the Project will not impact any of these cultural resources. It should be noted however, that lack of surface evidence of historical resources does not preclude the subsurface existence of archaeological resources. During excavation activities, there is always the potential to discover historical resources. In the event historical resources are found, construction will halt, and a qualified historical resources specialist will be contacted and will make recommendations to the City. Implementation of the City of Fresno PEIR Mitigation Measure CUL-1.1 will result in a *less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated*.

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

See Response V (a), above. There are no known archaeological resources that exist within the Project site. Nevertheless, there is some possibility that a buried site may exist in the area and be obscured by vegetation, fill, or other historic activities, leaving no surface evidence. Therefore, with implementation of the City of Fresno PEIR Mitigation Measure CUL-1.1 and CUL-1.2, impacts are considered to be *less than significant with mitigation incorporation*.

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

Although cultural resources are not anticipated onsite, like most projects in the State, the possibility exists that these resources could be found during construction; therefore, mitigation would be required to reduce this impact to a less than significant level. Therefore, due to the ground-disturbing activities that will occur as a result of the Project, the measures within the City of Fresno PEIR Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to address archaeological resources and human remains will be employed to guarantee that should archaeological and/or historic artifacts be encountered during Project excavations, then work shall stop immediately; and, that qualified professionals in the respective field are contacted and consulted in order to ensure that the activities of the proposed Project will not involve physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of historical, archaeological, or paleontological resources. In conclusion, with the City of Fresno PEIR Mitigation Measures CUL-1.1, CUL 1.2, CUL-2, and CUL-3 incorporated, the proposed Project will not result in any cultural resource impacts beyond those analyzed in the PEIR. Therefore, impacts would be *less than significant with mitigation incorporated*.

Mitigation Measures

The proposed Project shall implement and incorporate the cultural resources related mitigation measures as identified in the attached Project Specific Mitigation Monitoring Checklist dated May 20, 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	

The following analysis is based on the Small Project Analysis Level Assessment (SPAL) (Trinity Consultants, 2022) prepared for the Project (Appendix A) and available energy resource consumption data.

DISCUSSION

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

The proposed Project would involve the use of energy during construction and operation. Energy use during the construction phase would be in the form of fuel consumption (e.g., gasoline and diesel fuel) to operate heavy equipment, light-duty vehicles, and machinery. The proposed Project's long-term operation includes electricity and natural gas service to power internal and exterior building lighting and heating and cooling systems. In addition, the increase in vehicle trips associated with the Project would increase fuel consumption within the City.

Energy demand during the construction phase would result from the transportation of materials, construction equipment, and employee vehicle trips. Construction equipment includes rubber-tired dozers, tractors, loaders, backhoes, excavators, graders, scrapers, cranes, forklifts, generator sets, welders, pavers, paving equipment, rollers, and air compressors. The Project would comply with the SJVAPCD requirements regarding the use of fuel-efficient vehicles.

Energy-saving strategies will be implemented where possible to further reduce the Project's energy consumption during the construction phase. Strategies being

implemented include those recommended by the California Air Resources Board (CARB) that may reduce the Project’s energy consumption, including diesel anti-idling measures, light-duty vehicle technology, alternative fuels such as biodiesel blends and ethanol, and heavy-duty vehicle design measures to reduce energy consumption. Additionally, as outlined in the SJVAPCD’s GAMAQI, the Project includes recommendations to reduce energy consumption by shutting down equipment when not in use for extended periods, limiting the usage of construction equipment to eight cumulative hours per day, usage of electric equipment for construction whenever possible in lieu of diesel or gasoline-powered equipment, and encouragement of employees to carpool to retail establishments or to remain on-site during lunch breaks.

The Project consists of 73 single-family residential units and approximately 6,000 square feet of open space, along with a public trail. The amount of energy used at the Project site would directly correlate to the size of the proposed buildings, the energy consumption of associated appliances and technology, and outdoor lighting. Other major sources of proposed Project energy consumption include fuel used by vehicle trips generated during Project construction and operation and fuel used by off-road construction vehicles during construction. The proposed Project will be consistent with the City’s Greenhouse Gas Reduction Plan related to energy conservation and reduction measures, as shown in Table 6-1.

**Table 6-1
City of Fresno Greenhouse Gas Reduction Plan**

<p>Objective RC-8 Reduce the consumption of non-renewable energy resources by requiring and encouraging conservation measures and the use of alternative energy sources.</p>	<p>Consistent. The Project will comply with Title 24 Energy Efficiency Standards and CalGreen Code requirements for solar-ready roofs, electric vehicle charging, and water conservation. The 2019 Building Efficiency Standards are the current regulations and went into effect on January 1, 2020. One of the notable changes in the 2019 Title 24 Standards includes the solar photovoltaic systems requirement for new low-rise residential homes.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>Consistent. The Project will comply with all applicable energy standards.</p>

<p>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.</p>	<p>Consistent. The Project will comply with the Title 24 energy standards in effect at the time building permits are processed for approval.</p>
<p>Source: City of Fresno Greenhouse Gas Reduction Plan 2014.</p>	

There are no unusual project characteristics or construction processes that would require the use of equipment that would be more energy-intensive than is used for comparable activities. All construction equipment shall conform to current emissions standards and related fuel efficiencies. In particular, construction and operations of the Project would be subject to applicable CARB regulations (Airborne Toxic Control Measure), California Code of Regulations (Title 13, Motor Vehicles), and Title 24 standards that include a broad set of energy conservation requirements (e.g., Lighting Power Density requirements). In addition, the Project would follow Best Management Practices (BMPs) for water conservation, as warranted and appropriate. Enforcement of these regulations, requirements, and practices would thereby minimize or eliminate unnecessary or wasteful consumption of energy. In addition, the Project would be served by PG&E and would not require extensions of energy infrastructure or new energy supplies. For these reasons, the Project would have a less than significant impact.

The proposed Project would use energy resources for the operation of Project buildings (electricity and natural gas), for on-road vehicle trips (e.g., gasoline and diesel fuel) generated by the proposed Project, and from off-road construction activities associated with the proposed Project (e.g., diesel fuel). Each of these activities would require the use of energy resources. The proposed Project would be responsible for conserving energy to the extent feasible and relies heavily on reducing per capita energy consumption to achieve this goal, including through State-wide and local measures. Therefore, impacts would be *less than significant*.

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

The proposed Project would be in compliance with all applicable federal, State, and local regulations regulating energy usage, as shown in Table 6-1. The Project will comply with Title 24 Energy Efficiency Standards and CalGreen Code requirements for solar-ready roofs, electric vehicle charging, and water conservation. The Project also includes the installation of solar panels on each home to offset the use of

electricity that would be generated by non-renewable energy sources such as coal-fired power plants.

PG&E is responsible for the mix of energy resources used to provide electricity for its customers, and it is in the process of implementing the State-wide Renewable Portfolio Standard (RPS) to increase the proportion of renewable energy (e.g., solar and wind) within its energy portfolio. PG&E is expected to achieve at least 50% renewable energy by 2030 and 100% by 2045.

Other statewide measures, including those intended to improve the energy efficiency of the State-wide passenger and heavy-duty truck vehicle fleet (e.g., the Pavley Bill and the Low Carbon Fuel Standard), would improve vehicle fuel economies, thereby conserving gasoline and diesel fuel. These energy savings would continue to accrue over time.

As a result, the proposed Project would not result in any significant adverse impacts related to Project energy requirements, energy use inefficiencies, and/or the energy intensiveness of materials by the amount and fuel type for each stage of the Project, including construction, operations, maintenance, and/or removal. PG&E, the electricity and natural gas provider to the site, maintains sufficient capacity to serve the proposed Project. The proposed Project would comply with all existing energy standards and would not result in significant adverse impacts on energy resources. For these reasons, the proposed Project would not be expected to cause an inefficient, wasteful, or unnecessary use of energy resources nor cause a significant impact on any of the thresholds as described by Appendix F of the CEQA Guidelines. In conclusion, energy impacts would be considered *less than significant*.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures are 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:			X	
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.			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	
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	

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?				X
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?		X		

The following analysis is based in part on the Geotechnical Engineering Investigation (Krazan & Associates, Inc., 2021a) prepared for the Project (Appendix D).

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.**

Fresno has no known active earthquake faults and is not in any Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zones. The immediate Fresno area has extremely low seismic activity levels, although shaking may be felt from earthquakes whose epicenters lie to the east, west, and south. Known major faults are over 50 miles distant and include the San Andreas Fault, Coalinga area blind thrust fault(s), and the Long Valley, Owens Valley, and White Wolf/Tehachapi fault systems. The most serious threat to Fresno from a major earthquake in the eastern Sierra would be flooding that could be caused by damage to dams on the upper reaches of the San Joaquin River.

Fresno is classified by the State as being in a moderate seismic risk zone, Category “C” or “D,” depending on the soils underlying the specific location being categorized and that location’s proximity to the nearest known fault lines. All new structures are required to conform to current seismic protection standards in the California Building Code. No adverse environmental effects related to seismology or known fault lines are expected as a result of this Project.

Further, according to the Fault Rupture Zones Map prepared by the California Department of Conservation in 2018, the City of Fresno GP PEIR Planning Area is not located within a Fault-Rupture Hazard Area. Moreover, no active faults have been identified within the Planning Area.

Therefore, because no active faults occur within the Planning Area, impacts associated with fault rupture would be *less than significant*.

ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?

According to the Fresno County Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan, the Project site is located in an area of relatively low seismic activity. However, the GP PEIR indicates that projects within the Planning Area would be designed to withstand strong ground shaking because all built projects are required to comply with the CBC to minimize the potential effects of ground shaking and other seismic activity. To reduce ground-shaking impacts, the approved General Plan also includes Objective NS-2 and policies NS-2-a through NS-2-d, and the City of Fresno Municipal Code includes Section 11-101.

With the implementation of the above-referenced objective and policies as well as adherence to the Municipal Code and other applicable regulations, development in accordance with the approved General Plan would reduce potential seismic ground shaking impacts to a less-than-significant level. Compliance with local and State building codes would ensure Project structures and personnel present during the construction would not be exposed to substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death resulting from strong seismic ground shaking. Therefore, implementation of these building code requirements and local agency enforcement would reduce impacts from ground shaking to *less than significant* levels.

iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

No specific countywide assessment of liquefaction has been performed; however, the Fresno County Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan identifies the risk of liquefaction within the county as low because the soil types are unsuitable for liquefaction. The Project site is within an area of low seismic activity, and the groundwater in the Project area occurs below 60 feet, and the soils associated with the Project site are not suitable for liquefaction (Krazan & Associates, Inc., 2021a). Impacts would be *less than significant*.

iv. Landslides?

Landslides include rockfalls, deep slope failure, and shallow slope failure. Factors such as the geological conditions, drainage, slope, vegetation, and others directly affect the potential for landslides. One of the most common causes of landslides is construction activity that is associated with road building (i.e., cut and fill). The Project

site is relatively flat; therefore, the potential for a landslide in the Project site is essentially non-existent. Because the Project is within an area with relatively flat topography, the Project will not have any environmental impacts relating to landslides. Therefore, impacts would be *less than significant*.

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

Minimal soil will be removed from the Project site during construction, as the site is relatively flat and has been previously impacted by grading from previous site use. Development of the Project site would require typical site preparation activities such as grading and trenching, which may result in the potential for short-term soil disturbance or erosion impacts. Construction would also involve the use of water, which may cause further soil disturbance. Such impacts would be addressed through compliance with regulations set by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB). Namely, the SWRCB requires sites larger than one (1) acre to comply with the General Permit for Discharges of Storm Water Associated with Construction Activity (i.e., General Permit Order No. 2012-0006-DWQ). The General Permit requires the development of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) by a certified Qualified SWPPP Developer (QSD). The SWPPP estimates the sediment risk associated with construction activities and includes best management practices (BMP) to control erosion. These BMPs are developed to prevent significant impacts related to erosion from construction. Additionally, because these soils have been disturbed, it is recommended that the surface soils be recompacted to stabilize the surface soils and locate any unsuitable or pliant areas. Because Project impacts related to erosion would be temporary and limited to construction and required BMPs would prevent significant impacts related to erosion, the impacts will be *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?

Soil conditions were analyzed and determined to be disturbed, have low strength characteristics, and be highly compressible when saturated. As such, the soils are recommended to be recompacted. Following these recommendations, the site soils would be considered stable in that there is no potential of on or offsite landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, or collapse. As discussed in Impact VII. Geology and Soils (a-iii) Soils, the Project site soils have a low overall potential for significant liquefaction to occur at the site. All structures would be subject to all IBC and CBC earthquake construction standards, including those relating to soil characteristics. Development of the property requires compliance with grading and drainage standards of the City of Fresno. Therefore, there would be *less than significant impact*.

- 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?**

Expansive soils contain large amounts of clay, which absorb water and cause the soil to increase in volume. Conversely, the surface soils on the site have a loose consistency. These soils are disturbed, have low strength characteristics, and are highly compressible when saturated. Preliminary testing indicates the on-site soils include Exeter, Hanford, and Ramona series, which are often underlain at a shallow depth by a clayey or hardpan substrate. These soils have low strength characteristics and are highly compressible when saturated (Krazan & Associates, Inc., 2021a). The soils associated with the Project have a low potential for expansion. Implementation of the Project will pose no direct or indirect risk to life or property caused by expansive soils, and there would be no impact. The proposed Project would not result in any expansive soils environmental impacts beyond those analyzed in City of Fresno PEIR. In conclusion, the Project would have a *less than significant impact*.

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

The proposed Project would not include the use of septic tanks or any other alternative wastewater disposal systems. The dwelling units will be required to tie into the existing sewer services. Therefore, there would be *no impact*.

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

As noted previously, there are no known paleontological resources that exist within the Project site. Nevertheless, previously unknown paleontological resources could be disturbed during Project construction. Therefore, due to the ground-disturbing activities that will occur as a result of the Project, the measures within the City of Fresno PEIR Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to address paleontological resources will be employed to guarantee that should archaeological and/or animal fossil material be encountered during Project excavations, then work shall stop immediately; and, that qualified professionals in the respective field are contacted and consulted in order to ensure that the activities of the proposed Project will not involve physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of historical, archaeological, or paleontological resources. Mitigation Measure GEO-6.1 will reduce the impacts to paleontological resources to a *less than significant impact with mitigation incorporation*.

Mitigation Measures

The proposed Project shall implement and incorporate the paleontological resources related mitigation measure as identified in the attached Project Specific Mitigation Checklist dated May 20, 2022.

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

Analysis of Greenhouse Gases is based on the Small Project Analysis Level Assessment (SPAL) prepared for the Project (Trinity Consultants, 2022), which is included as Appendix A of this document.

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

The City of Fresno adopted a Greenhouse Gas Reduction Plan in 2014 that includes procedures for certain qualified projects to demonstrate consistency with the plan and use the streamlining provisions allowed under CEQA. In addition to the plan consistency analysis, a quantitative analysis was prepared to show that reductions from Business As Usual (BAU) emissions would exceed the 21.7 percent required by 2020 to show consistency with State reduction targets. The SJVAPCD’s Guidance for Valley Land-use Agencies in Addressing GHG Emission Impacts for New Projects under CEQA provides guidance for preparing a BAU analysis (SJVAPCD 2009b). Under the SJVAPCD guidance, projects meeting one of the following would have a less than significant impact on climate change:

- Exempt from CEQA;
- Complies with an approved GHG emission reduction plan or GHG mitigation program;
- Project achieves 29 percent GHG reductions by using approved Best Performance Standards; and
- Project achieves AB 32 targeted 29 percent GHG reductions compared with “business as usual.”

The 29 percent GHG reduction level is based on the target established by ARB’s AB 32 Scoping Plan, approved in 2008. The GHG reduction level for the State to reach 1990 emission levels by 2020 was reduced to 21.7 percent from BAU in 2020 in the 2014 First Update to the Scoping Plan to account for slower than projected growth after the 2008 recession. In addition, the State has reported that the 2016 greenhouse gas inventory was below the 2020 target for the first time (ARB 2018b). Furthermore, the 2017 Scoping Plan states that California is on track to achieve the 2020 target). The first occupancy at the Project site is expected to occur in 2022, which is the year after the AB 32 target year. It is unknown when future development will occur as a result of the Project approval, but it is expected to take several years, depending on market conditions. Until a new threshold or BPS are identified for projects constructed after 2020, significance is based on making continued progress toward the AB 32 2030 goal. For the proposed future development as a result of the Project approval, there will be a less than significant impact on climate change because the facts (set forth in this section) demonstrate that the Project will work to meet the AB 32 targeted 29 percent GHG reductions (Trinity Consultants, 2022).

Although construction of the proposed Project would result in temporary emissions of GHGs, the Project as a whole is not expected to generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment. The Project’s greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions are primarily from mobile source activities and are shown in Table 8-1.

**Table 8-1
Estimated Annual Greenhouse Gas Emissions**

	CO₂ Emissions metric tons	CH₄ Emissions metric tons	N₂O Emissions metric tons	CO₂e Emissions metric tons
Project Operations	781.27	1.16	0.04	821.14
2005 BAU	1,327.22	1.72	0.12	1,406.98
BAU less Project emissions				41.6%

Additionally, the Project’s GHG emissions are less than the 2005 business-as-usual emissions for the Project by 821 metric tons per year of CO₂e, which is a 41.6 percent reduction. Therefore, the Project would not generate a cumulatively considerable GHG impact, nor would it conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs. The Project will also not conflict with any elements of the California Air Resources Board’s 2008 Climate Change Scoping Plan. Therefore, the Project would have a less than significant impact.

The General Plan and PEIR rely upon the Recirculated Greenhouse Gas Reduction Plan Update that provides a comprehensive assessment of the benefits of city policies

and proposed code changes, existing plans, programs, and initiatives that reduce greenhouse gas emissions. The Recirculated Plan provides goals and supporting measures to reflect and ensure compliance with changes in the local and State policies while ensuring it encourages economic growth and keeps the city economically competitive while achieving GHG reductions, as discussed under VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS (b) Mitigation Measure GHG-1.1 below. The benefits of adopted regulations become flat in later years, and growth starts to exceed the reductions from all regulations and measures. In conclusion, the proposed project would not result in any greenhouse gas emission environmental impacts beyond those analyzed in the City of Fresno PEIR.

Therefore, there would be a *less than significant impact with mitigation incorporation* as the Project would adhere to standards as identified in the Fresno City General Plan and PEIR (GHG-1.1).

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

The City of Fresno adopted its Recirculated GHG Reduction Plan Update (2021) as part of the General Plan Update. The Project's consistency with applicable GHG policies from the Recirculated GHG Reduction Plan policies is assessed below.

The Project is also assessed for its consistency with ARB's adopted Scoping Plans. This would be achieved with an assessment of the Project's compliance with Scoping Plan measures contained in the 2008 Scoping Plan and the 2017 Scoping Plan Update.

City of Fresno Recirculated GHG Plan Update

The Recirculated GHG Plan Update includes procedures to use when assessing the impacts of Project's requiring a general plan amendment. The following requirements apply.

1. Review General Plan policies listed in the Recirculated GHG Reduction Plan Update to identify those that apply to the project and prepare a consistency analysis for compliance with the applicable policies.
2. Ensure Project is consistent with the City's Development Code as it relates to complete streets and design standards for multi-family projects.
3. Prepare a GHG technical study to quantify project emissions and emission reductions through compliance with regulations and project design features.

In summary, the Project would be required to incorporate a number of features that would minimize GHG emissions as required by the City's existing plans and policies. These features are consistent with project-level strategies identified by the ARB's

Scoping Plan and the City of Fresno Recirculated GHG Reduction Plan Update (2021).

Consistency with California's Post-2020 Targets

The State's executive branch adopted several Executive Orders related to GHG emissions. Executive Orders S-3-05 and B-30-15 are two examples. Executive Order S-3-05 sets goals to reduce emissions to 1990 levels by 2020 and 80 percent below 1990 levels by 2050. The goal of Executive Order S-3-05 to reduce GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020 was codified by AB 32. The Project, as analyzed above, is consistent with AB 32. Therefore, the Project does not conflict with this component of Executive Order S-3-05. Executive Order B-30-15 establishes an interim goal to reduce GHG emissions to 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030.

Consistency with SB 32

The 2017 Climate Change Scoping Plan Update (2017 Scoping Plan) includes the strategy that the State intends to pursue to achieve the 2030 targets of Executive Order S-3-05 and SB 32. The Project is required to comply with the SB 32 strategy and is not expected to conflict with this component of Executive Order S-3-05.

As discussed above, the proposed Project will not occur at a scale or scope with the potential to contribute substantially or cumulatively to the generation of GHG emissions, either directly or indirectly, or conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs. There would be a *less than significant impact with mitigation incorporation* as the Project would adhere to standards as identified in the Fresno City General Plan and PEIR (GHG-1.1). In conclusion, the proposed Project will not result in any GHG impacts beyond those analyzed in City of Fresno PEIR. Therefore, impacts are considered *less than significant with mitigation incorporation*.

Mitigation Measures

The proposed Project shall implement and incorporate, as applicable, the GHG-related mitigation measures as identified in the attached Project Specific Mitigation Monitoring Checklist dated May 20, 2022.

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	
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?				X

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?			X	
g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?			X	

The following analysis is based in part on the Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment (Krazan and Associates, 2021b) prepared for the Project (Appendix E).

DISCUSSION

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

Pursuant to the Fresno General Plan, hazardous materials are defined as those that no longer have a practical use, such as substances that have been discarded, discharged, spilled, contaminated, or are being stored prior to proper disposal. Hazardous materials and hazardous wastes are classified according to four properties: toxic (causes human health effects), ignitable (has the ability to burn), corrosive (causes severe burns or damage to materials), and reactive (causes explosions or generates toxic gases). Hazardous materials have been and are commonly used in commercial, agricultural, and industrial applications and, to a limited extent, in residential areas.

Construction of the Project would involve the temporary transport and use of minor quantities of hazardous materials such as fuels, oils, lubricants, hydraulic fluids, paints, and solvents. The types and quantities of hazardous materials to be used and stored on-site would not be of a significant amount to create a reasonably foreseeable upset or accident condition. The handling and transport of all hazardous materials onsite would be performed in accordance with all applicable federal, State, and local laws and regulations.

Hazardous and non-hazardous wastes would likely be transported to and from the Project site during the construction phase of the proposed Project. Construction would involve the use of some hazardous materials, such as diesel fuel, hydraulic oil, grease,

solvents, adhesives, paints, and other petroleum-based products, although these materials are commonly used during construction activities and would not be disposed of on the Project site. Workers would likely be trained to properly identify and handle all hazardous materials, following OSHA/CALOSHA regulations. Hazardous waste would be either recycled or disposed of at a permitted and licensed treatment and/or disposal facility. Hazardous waste would be either recycled or disposed of at a permitted and licensed treatment and/or disposal facility. Any hazardous waste or debris that is generated during the construction of the proposed Project would be collected and transported away from the site and disposed of at an approved off-site landfill or other such facility. In addition, sanitary waste generated during construction would be managed through the use of portable toilets, which would be located at reasonably accessible on-site locations. Hazardous materials such as paint, bleach, water treatment chemicals, gasoline, oil, etc., may be used during construction. These materials are stored in appropriate storage locations and containers in the manner specified by the manufacturer and disposed of in accordance with local, federal, and State regulations. No significant hazard to the public or to the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous waste during the construction or operation of the new residential development would occur.

There are a number of sensitive receptors (schools and other residences) located in close proximity to the Project site. However, the use of hazardous materials will be limited in quantities and duration and, if spilled, would be localized. The proposed Project would not emit hazardous emissions or involve handling hazardous or acutely hazardous materials substances. The transport use and storage of hazardous materials would be required to comply with all applicable State and federal regulations, such as requirements that spills would be cleaned immediately, and all wastes and spills control materials would be properly disposed of at approved disposal facilities.

Residential construction generally uses fewer hazardous chemicals or use chemicals in relatively small quantities and concentrations as compared to commercial or industrial uses. In addition, once the Project is completed, the chemicals used would include minor quantities of pesticides/ rodenticides, fertilizers, paints, detergents, and other cleaners.

Once constructed, the use of such materials such as paint, bleach, etc., are considered common for residential developments, and it would be unlikely for such materials to be stored or used in such quantities that would be considered a significant hazard. The Project itself will not generate or use hazardous materials in a manner outside health department requirements. Therefore, there would be *less than significant impact*.

- 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?**

As noted in VII GEOLOGY AND SOILS(b), the Project would be required to prepare and implement an SWPPP under the NPDES permit for construction sites over one acre. The SWPPP identifies potential sources of pollution from the Project that may affect the quality of stormwater discharge and requires that BMPs be implemented to prevent contamination at the source. By implementing BMPs during construction activities, accidental spills of hazardous materials would be contained, and soil and groundwater contamination would be minimized or prevented. While there are no known existing hazardous material conditions on the site and the Project is not located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5, portions of the Project site have been utilized for agricultural purposes, which may have utilized pesticides in association with agricultural operations and cultivation.

As noted in III- Air Quality, the Project would include compliance with the SJVAPCD's Regulation VIII (Fugitive PM10 Prohibitions). Grading of the site will be minimal, and with the appropriate application of water or other dust suppression during construction, impacts from pesticides in the soil during construction will be minimal.

Valley Fever or *coccidioidomycosis*, is prevalent in the central San Joaquin Valley of California. This disease, which affects both humans and animals, is caused by inhalation of arthroconidia (spores) of the fungus *Coccidioides immitis* (CI). CI spores are found in the top few inches of soil, and the existence of the fungus in most soil areas is temporary. The proposed project has the potential to generate fugitive dust and suspend Valley Fever spores with the dust that could then reach nearby sensitive receptors. It is possible that on-site workers could be exposed to valley fever as fugitive dust is generated during construction. Implementation of dust control measures throughout the construction period would reduce fugitive dust emissions (Trinity Consultants, 2021). Therefore, the exposure to Valley Fever would be minimized. With the implementation of these dust control measures, dust from the construction of the proposed Project would not add significantly to the existing exposure level of people to this fungus, including construction workers, and impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels.

There is a completed LUST site reported releases of hazardous materials to the subsurface reported within a 4,000 radius of the site. The review of the State of California Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) Geotracker database available via the RWQCB Internet Website indicated that no active LUST sites, land disposal sites, or military sites are listed for the subject site, the adjacent properties, or properties located within the subject site vicinity (California State Water Resources Control Board, 2022).

A review of the State of California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) Envirostor database available via the DTSC's Internet Website indicated that there are two school investigations to the south of the Project site within a 1-mile radius (California Department of Toxic Substances, 2022). However, the site will not impact

the Project's construction and operation. Envirostor does not list any other sites, including State response sites, school cleanup sites, or military or school evaluation sites listed for the subject site or adjacent properties. Additionally, no Federal Superfund – National Priorities List (NPL) sites were determined to be located within a one-mile radius of the subject site.

Review of State of California Department of Conservation, Geological Energy Management Division (Cal GEM) Online Mapping System (DOMS) indicated that no plugged and abandoned or producing oil wells are located on or adjacent to the subject site (Krazan and Associates, 2021b).

During the Phase 1 ESA survey of the site, there was no evidence of recognized environmental conditions (RECs), controlled RECs (CRECs), or historical RECs (HRECs) (Krazan and Associates, 2021b). If during the construction phase of the Project there is a use of hazardous materials, the safe processing and storage of hazardous materials consistent with the California Building Code and the Uniform Fire Code will be required. Additionally, there is no record or indication of underground storage tanks (USTs) being located at the site. If an unknown UST was discovered during construction, it would be properly destroyed in accordance with the State.

It was also noted that there was no material evidence was obtained related to the use of environmentally persistent pesticides/herbicides during the course of the Phase 1 ESA. It is anticipated that any environmentally persistent pesticides/herbicides potentially located on-site will be dislocated and diluted as a result of the grading and trenching operations conducted in conjunction with the proposed development of the property. Consequently, given the above-referenced factors and experience in the Project site vicinity, it was determined the potential is low for elevated concentrations of environmentally persistent pesticides/herbicides (Krazan and Associates, 2021b).

If during the construction phase of the Project there is a use of hazardous materials, the safe processing and storage of hazardous materials consistent with the California Building Code and the Uniform Fire Code will be required. To reduce potential impacts regarding transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials in the City, the Policies NS-4-a through NS-4-I will be implemented.

The proposed Project is not anticipated to create a significant hazard to the public or the environment. As mentioned previously in subsection a) above, the residential Project would not routinely transport, use, dispose of, or discharge hazardous materials into the environment. The Project will not result in any hazards and hazardous material impacts beyond those analyzed in the City of Fresno PEIR. Therefore, Project impacts are considered to be *less than significant*.

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

The closest schools are Storey Elementary School, approximately 100 feet to the south, Southeast Elementary School approximately 0.3 miles to the southwest, and Terronez Middle School approximately 0.55 miles to the west. Construction activities of the proposed Project will result in the temporary use of minimal hazardous materials and or substances, such as lubricant and diesel fuel, during construction. Exhaust from construction and related activities is expected to be minimal and not significant. Once constructed, the residential Project is not expected to result in hazardous emissions. All construction-related activities as a result of the proposed Project would be subject to local, State, and federal laws related to emissions of hazardous materials and substances. In conclusion, the Project will not result in any hazards and hazardous material impacts beyond those analyzed in the City of Fresno PEIR. Therefore, there would be *less than significant impacts*.

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?

See discussion under IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIAL (b), There are no known existing hazardous material conditions on the property, and the property is not included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and the DTSC. The Project itself will not generate or use hazardous materials in a manner outside health department requirements.

The State Water Resources Control Board website, GeoTracker, indicated that there are no Permitted Underground Storage Tanks, Leaking Underground Storage Tanks, or any other active remediation and cleanup sites on or in the vicinity (within one mile) of the Project site (California State Water Resources Control Board, 2022). It is, therefore, possible that subsurface features such as unregistered USTs may exist in the vicinity of the former on-site structures, which remain unknown based upon the absence of any regulatory, municipality, interview data, or other evidence indicating their presence or location. If a UST is discovered, it should be properly destroyed in accordance with local guidelines.

To reduce potential impacts regarding transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials in the City, the Policies NS-4-a through NS-4-l will be applied and followed. It is not anticipated that there are no known underground storage tanks or pipelines located on the Project site that contain hazardous materials; however, any underground storage tanks or pipelines will be removed in accordance with removal standards of the Fresno County Department of Public Health. The disturbance of such items during construction activities is unlikely. Therefore, because the Project is not located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled

pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. In conclusion, the Project will not result in any hazards and hazardous material impacts beyond those analyzed in the City of Fresno PEIR. Therefore, Project impacts are considered to be *less than significant*.

- 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?**

The Project site is approximately 3.39 miles south of the Fresno Yosemite International Airport. The Project site is not located within Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan or within two miles of a public airport; therefore, there would be *no impact*.

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

The City of Fresno Fire Department Emergency Preparedness Office coordinates planning, preparedness and response/recovery efforts for the City. The design and environmental review procedures employed will ensure compliance with emergency response and evacuation plans. In addition, the site plan will be reviewed by the Fire Department and Public Works Department per standard City procedure to ensure consistency with emergency response and evacuation needs.

All Project plans submitted to the City will be reviewed in compliance with federal, State, and local regulations related to emergency access. The proposed Project would not impair the implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. Therefore, the proposed Project would have a less than significant impact on emergency evacuation. In conclusion, the Project will not result in any interference with an emergency evacuation plan impacts beyond those analyzed in the City of Fresno PEIR. Therefore, Project impacts are considered to be *less than significant*.

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

The General Plan Update identified areas within the city limits as largely being categorized as little or no threat or moderate fire hazard, which is attributed to urbanization. The General Plan further indicated that small areas along the San Joaquin River Bluff area in northern Fresno are prone to wildfires due to relatively steep terrain/vegetation, and these areas are classified as high fire hazard areas. However, the Project site is not located within this area and is proposed on a relatively flat surface.

The land surrounding the Project site is primarily developed with urban, suburban, and educational facility uses and would not be considered to be wildlands. Additionally, Cal Fire indicates that the Project site has a low frequency, limited extent, limited magnitude, and low significance regarding wildfire threats (CAL FIRE, 2022). The structures will be built following applicable California Building Codes and standards. The land surrounding the Project site is primarily vacant land and is not considered to be wildlands. The proposed Project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires. The Project will not result in exposure to people or structures to a significant risk involving wildland fires beyond those analyzed in the City of Fresno PEIR. Therefore, Project impacts are considered to be *less than significant*.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures 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		
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		
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		

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 groundwater quality?

Adverse groundwater conditions of limited supply and compromised quality have been well documented by planning, environmental impact report, and technical studies over the past 20 years, including the City of Fresno PEIR, the GP PEIR 10130 for the 2025 Fresno General Plan, Final EIR No.10100, Final EIR No.10117 and Final EIR No. SCH 95022029 (Fresno Metropolitan Water Resource Management Plan), et al. These conditions include water quality degradation due to contamination from 1,2-dibromo-3-chloropropane (DBCP), ethylene-dibromide (EDB), trichloroethylene (TCE), 1,2,3-trichloropropane (TCP), tetrachloroethylene (PCE), 1,1-dichloroethane (DCE), nitrate, and from naturally occurring arsenic, iron, manganese, and radon concentrations; low water well yields in some parts of the City; limited aquifer storage capacity from over-utilization; limited recharge activities; and, intensive urban or semi-urban development occurring up-gradient from the Fresno Metropolitan Area.

In order to be compliant with State regulations, the Project is required to comply with State regulations adopted to reduce groundwater degradation. Construction activities, including grading, could temporarily increase soil erosion rates during and shortly after Project construction. Construction-related erosion could result in the loss of soil and could adversely affect water quality in nearby surface waters. As noted in Section VII Geology and Soils, development as a result of the proposed Project will be required to prepare a site-specific SWPPP as required by the RWQCB. The SWPPP is required to be approved by the RWQCB prior to construction which identifies project-specific best management measures that are designed to control drainage and erosion.

In addition, prior to the commencement of construction activities, the Project proponent would be required to adhere to the requirements of the City Grading Code.

This includes implementation of various measures designed to prevent erosion and control drainage onsite, thereby further preventing the potential sedimentation and subsequent degradation of stormwater. With PEIR mitigation measures incorporated (HYD-3.1 through HYD-3.4), the Project will not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality impacts beyond those analyzed in the City of Fresno PEIR. Therefore, Project impacts are considered to be *less than significant with mitigation incorporation*.

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

Fresno is one of the largest cities in the United States that still maintains a significant reliance on groundwater as part of its public water supply portfolio. Surface water treatment and distribution have been implemented in the northeastern part of the City since 2004 and in the southeastern part of the City since 2018, but the City is still subject to an EPA Sole Source Aquifer designation. While the aquifer underlying Fresno typically exceeds a depth of 300-feet and is capacious enough to provide adequate quantities of safe drinking water to the metropolitan area well into the twenty-first century, groundwater degradation, increasingly stringent water quality regulations, and a historical trend of high consumptive use of water on a per capita basis (currently 205 gallons per day per capita), have resulted in a general decline in aquifer levels, increased cost to provide potable water, and localized water supply limitations.

The City's groundwater aquifer has been documented by the State Department of Water Resources (Bulletin 118 - Interim Update 2016) to be critically over-drafted and has been designated a high-priority basin for corrective action through the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA).

The City of Fresno is actively addressing these issues through citywide metering and updating water use targets and the water shortage contingency plan in the City of Fresno 2020 Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP). The City has adopted the Fresno Metropolitan Water Resource Management Plan. The purpose of these management plans is to provide safe, adequate, and dependable water supplies in order to adequately meet existing and the future needs of the metropolitan area in an economical manner; protect groundwater quality from further degradation and overdraft, and provide a plan of reasonably implementable measures and facilities. City water wells, pump stations, recharge facilities, water treatment, and distribution systems have been expanded incrementally to mitigate increased water demands and respond to groundwater quality challenges.

In response to the need for a comprehensive long-range water supply and distribution strategy, the Fresno General Plan recognizes regional water resource planning

efforts, such as the Kings Basin's Integrated Regional Water Management Plan, the Fresno Area Regional Groundwater Management Plan, the North Kings Groundwater Sustainability Agency, City of Fresno Metropolitan Water Resource Management Plan and cites the findings of the City of Fresno 2020 UWMP. The purpose of these management plans is to provide safe, adequate, and dependable water supplies in order to adequately meet the existing and future needs of the Kings Basin regions and the Fresno-Clovis metropolitan area in an economical manner; protect groundwater quality from further degradation and overdraft, and provide a plan of reasonably implementable measures and facilities.

The City has indicated that groundwater wells, pump stations, recharge facilities, water treatment, and distribution systems shall be expanded incrementally to mitigate increased water demands. One of the primary objectives of Fresno's future water supply plans detailed in Fresno's Metropolitan Water Resources Management Plan, 2010, 2015 & 2020 UWMPs is to balance groundwater operations through a host of strategies. Through careful planning, Fresno has designed a comprehensive plan to accomplish this objective by increasing the utilization of surface water supplies through expansion of surface water treatment facilities, intentional recharge, and conservation, thereby reducing groundwater pumping. The City continually monitors the impacts of land use changes and development project proposals on water supply facilities by assigning fixed demand allocations to each parcel by land use as currently zoned or proposed to be rezoned.

The 2020 City of Fresno Urban Water Management Plan outlines the City of Fresno's goals to achieve a 'water balance' between supply and demand while decreasing reliance upon and use of groundwater. To achieve these goals, the City is implementing a host of strategies, including:

- Intentional groundwater recharge through reclamation at the City's groundwater recharge facility at Leaky Acres (located northwest of Fresno-Yosemite international Airport), refurbish existing streams and canals to increase percolation, and recharge at Fresno Metropolitan Flood Control District's (FMFCD) stormwater basins;
- Increase use of existing surface water entitlements from the Kings River, United States Bureau of Reclamation, and Fresno Irrigation District for treatment at the Northeast Surface Water Treatment Facility (NESWTF) and construct a new Southeast Surface Water Treatment Facility (SESWTF); and
- Recycle wastewater at the Fresno-Clovis Regional Wastewater Reclamation Facility (RWRF) for treatment and re-use for irrigation and to percolation ponds for groundwater recharge. Further actions include the General Plan, Policy RC-6-d to prepare, adopt and implement a City of Fresno Recycled Water Master Plan.

The City has indicated that groundwater wells, pump stations, recharge facilities, water treatment, and distribution systems shall be expanded incrementally to mitigate

increased water demands. One of the primary objectives of Fresno's future water supply plans detailed in Fresno's Metropolitan Water Resources Management Plan, 2010 & 2015 UWMPs is to balance groundwater operations through a host of strategies. Through careful planning, Fresno has designed a comprehensive plan to accomplish this objective by increasing the utilization of surface water supplies through expansion of surface water treatment facilities, intentional recharge, and conservation, thereby reducing groundwater pumping. The City continually monitors impacts of land use changes and development project proposals on water supply facilities by assigning fixed demand allocations to each parcel by land use as currently zoned.

The use of groundwater will continue to be an important part of the City's supply but will not be relied upon as heavily as has historically been the case. The 2020 UWMP shows that groundwater pumped by the City has decreased from approximately 148,006 AF/year in 2008 to approximately 55,000 AF/year in 2020. The projected total estimated groundwater yield for 2045 is approximately 159,820 AF/year, inclusive of intentional recharge (Table 6-1, 2020 UWMP). In order to meet future demand projections, the City is planning to rely on expanding their delivery and treatment of surface water supplies and groundwater recharge activities.

Project construction would add additional impervious surfaces to the Project site; however, various areas of the Project site would remain largely pervious, which would allow infiltration to underlying groundwater. For example, the Project includes ample landscaping areas that would remain pervious. The areas would continue to contribute to groundwater recharge following the construction of the Project. Furthermore, the Project is not anticipated to significantly affect groundwater quality because sufficient stormwater infrastructure would be constructed as part of Project to detain and filter stormwater runoff and prevent long-term water quality degradation. Therefore, Project construction and operation would not substantially deplete or interfere with groundwater supply or quality.

The Urban Water Management Plan states that in 2020, the City's water use averaged 198 GPCD based on 121,993 AF of water production and a service area population of 550,217. The City is far below its 2020 daily per capita water use target of 247 GPCD due to the extensive conservation efforts implemented by the City in the past decade (City of Fresno, 2020).

The proposed Project consists of 73 dwelling units, and the average household size in Fresno is 3.06 (U.S. Census Bureau, 2019); therefore, the Project will house approximately 223 people. Thus, the proposed Project would result in an estimated water demand 44,154 gallons per day (226 people x 198 gallons/day x 365 days = 16.12 million gallons/year, or 49.46 acre-feet).

The PEIR also evaluated the need for additional water conveyance infrastructure (e.g., new water wells) and the increase in additional water demand with the approval of

proposed development in the City. PEIR Mitigation Measure UTL-1.1.1 requires the evaluation of new development related to water conveyance infrastructure and increased water demand. UTL-1.2.1 relates to the evaluation of the City's water supply system and the need for additional capacity improvements to the existing surface water treatment facility.

The Project will not conflict with the implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management. With implementation of applicable PEIR mitigation measures HYD-3.1 through HYD-3.4 and UTL 1.1.1 and UTL 1.2.1, the proposed Project would not obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan beyond those analyzed in the City of Fresno PEIR.

With implementation of the City of Fresno General Plan policies and PEIR, this will ensure that the City has a reliable, long-range source of water through the implementation of measures, standards, incentives, and capital investments to promote water conservation and supply. The Project will not substantially impede groundwater recharge impacts beyond those analyzed in the City of Fresno PEIR.

Once constructed, the Project would drain water into the existing City sewer system and would not degrade surface or groundwater quality, and impacts would be less than significant.

The proposed Project would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted). Therefore, impacts are *less than significant with mitigation incorporation*.

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?

The Project site is mostly flat, and the Project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area. The Project site does not have a stream or river and is not near another body of water. The Project would not result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site.

As discussed in VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS (b), above, potential impacts on water quality arising from erosion and sedimentation are expected to be localized and temporary during construction. Construction-related erosion and sedimentation

impacts as a result of soil disturbance would be less than significant after implementation of an SWPPP and BMPs required by NPDES. No drainages or other water bodies are present on the Project site, and therefore, the proposed Project would not change the course of any such drainages.

The PEIR has recommended Mitigation Measure HYD-3.1 related to the Storm Drainage and Flood Control Master Plan (SDFCMP) for collection systems in drainage areas requiring developers to install, operate, and maintain Fresno Metropolitan Flood Control District (FMFCD) approved on-site detention systems to reduce the peak runoff rates. PEIR HYD-3.2 also requires that prior to the approval of development projects, coordinate with FMFCD to analyze the impacts to existing and planned retention basins to determine remedial measures required to reduce the impact on retention basin capacity to less than significant levels. HYD-3.3 requires developers to coordinate with FMFCD to determine the impacts to the urban detention basin weir overflow rates and determine remedial measures required to reduce the impact on the detention basin, and HYD-3.4 requires coordination with FMFCD to determine the extent and degree to which the capacity of the existing pump system will be exceeded.

Once constructed, the Project would develop areas of impervious surfaces that would reduce the rate of percolation at the site or concentrate, but areas of open space and the proposed stormwater retention basin will allow for the percolation of stormwater to recharge the aquifer or the water would be directed into the City's existing stormwater sewer system. The Project would comply with applicable City development standards and codes. Therefore, the Project would have a less than significant impact on drainage patterns or cause substantial erosion or siltation on or off the site. With implementation of applicable PEIR mitigation measures HYD-3.1 through HYD-3.4, the Project will not substantially result in substantial erosion or siltation on or offsite beyond those analyzed in the City of Fresno PEIR. The impact would be *less than significant with mitigation incorporation*.

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

See also X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY (c(i)), above. No drainages or other water bodies are present on the Project site, and therefore, the development of the site would not change the course of any such drainages that may potentially result in on or offsite flooding. Water would be used during the temporary construction phase of the proposed Project (i.e., for dust suppression). However, any water used for dust control would be mechanically and precisely applied and would generally infiltrate or evaporate prior to running off.

The BMPs associated with the SWPPP would prevent flooding onsite and offsite. As noted above, Mitigation Measure HYD-3.1 requires developers to install, operate, and maintain FMFCD-approved on-site detention systems to reduce the peak runoff rates. PEIR HYD-3.2 also requires that FMFCD review existing and planned retention basins

to determine remedial measures required to reduce the impact on retention basin capacity to less than significant levels. Therefore, the Project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on or offsite.

With implementation of applicable PEIR mitigation measures HYD-3.1 through HYD-3.4, the Project will not substantially result in onsite or offsite flooding beyond those analyzed in the City of Fresno PEIR. Therefore, Project impacts are considered to be *less than significant with mitigation incorporation*.

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?

See response to i and ii, above. The Project will comply with all applicable State and City codes and regulations. The storm drainage plan will be supported by engineering calculations to ensure that the project does not create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff. Therefore, the Project would not create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff. HYD-3.1 through HYD 3.5 in the City of Fresno PEIR requires projects to implement measures aimed toward reducing impacts on the capacity of existing or planned SDFCMP collection systems and to coordinate with FCMFCD. Therefore, the impact will be *less than significant with mitigation incorporation*.

iv. Impede or redirect flood flows?

Please see X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY (c(i)-c(iii)), above. The rate and amount of surface runoff are determined by multiple factors, including the following: topography, the amount and intensity of precipitation, the amount of evaporation that occurs in the watershed, and the amount of precipitation and water that infiltrates to the groundwater. The proposed Project would alter the existing drainage pattern of the site, and a temporary basin will be located on-site during construction and will be utilized for stormwater management in accordance with City requirements outlined in PEIR HYD-3.1 and HYD-3.2.

The existing drainage pattern of the site and area would be affected by Project development because of the increase in impervious surfaces at the site. The Project design includes natural features such as landscaping and vegetation that would allow for the percolation of stormwater. However, there will be an addition in impervious surfaces (houses, driveways, roadways, etc.), which could increase the potential for stormwater runoff. Overflow will be distributed to areas where the City has rights to

spread water per its Storm Drain Master Plan. The Project would also connect to existing City stormwater sewer infrastructure.

With implementation of applicable PEIR mitigation measures HYD-3.1 through HYD-3.4, the proposed Project would not direct flood flows beyond those analyzed in the City of Fresno PEIR. Therefore, Project impacts are considered to be *less than significant with mitigation incorporation*.

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

The Project is located inland and not near an ocean or large body of water; therefore, it would not be affected by a tsunami. The Project is not located within a FEMA 100-year floodplain. Since the Project is located in an area that is not susceptible to inundation, the Project would not risk the release of pollutants due to Project inundation. The impact would be *less than significant*.

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

Please see response b, above. As noted, the proposed Project is anticipated to use approximately 50.12 acre-feet of water annually. The Project will obtain water by connecting to City utility services.

Implementation of the Fresno General Plan policies, the Kings Basin Integrated Regional Water Management Plan, City of Fresno Urban Water Management Plan, Fresno-Area Regional Groundwater Management Plan, and City of Fresno Metropolitan Water Resource Management Plan and the applicable policies of the City's PEIR, will address the issues of providing an adequate, reliable, and sustainable water supply for the Project's urban domestic and public safety consumptive purposes. The City of Fresno, Water Division has reviewed the Project for water quality and groundwater management compliance. Further, the Fresno General Plan policies and initiatives ensure water conservation. The PEIR also evaluated the need for additional water conveyance infrastructure (e.g., new water wells) and the increase in additional water demand with the approval of proposed development in the City. PEIR Mitigation Measure UTL-1.1.1 requires the evaluation of new development related to water conveyance infrastructure and increased water demand. UTL-1.2.1 relates to the evaluation of the City's water supply system and the need for additional capacity improvements to the existing surface water treatment facility.

The Project will not conflict with the implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management. With implementation of applicable PEIR mitigation measures HYD-3.1 through HYD-3.4 and UTL 1.1.1- and UTL-1.2.1, the proposed Project would not obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan beyond those analyzed in the City of

Fresno PEIR. Therefore, the Project is considered to have a *less than significant impact with mitigation incorporation*.

Mitigation Measures

The proposed Project shall implement and incorporate the hydrology and water quality related mitigation measures as identified in the attached Project Specific Mitigation Monitoring Checklist dated May 20, 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?

The Project is located within an area primarily consisting of residential parcels located within the Fresno city limits. The City’s General Plan designated the parcel as Medium Density and Medium Low Density Residential. The proposed residential use is allowed with the land use designation. The Project would not create a physical barrier between existing communities, as there will be a trail allowing connectivity to the existing communities to the east. The Project will not result in any land use and/or planning impacts beyond those analyzed in the City of Fresno PEIR, and there are *no impacts*.

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?

The proposed Project is located in an area that is planned for residential and urban development by the City. The construction of this Project will not conflict with any conservation plans because it is not located within any conservation plan areas.

Upon approval the proposed Project would not conflict with any land use plan, policy or regulation. The discretionary approval required for the Project will include reviews and comments from responsible agencies, and from several City departments to ensure compliance with all applicable, plans, policies, regulations, standards, and conditions of approval. With approval of the discretionary actions, the Project will be

consistent with the City's General Plan and Zoning Ordinance and will comply with local and State building codes and requirements.

The zoning and General Plan designation are consistent with the proposed residential development.

The proposed Project would not result in any land use and planning environmental impacts beyond those analyzed in the City of Fresno PEIR. There would be *no impact*.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures 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:				
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?

The California Department of Conservation, Geological Survey classifies lands into Aggregate and Mineral Resource Zones (MRZs) based on guidelines adopted by the California State Mining and Geology Board, as mandated by the Surface Mining and Reclamation Act of 1974. These MRZs identify whether known or inferred significant mineral resources are present in areas. Lead agencies are required to incorporate identified MRZs resource areas delineated by the State into their General Plans. The subject site is not located in an area designated for mineral resource preservation or recovery area.

According to the California Department of Conservation - Geologic Energy Management Division (CalGEM) website, there are no active, inactive, or capped oil wells located within the Project site, and it is not within a DOGGR-recognized oilfield. Additionally, the Fresno General Plan has not designated the Project site to be located in an area designated for mineral resource preservation or recovery. The Project will not 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. Therefore, the Project would not result in any mineral resource environmental impacts beyond those analyzed in the City of Fresno PEIR. Therefore, there would be *no impact*.

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

The subject site is not designated by the General Plan, specific plan, or other land use plan as a locally-important mineral resource recovery site; therefore, it will not result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource. This is a less than significant impact. Therefore, the Project would not result in any mineral resource environmental impacts beyond those analyzed in the City of Fresno PEIR, and there is *no impact*.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures 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

The analysis presented in this section are based on an Acoustical Analysis (WJV Acoustics, Inc, 2022) for the Project, which is attached as Appendix F.

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?

The 2020 City of Fresno General Plan Update and associated PEIR provides noise level criteria for land use compatibility for both transportation and non-transportation noise sources. The General Plan sets noise compatibility standards for transportation noise sources in terms of the Day-Night Average Level (Ldn). The Ldn represents the

time-weighted energy average noise level for a 24-hour day, with a 10-dB penalty added to noise levels occurring during the nighttime hours (10:00 p.m.-7:00 a.m.). The Ldn represents cumulative exposure to noise over an extended period of time and is therefore calculated based upon annual average conditions.

Implementing Policy NS-1-h of the Noise Element requires that interior noise levels attributable to exterior transportation noise sources not exceed 45 dB Ldn. The intent of the interior noise level standard is to provide an acceptable noise environment for indoor communication and sleep.

Traffic Noise Exposure

Table 13-1 below indicates that the traffic noise exposure at the closest lots to S. Peach Avenue would be approximately 63 dB Ldn for existing conditions and approximately 64 dB Ldn for future (2035) traffic conditions. The table also indicates that traffic noise exposure at the closest lots on East Church Avenue would be approximately 55 dB Ldn for existing conditions and approximately 54 dB Ldn for future (2035) traffic conditions. Such noise exposure levels do not exceed the City's 65 dB Ldn exterior noise level standard, and mitigation measures are not required for compliance with the City's exterior noise level standard.

**Table 13-1
Modeled Traffic Noise Levels, DB, L_{dn}
Olive Lane Subdivision**

Roadway	Existing Conditions	2035 Conditions
S. Peach Avenue (north of E. Church Avenue)	63	64
E. Church Avenue (east of S. Peach Avenue)	55	54

Source: WJV Acoustics / Fresno COG

The City of Fresno's interior noise level standard is 45 dB Ldn. The worst-case noise exposure within the proposed residential development would be approximately 64 dB Ldn (2035 conditions along S. Peach Avenue). This means that the proposed residential construction must be capable of providing a minimum outdoor-to-indoor noise level reduction (NLR) of approximately 19 dB (64-45=19). Residential construction methods will comply with current building code requirements and reduce exterior noise levels by approximately 25 dB if windows and doors are closed. This will be sufficient for compliance with the City's 45 dB Ldn interior standard at all proposed Project.

The Project site is located on the northeast corner of the intersection of Church Avenue and Peach Avenue. Existing land uses in the immediate vicinity include a school to the south and residential development to the north, east, and west.

Conclusion

The Project will be required to comply with all noise policies and development standards identified within the Fresno General Plan and PEIR as well as the noise ordinance of the Fresno Municipal Code, Chapter 10 Article 1 – Noise Regulations. Through compliance with the policies and development standards and with implementation of General Plan policies NS-1-i, NS-1-j as proposed on the TTM to reduce noise impacts related to the railroad and park sites, the interior and exterior noise levels would comply with the City’s noise standards, and impacts will be less than significant. Furthermore, the Project may produce an elevated ambient noise level during construction; however, those impacts are temporary, and no operational noise will be generated that exceeds the adopted noise levels identified for neighboring land uses. Therefore, Project impacts are considered to be *less than significant with mitigation incorporated*.

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

According to the Federal Transit Administration Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Guidelines (FTA-VA-90-06), ground-borne vibration can be a serious concern for nearby neighbors of a transit system route or maintenance facility, causing buildings to shake and rumbling sounds to be heard. In contrast to airborne noise, ground-borne vibration is not a common environmental problem. It is unusual for vibration from sources such as buses and trucks to be perceptible, even in locations close to major roads.

The City of Fresno does not currently have adopted standards for groundborne vibration. As a result, vibration impact criteria established by the U.S. Department of Transportation’s Federal Transit Administration (FTA) criteria were applied to the assessment of railroad operations at the project site. The FTA vibration impact criteria are based on maximum overall levels for a single event, such as train passersby.

Construction activity would be exempt from City of Fresno noise regulations as long as such activity is conducted pursuant to an applicable construction permit and occurs between 7:00 a.m. and 10:00 p.m., excluding Sunday. The Project would also comply with PEIR Mitigation Measure NOI-2, which prohibits the use of heavy construction equipment within 25 feet of existing structures during construction. With implementation of PEIR NOI-2, short-term construction impacts associated with the exposure of persons to or the generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the general plan or noise ordinance or applicable standards of other agencies would be less than significant. The Project would not generate excessive vibratory or noise impacts beyond those analyzed in the City of Fresno PEIR.

Therefore, the Project will have a *less than significant impact with mitigation incorporation*.

- 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?**

The closest airport or airstrip is the Fresno Yosemite International Airport, located approximately 3.89 miles south of the Project site. The proposed Project is outside noise level contours identified in the Fresno Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (Fresno Council of Governments, 2018).

Therefore, the proposed Project would not expose people residing or working at the Project site to excessive noise levels associated with such airport facilities. In conclusion, with implementation of the Project, the Project will not result in any noise impacts beyond those analyzed in the City of Fresno PEIR, and the Project will have *no impact*.

Mitigation Measures

The proposed project shall implement and incorporate the noise related mitigation measures as identified in the attached Project Specific Mitigation Monitoring Checklist dated May 20, 2022.

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING – Would the project:				
a) Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?			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)?

The population in Fresno is 542,107 people, and the average persons per household is 3.07 (United States Census, 2021). It is anticipated that by 2040 the Fresno population will be 816,980 (Fresno County Council of Governments, 2017).

The Project build-out will result in an additional 73 single-family residences and a corresponding population increase of 224 residents. The Project population growth represents a 0.0435642 percent increase in the 2020 population. The Project-related population increase is de-minimis and will be absorbed upon full build-out of the Project. The installation of new infrastructure would be limited to the internal single-family residences and related improvements. The sizing of the infrastructure would be specific to the number of units proposed within the Project site.

The City’s General Plan includes encouraging residential developments to meet the future population growth needs. This project accommodates this anticipated increase in City’s population by providing 73 new residences for existing and future residents. Implementation of the proposed Project would not induce unplanned population growth in an area, either directly or indirectly, beyond those analyzed in the City of Fresno PEIR. Therefore, impacts are considered to be *less than significant*.

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

Construction of the Project would likely be completed by construction workers residing in the City or the surrounding area; they would not require new housing. The proposed Project would not require the demolition of any housing, as the project site is currently undeveloped. As proposed, the Project will not displace existing housing or people either directly or indirectly beyond those analyzed in the City of Fresno PEIR. Therefore, there are *no impacts*.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures 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	
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?

The Project site is located approximately 2 miles southwest of Fire Station 15. The proposed Project will comply with Title 24 of the California Building Code and local development standards. Prior to the recordation of any subdivision map, the applicant will be required to enter into an agreement with the City to pay development impact

fees that are collected for the provision of capital facilities for fire facilities that will provide for future facilities as the City's population increases.

The Project is required to pay development impact fees that are collected that will provide for future fire-related facilities as the City's population increases. Recognizing that there would be an increased demand for fire and emergency medical response, the General Plan includes several policies to support the activities of the Fresno Fire Department. The policies and objectives of the General Plan will ensure that the proposed Project does not significantly affect fire protection.

The construction of the Project may result in a minor increase in demand for fire protection services but would not require new or altered facilities. The General Plan Update includes several policies to support the activities of the Fresno Fire Department, such as PU-3-d, which requires the Fire Department to review development applications, and PU-3-e, which enforces amendments to construction and fire codes, to systematically reduce the level of risk to life and property from fire, commensurate with the City's fire suppression capabilities.

The policies and objectives of the General Plan will ensure that the proposed Project does not significantly affect fire protection. The Project would not affect the Department's response time to incidents as described in General Plan Policy PF-H 8. The City of Fresno PEIR includes MM PSR-1.1, which requires an environmental review of future fire facilities to analyze potential impacts to air quality/greenhouse gas emissions, noise, traffic, and lighting. Implementation of MM PSR-1.1 would reduce impacts related to fire protection facilities. Therefore, impacts would be *less than significant with mitigation incorporation*.

ii. Police protection?

The Project site is approximately 2.15 miles southeast of the Fresno Police Department Southeast Policing District station.

According to the City of Fresno General Plan, development impact fees are collected for the provision of capital facilities for public safety facilities that will provide for future facilities as the City's population increases. Recognizing that there would be an increased demand for police and emergency medical response, the General Plan includes several policies to support the activities of the Police Department.

The Project may result in significant environmental impacts related to acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives specific to police protection services. However, to reduce impacts to public protection services, the Project developer is required to pay appropriate impact fees related to police protection and is responsible for constructing any infrastructure needed to serve the Project. Therefore, the Project does not significantly affect police protection.

Therefore, with implementation of standard local requirements for development projects related to police protection services, impacts will not be beyond those analyzed in the City of Fresno PEIR, and Project impacts are considered *less than significant*.

iii. Schools?

Impacts on schools are determined by analyzing the projected increase in demand for schools as a result of future residential development projected under the proposed Project.

School fees are collected for all new residential and commercial buildings. Fees are typically higher for residential uses, as these uses are associated with increased population growth, leading to an increased student population at existing schools. The Project includes discretionary approvals for a Vesting Tentative Tract Map. The Project review and approval process will ensure that all school-related fees are paid by the applicant. These requirements will ensure that the proposed Project does not significantly affect Fresno Unified School District's facilities. The District recognizes that the legislature, as a matter of law, has deemed under Government Code Section 65996 that all school facilities' impacts are mitigated as a consequence of SB 50 Level 1, 2, and 3 developer fee legislative provisions. The project developer will pay appropriate impact fees at the time of building permits. The proposed Project does not result in the construction of new school facilities.

Therefore, with implementation of standard local requirements for development projects related to school fees, impacts will not be beyond those analyzed in the City of Fresno PEIR, and impacts are considered *less than significant*.

iv. Parks?

Impacts on parks and recreational facilities are determined by analyzing the projected increase in demand for these facilities as a result of future residential development and the corresponding population increase projected under the proposed Project. According to the 2025 City of Fresno General Plan, the City's standard called for at least 3.0 acres of parkland to be provided per 1,000 residents. Park and recreation fees (Quimby) are collected for all new residential developments. The Project review and approval process will ensure that all park-related fees are paid by the applicant.

However, the Project proposes an outlot that will be approximately 6,000 square feet of open space dedicated to the City of Fresno to satisfy park requirements. Therefore, as the Project proposes, the proposed Project does not significantly affect park and recreation facilities. Therefore, impacts will not be beyond those analyzed in the City of Fresno PEIR, and there is *no impact* as the Project will increase park facilities.

v. Other public facilities?

The Project build-out will result in an additional 73 single-family residences and a corresponding projected population increase of 224 residents. The Project population growth represents a 0.0435642 percent increase in the 2020 population. Impacts on other public facilities such as courts, libraries, and hospitals are determined by analyzing the projected increase in demand for these facilities.

The Project review and approval process will ensure that all development-related impact fees are paid by the applicant. In addition, the Project will not result in any public service impacts beyond those analyzed in the City of Fresno PEIR. Therefore, Project impacts are considered to be *less than significant*.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures 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?

See also Section XV (iv) PUBLIC SERVICES, above. The Project proposes approximately 6,000 square feet of open space and an additional public trail. Impacts on parks and recreational facilities are determined by analyzing the projected increase in demand for these facilities as a result of future residential development and corresponding population increases. The Project build-out will result in an additional 73 single-family residences and a corresponding population increase of 224 residents. The Project population growth is minimal and will not have a negative impact on neighborhood or regional parks as the Project has its own park area. Therefore, Project impacts related to parks and recreational facilities will not be greater than those analyzed in the City of Fresno PEIR and are considered to have *no impacts*.

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

As stated above, Project proposes to develop approximately 6,000 square feet of open space for dedication to the City of Fresno and an additional public trail as

Identified on TT 6410. Future construction of the park facilities and any associated infrastructure additions will be conducted by the City of Fresno. Therefore, through the standard City building process for the future park, City staff will ensure that the proposed Project does not significantly affect park and recreation facilities. The Project would not result in any recreational environmental impacts beyond those analyzed in the City of Fresno PEIR. Therefore, impacts are considered to be *less than significant*.

Mitigation Measures

No Mitigation measures 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?

Bicycle Facilities

The 2017 City of Fresno Active Transportation Plan (ATP) refers to the Caltrans Highway Design Manual for the classification of bicycle facilities as follows:

- Class I Bikeway (Bike Path): Off-street facilities that provide exclusive use for non-motorized travel, including bicyclists and pedestrians.
- Class II Bikeway (Bike Lane): On-street facilities that use striping, stencils, and signage to denote preferential or exclusive use by bicyclists.
- Class III Bikeway (Bike Route): On-street pavement markings or signage that connect the bicycle roadway network along corridors that do not provide enough space for dedicated lanes on low-speed and low-volume streets.
- Class IV Bikeway (Separated Bikeways): Physically separated bicycle facilities that are distinct from the sidewalk and designed for exclusive use by bicyclists.

Commonly known as “cycle tracks,” they are located within the street right-of-way but provide similar comfort when compared to Class I Bikeways.

The ATP identifies existing Class II and Class III bike lanes in the immediate vicinity of the Project site. The ATP also identifies existing Class II bikeway facilities running east-west along Church Avenue and Class III bike lane along the eastern portion of Peach Avenue westerly adjacent to the Project site.

Pedestrian Facilities

Pedestrian connectivity is not well established in the general vicinity of the site. Sidewalks typically exist only within and along the frontage of adjacent residential developments. The Project would be required to construct sidewalks along its frontage. Upon submittal of development permits with the City for the Project, all applicable requirements for updating sidewalks and other related infrastructure will be required from the ATP.

Transit

Fresno Area Express (FAX) is the transit operator in the City of Fresno. The closest is FAX Route 41, located at the intersection of Church and Maple Avenues. The Project is not expected to disrupt or impede existing transit facilities.

The Project is not expected to disrupt or impede existing or planned bicycle facilities, or pedestrian or transit facilities. The Project will not conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities. Impacts related to these transit facilities will not be greater than those analyzed in the City of Fresno PEIR, and impacts are *less than significant*.

Table 17-1 below presents trip generation estimates for the Project. For comparison purposes, an estimate of the number of trips that potentially could have been generated by a Project constructed based on the current Single-Family Residential land use designation is presented below.

**Table 17-2
Project Trip Generation Estimate**

Land Use	Units	Daily		A.M. Peak Hour					P.M. Peak Hour				
		Rate	Total	Rate	In:Out	In	Out	Total	Rate	In:Out	In	Out	Total
Single-Family Detached Housing (210)	73	9.44	698	0.74	25:75	13	41	54	0.99	63:37	46	27	73

Source: Trip Generation Manual 10th Edition – Volume 2: Data

Trips generated during construction would not likely result in a substantial increase in traffic in relation to the existing roadway capacity nor congestion at intersections. The potential impacts on the local roadway system from the construction of 73 single-family homes related to vehicle trips and the Project's operational traffic on the area roadway and circulation system is minimal. Impacts related to traffic will not be greater than those analyzed in the City of Fresno PEIR, and impacts are *less than significant*.

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

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.”

One of the eligible screening criteria is if a project is located within an area with low VMT, as designated in the screening map for residential uses (Figure 6) in the City of Fresno’s CEQA Guidelines for Vehicle Miles Traveled Thresholds Technical Advisory. These low VMT areas were calculated using Fresno County as the region. The Fresno County average VMT per capita is 16.10.

The proposed project is eligible to screen out because it is located in a low VMT zone, as designated by the Fresno COG screening map and Figure 6 of the City of Fresno CEQA Guidelines for VMT Thresholds.

In conclusion, 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)?

The Project will be designed to current standards and safety regulations. All intersections will be constructed to comply with the City and Caltrans regulations and design and safety standards of Chapter 33 of the California Building Codes (CBC) and the guidelines of Title 24 to create safe and accessible roadways. All new driveways connecting to existing adjacent streets must be designed in accordance with the City’s street standards that assure safe ingress/egress.

Vehicles exiting the subdivision will be provided with a clear view of the roadway without obstructions. Landscaping associated with the entry driveways could impede such views if improperly installed. Specific circulation patterns and roadway designs will incorporate all applicable safety measures to ensure that hazardous design features or inadequate emergency access to the site or other areas surrounding the Project area would not occur.

Therefore, with the incorporated design features and all applicable rules and regulations for City standards, Project impacts are considered to be *less than significant*, and no further analysis is warranted.

d) Result in inadequate emergency access?

There will be two main entry points to the Project off of Church Avenue. The Project will be required to construct all necessary street frontage improvements to City Standards. In addition, the proposed Project will be required to dedicate and construct improvements along all major street frontages and on any future proposed local interior streets within respective phases in accordance with City of Fresno standards, specifications, and requirements.

The Project would not inhibit the ability of local roadways to continue to accommodate emergency response and evacuation activities. The Project would not interfere with the City's adopted emergency response plan. Therefore, with the incorporated design features and all applicable rules and regulations for State and City standards. Therefore, the Project would result in a *less than significant* impact associated with emergency access. In conclusion, the proposed Project would not result in any transportation environmental impacts beyond those analyzed in the PEIR.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures 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:		X		
i) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in PRC section 5020.1(k), or,		X		
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

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 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)).

Pursuant to AB 52, the Table Mountain Rancheria of California and Dumna Wo Wah Tribal Government were invited to consult under AB 52. The City of Fresno mailed notices of the proposed Project to each of these tribes on April 15, 2022 which included the required 30-day time period regarding AB 52 ending on May 16, 2022. To date, neither tribal group has responded to the City's notices for this Project.

As noted in V. CULTURAL RESOURCES (a)-(c), the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) was asked to conduct a search of its Sacred Lands File to identify previously recorded sacred sites or cultural resources of special importance to tribes and provide contact information for local Native American representatives who may have information about the Project area. A response dated March 1, 2022, indicates negative results.

A records search (#22-006) was conducted at the Southern San Joaquin Valley Information Center (IC), CSU Bakersfield, records search covered an area within one-half mile of the Project and included a review of the *National Register of Historic Places*, *California Points of Historical Interest*, *California Registry of Historic Resources*, *California Historical Landmarks*, *California State Historic Resources Inventory*, and a review of cultural resource reports on file.

Based on the results of cultural records search findings and the lack of historical or archaeological resources previously identified within a half-mile radius of the proposed Project, the potential to encounter subsurface cultural resources is minimal. Additionally, the Project construction would be conducted within the partially developed and previously disturbed parcel. The Project would not impact the cultural resource properties that are within the vicinity. The potential to uncover subsurface historical or archaeological deposits would be considered unlikely.

The Project site is currently undeveloped and was historically in agricultural production. If any artifacts are inadvertently discovered during ground-disturbing activities, existing federal, State, and local laws and regulations as well as the mitigation measures of the PEIR, will require construction activities to cease until such artifacts are properly examined and determined not to be of significance by a qualified cultural resources professional.

In conclusion, with GP PEIR mitigation measures incorporated, the Project will not result in any cultural resource impacts beyond those analyzed in the City of Fresno PEIR, and implementation of the GP PEIR Mitigation Measure CUL-1.1, CUL-1.2 CUL-2 and CUL-3 will result in a *less than significant impact with mitigation incorporation*.

- 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.**

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 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)).

Additional 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.

Overall, because all tribes, to which invitations for consultation were extended, declined AB 52 consultation and because existing cultural resources protection laws exist that would require construction activities to cease if artifacts are discovered. The Project site is currently undeveloped and was historically in agricultural production. If any artifacts are inadvertently discovered during ground-disturbing activities, existing federal, State, and local laws and regulations as well as the mitigation measures of the PEIR will require construction activities to cease until such artifacts are properly

examined and determined not to be of significance by a qualified cultural resources professional.

In conclusion, with City of Fresno PEIR mitigation measures incorporated, the Project will not result in any cultural resource impacts beyond those analyzed in the City of Fresno PEIR, and implementation of PEIR Mitigation Measures CUL-1.1, CUL 1.2, CUL-2 and CUL-3 will result in a *less than significant impact with mitigation incorporation*.

Mitigation Measures

The proposed project shall implement and incorporate the tribal cultural resource related mitigation measures as identified in the attached Project Specific Mitigation Monitoring Checklist dated May 20, 2022.

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		
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 stormwater drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?**

The proposed Project will require the construction of new infrastructure to connect to the existing utility infrastructure. This will include water, wastewater, and stormwater drainage connections. Additionally, the Project will include connections for electric power, natural gas, and telecommunications facilities. The installation of this infrastructure will not require any major upsizing or other offsite construction activities that would cause a significant impact. The new infrastructure would be connected to the existing infrastructure that is adjacent to the Project site.

Impacts to storm drainage facilities have been previously discussed in X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY (b, c (i)-C(iii) and e). In compliance with NPDES General Construction Permit requirements, the proposed Project would design and submit a site-specific SWPPP to minimize the discharge of wastewater during construction and a Water Quality Management Plan that includes BMPs for runoff control as required. Therefore, the proposed Project would not require new stormwater drainage facilities to manage stormwater runoff during construction or operation, and impacts would be *less than significant*.

The proposed Project would be subject to the payment of any applicable connection charges and/or fees and extension of services in a manner that is compliant with the Department of Public Utilities standards, specifications, and policies.

Sanitary sewer and water service under City of Fresno jurisdiction, delivery is also subject to payment of applicable connection charges and/or fees; compliance with the Department of Public Utilities standards, specifications, and policies; the rules and regulations of the California Public Utilities Commission and California Health Services; and, implementation of the citywide program for the completion of incremental expansions to facilities for planned water supply, treatment, and storage.

With implementation of applicable PEIR mitigation measures HYD-3.1 through HYD-3.4 and UTL 1.1.1 and UTL 1.2.1, the proposed Project would not obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan beyond those analyzed in the City of Fresno PEIR. Therefore, the Project has a *less than significant impact with mitigation incorporation*.

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

As discussed under the Section VII HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY (b, c(i)-c(iii) and e, the proposed Project is anticipated to use approximately 50.12 acre feet of water annually. The Project will obtain water by connecting to City utility services. The PEIR recognizes regional water resource planning efforts, such as the Kings Basin's Integrated Regional Water Management Plan, the Fresno- Area Regional Groundwater Management Plan, and the City of Fresno Metropolitan Water Resource Management Plan and cites the findings of the City of Fresno 2020 UWMP. The purpose of these management plans is to provide safe, adequate, and dependable water supplies in order to adequately meet the existing and future needs of the Kings Basin regions and the Fresno-Clovis metropolitan area in an economical manner; protect groundwater quality from further degradation and overdraft; and, provide a plan of reasonably implementable measures and facilities.

Additionally, the applicant will be required to comply with all requirements of the City of Fresno Department of Public Utilities to reduce the Project's water impacts to *less than significant*. With implementation of applicable City of Fresno PEIR mitigation measures HYD-3.1 through HYD-3.4 and UTL 1.1.1 and UTL 1.2.1, the proposed Project would not obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan beyond those analyzed in the City of Fresno PEIR. Therefore, the Project has a *less than significant impact with mitigation incorporation*.

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?

The City acts as the Regional Sewer Agency and is responsible for operating the Fresno/Clovis Regional Wastewater Reclamation Facility (RWRF) and the North Fresno Wastewater Treatment Facility (NFWTF). The Regional Facility provides wastewater treatment for a service area that includes most of the Cities of Fresno and Clovis and some unincorporated areas of Fresno County. According to the City of Fresno PEIR, the Regional Facility received and treated approximately 72,302 acre-feet (AF) of wastewater during 2011, representing an annual average daily flow of approximately 64.5 million gallons per day (MGD). The quantity of wastewater received and treated by the Regional Facility has been declining since 2006, when it peaked at a total of approximately 80,801 AF, representing an annual average daily flow of approximately 72.1 MGD.

The permitted wastewater treatment capacity of the Regional Facility is currently 80-MGD as an annual, monthly average flow, and 88-MGD as a maximum monthly average flow. The City is currently evaluating upgrades and modifications to the existing Regional Facility that may result in a capacity rating increase of 15-MGD. The City of Clovis owns 9.3-MGD of wastewater treatment capacity at the Regional Facility, and the City of Fresno owns the remaining capacity.

The NFWTF was constructed in late 2006 to provide wastewater treatment service for residential and commercial development in the surrounding area of north Fresno. The permitted capacity of the NFWRF is 0.71 MGD, as an average monthly flow and 1.07 MGD, as a maximum daily flow. The City's master plan for the NFWRF calls for ultimate expansion to an average monthly flow capacity of 1.07-MGD upon full development of the NFWRF service area.

The City of Fresno PEIR concludes that impacts associated with wastewater treatment facilities and capacity resulting from the buildout of the General Plan, including the proposed Project site, would be less than significant with implementation of PEIR mitigation measures HYD-3.1 through HYD-3.4, UTL-1.3.1 UTL-1.3.2, and UTL-1.4.1.

The City of Fresno Department of Public Utilities will review the Project and determine which sanitary sewer facilities are available to provide service to the site. The Project conditions of approval may include payment of the applicable sanitary sewer fees, which would eventually be used to provide funding for the improvements at the RWRF and NFWTF in order to expand capacity (as required by Mitigation Measure UTL-1.1.2 of the PEIR).

The proposed Project will not result in an inadequate capacity to serve the Project's anticipated wastewater demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments. With implementation of applicable PEIR mitigation measures, the proposed Project would not obstruct implementation of wastewater management beyond those analyzed in the City of Fresno PEIR. Therefore, the Project has a *less than significant impact with mitigation incorporation*.

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?

The City of Fresno Department of Public Utilities, Solid Waste Division has reviewed the Project for compliance with any federal, State, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste. According to the City of Fresno PEIR, garbage disposed of in the City of Fresno is taken to Cedar Avenue Recycling and Transfer Station. Once trash has been off-loaded at the transfer station, it is sorted, and non-recyclable solid waste is loaded onto large trucks and taken to the American Avenue Landfill located approximately six miles southwest of Kerman. American Avenue Landfill is owned and operated by Fresno County and began operations in 1992 for both public and commercial solid waste haulers. The American Avenue Landfill is a sanitary landfill, meaning that it is a disposal site for non-hazardous solid waste spread in layers, compacted to the smallest practical volume, and covered by material applied at the end of each operating day.

The American Avenue Landfill (i.e., American Avenue Disposal Site 10-AA-0009) has a maximum permitted capacity of 32,700,000 cubic yards and a remaining capacity of

29,358,535 cubic yards, with an estimated closure date of August 31, 2031. The maximum permitted throughput is 2,200 tons per day. Other landfills within the County of Fresno include the Clovis Landfill, with a maximum remaining permitted capacity of 7,740,000 cubic yards, a maximum permitted throughput of 2,000 tons per day, and an estimated closure date of 2047. There is also the Coalinga Landfill, with a maximum remaining capacity of 1,930,062 cubic yards, a maximum permitted throughput of 200 tons per day, and an estimated closure date of 2029. As noted above, the estimated closure date of the American Avenue Landfill is 2031. Additional capacity also exists at the Clovis Landfill and Coalinga Landfill. The 200 tons per year would not result in an exceedance of the local capacity infrastructure.

It is anticipated the Project would generate minimal amounts of waste during construction. Any Hazardous waste generated during construction would be disposed of at an approved location, and construction activities are not expected to exceed the capacity of these landfills.

In the operation phase, typical household refuse would be generated by residences; according to CalRecycle residential units average 12.23 lbs. of household refuse per day. The proposed 73 units would generate approximately 893 lbs. per day (or 163 tons per year). The Project will comply with any statutes and regulations related to solid waste. Therefore, the proposed Project would not result in any waste related environmental impacts beyond those analyzed in the City of Fresno PEIR. Impacts would be less *than significant*.

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

Project construction and operational activities that generate solid waste are handled, transported, and disposed of in accordance with applicable federal, State, and local regulations pertaining to municipal waste. The 1989 California Integrated Waste Management Act requires jurisdictions to attain specific waste diversion goals (AB 393, 2019). In addition, the California Solid Waste Reuse and Recycling Access Act of 1991, as amended, requires expanded or new development Projects to incorporate storage areas for recycling bins into the proposed Project design. Reuse and recycling of construction debris would reduce operating expenses and save valuable landfill space. With development in accordance with the City's General Plan, solid waste will continue to be handled, transported, and disposed of according to all applicable federal, State, and local regulations pertaining to municipal waste disposal. The City has a number of provisions that require or promote recycling and waste reduction, including the Construction and Demolition Recycling Ordinance, which requires contractors to recycle construction and demolition debris.

In June of 2005, the Fresno City Council adopted the City of Fresno Solid Waste and Recycling Facilities Ordinance (Ord. No. 2003-100) in order to comply with AB 939, which requires the implementation of integrated waste management plans and

mandates that local jurisdictions divert at least 50 percent of all solid waste. The recycling of construction and demolition materials is required for any City-issued building, relocation, or demolition permit that generates at least eight cubic yards of material by volume.

The Project would generate solid waste during construction and operation of the new single-family residences. Common construction waste may include metals, masonry, plastic pipe, rocks, dirt, cardboard, or green waste related to land development. AB 939 and Ordinance No. 2003-100 require the City of Fresno to attain specific waste diversion goals. The waste disposal facilities listed above have the available capacity to accept construction waste from potential new facilities.

The Project is required to comply with all local, State, and federal regulations related to solid waste and would not result in any utility-related environmental impacts beyond those analyzed in the City of Fresno PEIR. Impacts are considered to be *less than significant*.

Mitigation Measures

The proposed Project shall implement and incorporate the hydrology, water quality, and utilities related mitigation measures as identified in the attached Project Specific Mitigation Monitoring Checklist dated May 20, 2022.

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	
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?

The Project site will connect to an existing network of City streets. The Project site has several access points allowing access in the event of an emergency. Therefore, no

significant impacts related to the impairment of the implementation of or physical interference with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan would occur.

The proposed Project is for the residential construction. These types of uses are similar in nature to the other uses within the Project area. It is not anticipated that new or different impairments would occur that may physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. All Project plans submitted to the City will be reviewed in compliance with federal, State, and local regulations related to emergency access. The Project is required to comply with all local, State, and federal regulations related to emergency preparedness and would not result in environmental impacts beyond those analyzed in the City of Fresno PEIR. Therefore, Project impacts are considered to be *less than significant*.

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?

See IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIAL (g). Although the City of Fresno is proximate to high and very high fire hazard designated areas, the City is largely categorized as little or no threat or moderate fire hazard, which is largely attributed to urban development. Some small areas along the San Joaquin River Bluff area in northern Fresno are prone to wildfires due to relatively steep terrain/vegetation, and these areas are classified as high fire hazard areas. The Project area is located in a Local Responsibility Area (LRA) and has been designated as Non-Wildland by CalFire.

The risk of wildfire is related to a variety of parameters, including fuel loading (vegetation), fire weather (winds, temperatures, humidity levels, and fuel moisture contents), and topography (degree of slope). Steep slopes contribute to fire hazard by intensifying the effects of wind and making fire suppression difficult. Fuels such as grass are highly flammable because they have a high surface area to mass ratio and require less heat to reach the ignition point. The Project site is located in an area that is predominately urban, which is not considered at significant risk of wildfire. There are minimal amounts of highly flammable fuels such as dry grasses in the area. Therefore, in the unlikely event of a wildfire, the project would not expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire. The Project would not pose a wildfire risk during construction or operations beyond those analyzed in the City of Fresno PEIR. Therefore, Project impacts are considered to 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?

See discussion under XX. WILDFIRE (a) above. The Project includes the development of infrastructure (water, sewer, and storm drainage) required to support the proposed residential uses and park site. The Project site is surrounded by existing and future urban development. However, the site is not located within an area designated as a high wildfire risk. Additionally, all new single-family residences would be required to comply with federal, State, and local health and safety regulations, development standards, building codes, and other laws and regulations that govern fire protection and suppression. All Project-related construction will meet or exceed all Federal, State, and local regulations and codes related to fire protection and suppression. Additionally, the Project would not require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure and will not exacerbate fire risk that may result in impacts to the environment. Therefore, there are no impacts beyond those analyzed in the City of Fresno PEIR. Therefore, Project impacts are considered to be *less than significant*.

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?

The proposed Project would require the installation of storm drainage infrastructure to ensure that storm waters properly drain from the Project site and do not result in downstream flooding or major drainage changes. A storm drainage plan would be designed and engineered to ensure the proper construction of storm drainage infrastructure to control runoff and prevent flooding, erosion, and sedimentation.

Upon development of the site, stormwater would flow to the existing storm drains in the adjacent roadways. Any further storm drain requirements will be processed by the Fresno Metropolitan Flood Control District and constructed per the District's standards. Additionally, the Project site is located within an "Area of Minimal Flood Hazard" indicating that the site is located outside of the 100-year flood hazard zone as determined by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) (Federal Emergency Management Agency, 2022). Further, because the site is essentially flat and located in an existing urbanized area of the City, downstream landslides would not occur.

Landslides include rockfalls, deep slope failure, and shallow slope failure. Factors such as the geological conditions, drainage, slope, vegetation, and others directly affect the potential for landslides. The Project site is flat and has little topography. Therefore, the Project will not expose people or structures to risks of causing downstream flooding, landslides, runoff, slope instability, or drainage changes. The Project would not pose a risk of downslope or downstream flooding or landslides during construction or operations beyond those analyzed in the City of Fresno PEIR, and there are *no impacts*.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures are required.

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

The size of the Project is a size that is not a detriment to the existing environment within the Project area. The Project will not reduce habitat, biological resources populations, or local historical components. The Project does not have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment or reduce the habitat of wildlife species and will not threaten plant communities or endanger any floral or faunal species. Furthermore, the Project has no potential to eliminate important examples of major periods in history. With implementation of applicable City of Fresno PEIR mitigation measures, impacts are considered to be *less than significant*.

- 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.)**

The Project is considered to be proposed at a size and scope that would not result in impacts that are cumulatively considerable when viewed in connection with existing or future development as described in this initial study document. With implementation of applicable City of Fresno PEIR mitigation measures, Project impacts are considered to be less than significant.

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

The Project is consistent with applicable environmental policies and mitigation measures as outlined in the General Plan PEIR that are required in several impact areas to reduce any potentially significant impacts to less than significant. Additionally, due to the existing residential development surrounding the project site and in the general area, the General Plan anticipates that future development will increase the density within adjacent areas. Development is planned to occur in the immediate area projected by the City's General Plan and analyzed in the City of Fresno PEIR.

Therefore, the Project is not anticipated to cause substantial adverse effects on human beings directly. With implementation of applicable City of Fresno PEIR mitigation measures, impacts are considered to be *less than significant*.

References

- California Department of Toxic Substances. (2022). *Envirostar*. Retrieved from <https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/map/?myaddress=Chuch+ave+and+peach+ave+fresno>
- CAL FIRE. (2022). *Fire Severity Maps*. Retrieved from Fresno: <https://osfm.fire.ca.gov/divisions/community-wildfire-preparedness-and-mitigation/wildland-hazards-building-codes/fire-hazard-severity-zones-maps/>
- Cal Recycle. (2022, Jan). *Visalia Disposal Site (54-AA-0009)*. Retrieved from SWIS Facility/Site Activity Details : <https://www2.calrecycle.ca.gov/SolidWaste/SiteActivity/Details/822?siteID=3839>
- CalGEM. (2022). *State of California Department of Conservation, Geological Energy Management Division*. Retrieved from Online Mapping System: <https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/doggr/wellfinder/#openModal/-119.63622/36.31040/15>
- California Building Standards Commission. (2019). *California Code of Regulations*.
- California Building Association v Bay Area Air Quality Mangement District, S213478 (Alameda Supreme Court 2015).
- California Department of Conservation. (2022, January). *Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program*. Retrieved from Important Farmland Finder- 2018: <https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/DLRP/CIFF/>
- California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery. (2022, Jan 1). *CalRecycle*. Retrieved from <https://www2.calrecycle.ca.gov/SolidWaste/Site/Search>
- California Department of Transportation. (2022, January). *California State Scenic Highway System Map*. Retrieved from State Scenic Highway System ARC GIS On LIne.: <https://www.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=465dfd3d807c46cc8e8057116f1aaca>
- California State Water Resources Control Board. (2022). *GeoTracker*. Retrieved from GeoTracker: <https://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/map/?CMD=runreport&myaddress=fowler+ave+and+dakota+ave%2C+fresno%2C+ca>
- California Water Service. (2022). *UWMP Standardized Tables Visalia District 2015 Urban Water Management Plan, Appendix H*. Retrieved from CalWater.com: https://www.calwater.com/docs/uwmp2015/vis/Appendix_H_-_DWR_UWMP_Tables_Worksheets.pdf
- City of Fresno. (2020). *2020 Urban Water Management Plan*.
- City of Hanford. (2010). *Hanford Municipal Airport Master Plan*.
- City of Hanford. (2015). *2015 Urban Water Mangement Plan*.
- City of Hanford. (2017). *2035 General Plan Update*.
- City of Hanford. (2017b). *Planning Division*. Retrieved from Zoning Map: https://cms6.revize.com/revize/hanfordca/document_center/Planning/Plans/Final%20Zoning%20Map%20Effective%2006-01-2017.pdf
- City of Hanford. (2020). *Urban Water Management Plan*.
- City of Hanford. (2022, January). *Hanford Municipal Code*. Retrieved from Title 17 Zoning, Chapt 17.50 Development Standards: <http://qcode.us/codes/hanford/>
- City of Hanford. (2022, January). *Hanford Municipal Code*. Retrieved from Title 17 Zoning, Chapt 17.50 Development Standards: <http://qcode.us/codes/hanford/>
- City of Hanford. (2022). *Housing Element (2016 - 2024)*. [https://cms6.revize.com/revize/hanfordca/document_center/Planning/General%20Plan/Adopted%20Housing%20Element%20\(03-31-2016\).pdf](https://cms6.revize.com/revize/hanfordca/document_center/Planning/General%20Plan/Adopted%20Housing%20Element%20(03-31-2016).pdf).
- City of Visalia . (2022, January). *General Plan EIR*. Retrieved from Noise Section: <https://www.visalia.city/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?BlobID=30500>
- City of Visalia. (2014, January). *General Plan Enviromental Impact Report*. Retrieved from <https://www.visalia.city/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?BlobID=30499>
- City of Visalia. (2017, March). *Active Transportation Plan*. Retrieved from <https://www.visalia.city/documents/Engineering/ATP-Final%20COV%20Optimized.pdf>
- City of Visalia. (2022). *Fixed Bus Routes*. Retrieved from https://www.visalia.city/depts/transportation_services/transit/bus_map_and_schedule_information/default.asp

City of Visalia. (2022, January). *General Plan Open Space and Conservation Element*. Retrieved from <https://www.visalia.city/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?BlobID=30478>

Department of Conservation. (2022, January 1). *Division of Oil, Gas, and Geothermal Resource*. Retrieved from <https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/doggr/wellfinder/#/-119.30129/36.36088/14>

Department of Conservation. (2022, January 1). *SMARA mapping tool*. Retrieved from <https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/mol/index.html>

Department of Toxic Substances Control. (2022). EnviroStor. California, United States of America.

Federal Emergency Management Agency. (2022). *FEMA*. Retrieved from Firmette: <https://msc.fema.gov/portal/home>

Federal Emergency Management Agency. (2022, Jan 1). *FEMA Firmette*. Retrieved from <https://msc.fema.gov/portal/home>

Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), U.S. Department of Transportation. (2017). *Highway Traffic Noise Analysis and Abatement Policy and Guidance*. https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/Environment/noise/regulations_and_guidance/.

Federal Transit Administration . (2006). *Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment*.

Fresno County Council of Governments. (2017). *Fresno County 2050 Growth Projections*.

Greater Kaweah Groundwater Sustainability Agency. (2020). *Groundwater Sustainability Plan*.

Kings County. (1994). *Kings County Airport Compatibility Plan*.

Kings County. (2009). *2035 General Plan*.

Krazan & Associates, Inc. (2021a). *Geotechnical Engineering Investigation- Church and Peach Avenues*.

Krazan and Associates. (2021b). *Phase I Environmental Site Assessment- Olive Lane Property*.

QK. (2022). *Biological Assessment Report- Lunaria Residential Development Project*.

QK. (2022). *Cultural Resources Technical Memo- Lunaria Residential Development*.

QK. (2022). *Water Supply Assessment- Pratt Family Ranch Project*.

QK. (2022a). *Biological Resource Evaluation - Olive Lane Project*.

QK. (2022b). *Cultural Resources Records Search Results - Olive Lane Project*.

SJVAPCD. (2015). *Guidance for Assessing and Mitigating Air Quality Impacts*.

Trinity Consultants. (2022). *Small Project Analysis Level Assessment- Olive Lane Tract*.

U.S. Census Bureau. (2019). *Census* . Retrieved from Fresno, CA: <https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fresnocitycalifornia>

U.S. Census Bureau. (2022). *Census*. Retrieved from Hanford, CA: <https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/hanfordcitycalifornia>

U.S. Census Bureau. (2022). *U.S. Census Bureau QuickFacts*. Retrieved from QuickFacts Visalia City, California: <https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/visaliacitycalifornia>

U.S. Department of Energy. (2014). *Hanford Emergency Management Plan*.

U.S. Department of Transportation, F. R. (2005). *High-Speed Ground Transportation Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment*.

United States Census. (2021). *U.S. Census*. Retrieved from Fresno City, CA.

United States Census Bureau. (2020). *Quick Facts*. Retrieved from Tulare County: <https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/tularecountycalifornia>

United States Census Bureau. (2022, January). Retrieved from <https://data.census.gov/cedsci/>

United States Environmental Protection Agency. (2022). *Energy and the Environment*. Retrieved from Greenhouse Gas Equivalencies Calculator: <https://www.epa.gov/energy/greenhouse-gas-equivalencies-calculator#results>

VRPA Technologies, Inc. (2021). *Transportation Impact Study- Pratt Family Ranch*.

VRPA Technologies, Inc. (2022). *Transportation Impact Study- Billingsley Ranch*.

VRPA Technologies, Inc. (2022). *Air Quality & Greenhouse Gas Impact Assessment: Lunaria Development Project*.

WJV Acoustics, Inc. (2022). *Acoustical Anaaysis- Olive Lane Subdivision*.

PROJECT SPECIFIC MITIGATION MONITORING CHECKLIST – May 20, 2022

This Project Specific Mitigation Monitoring Checklist has been formulated based upon the findings of the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) for Tentative Tract Map No. 6410 (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>	<p>Project Applicant and project architect</p>	<p>Lighting systems to be confirmed during plan check, prior to issuance of building permits.</p>	<p>Public Works Department (PW) and Planning and Development Department (PDD)</p>	
<p>AES-4.2: Lighting systems for public facilities such as active play areas shall provide adequate illumination for the activity; however, low intensity light fixtures and shields shall be used to minimize spillover light onto adjacent properties.</p>	<p>Project Applicant and project architect</p>	<p>Lighting systems to be confirmed during plan check, prior to issuance of building permits.</p>	<p>Public Works Department (PW) and Planning and Development Department (PDD)</p>	
<p>AG-1.1: Consistent with Policy RC-9-c of the approved General Plan, the City, in coordination with regional partners or independently, shall establish a Farmland Preservation Program by 2025. The intent of the Farmland Preservation Program would be that when Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance are proposed for development and converted to urban uses within the Sphere of Influence outside city limits, this program would require that the developer of such a project mitigate the loss of farmland consistent with the requirements of CEQA. The Farmland Preservation Program shall establish thresholds</p>	<p>Public Works</p>	<p>Prior to issuance of building permits</p>	<p>PDD</p>	

Mitigation Measure	Party responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Implementation Timing	Party responsible for Monitoring	Verification (name/date)
<p>of significance and provide several mitigation options that may include, but are not limited to, the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Restrictive Covenants or Deeds • In Lieu Fees • Mitigation Banks • Fee Title Acquisition • Conservation Easements • Land Use Regulations <p>The Farmland Preservation Program may be modeled after some or all of the programs described by the California Council of Land Trusts.</p> <p>Prior to the adoption of the Farmland Preservation Program, projects shall be required to comply with CEQA to address potential environmental impacts on an individual basis.</p>				
<p>AIR-2.1: 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 construction phase-related air quality impacts. The evaluation shall be prepared</p>	<p>Project Applicant and project architect</p>	<p>Prior to issuance of building permits</p>	<p>PDD</p>	

Mitigation Measure	Party responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Implementation Timing	Party responsible for Monitoring	Verification (name/date)
<p>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 onsite 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. 				

Mitigation Measure	Party responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Implementation Timing	Party responsible for Monitoring	Verification (name/date)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintain equipment according to manufacturers' specifications. • Restrict idling of equipment and trucks to a maximum of five 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 onsite 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 away with water. Use only minimal water for dust control. • Store stockpiled materials and wastes under a temporary roof or secured plastic sheeting or tarp. 				

Mitigation Measure	Party responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Implementation Timing	Party responsible for Monitoring	Verification (name/date)
<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 	Project Applicant and project architect	Prior to issuance of building permits	SJVAPCD	

Mitigation Measure	Party responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Implementation Timing	Party responsible for Monitoring	Verification (name/date)
<p>docks for plugging in the anticipated number of refrigerated trailers to reduce idling time and emissions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 reminder to limit the idling of vehicles while parked for loading/unloading in accordance with CARB Rule 2845 (13 California Code of Regulations [CCR] Chapter 10, Section 2485). • 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 				

Mitigation Measure	Party responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Implementation Timing	Party responsible for Monitoring	Verification (name/date)
<p>possible number of solar energy arrays on building roofs throughout the city to generate solar energy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 lawnmowers and leaf blowers. • Utilize only Energy Star heating, cooling, and lighting devices and appliances. • Use of water-based or low volatile organic compound (VOC) cleaning products. 				
<p>BIO-1.1: Construction of a proposed project shall avoid, where possible, vegetation communities that provide suitable habitat for a special-status species known to occur within the Planning Area. If construction within potentially suitable habitat must occur, the presence/absence of any</p>	<p>Project Applicant and qualified biologist</p>	<p>The City shall ensure that this measure is incorporated into project plans prior to project approval.</p>	<p>PDD and CDFW</p>	

Mitigation Measure	Party responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Implementation Timing	Party responsible for Monitoring	Verification (name/date)
<p>special-status plant or wildlife species must be determined prior to construction, to determine if the habitat supports any special-status species. If a special-status species are determined to occupy any portion of a project site, avoidance and minimization measures shall be incorporated into the construction phase of a project to avoid direct or incidental take of a listed species to the greatest extent feasible. Specific mitigation measures for direct or incidental impacts to special-status species 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>BIO-1.2: Direct or incidental take of any State or federally listed species shall be avoided to the greatest extent feasible. If construction of a proposed project will result in the direct or incidental take of a listed species, consultation with the resources agencies and/or additional permitting may be required. Agency consultation through the CDFW 2081 and USFWS Section 7 or Section 10 permitting processes shall take</p>	<p>Project Applicant and qualified biologist</p>	<p>The City shall ensure that this measure is incorporated into project plans prior to project approval.</p>	<p>PDD and CDFW</p>	

Mitigation Measure	Party responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Implementation Timing	Party responsible for Monitoring	Verification (name/date)
<p>place prior to any action that may result in the direct or incidental take of a listed species. Specific mitigation measures for direct or incidental impacts to special-status species 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>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 onsite to ensure that no proposed project activities would impact the active nest. A suitable buffer shall be established</p>	<p>Project Applicant and qualified biologist</p>	<p>Prior to and During construction</p>	<p>PDD and CDFW</p>	

Mitigation Measure	Party responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Implementation Timing	Party responsible for Monitoring	Verification (name/date)
<p>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 the 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</p>				

Mitigation Measure	Party responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Implementation Timing	Party responsible for Monitoring	Verification (name/date)
recommended by the agency at the time of consultation.				
<p>BIO-2.1: A pre-construction clearance survey, following current CDFW protocols, shall be conducted by a qualified biologist to determine if a proposed project will result in the removal or impact to any riparian habitat and/or a special-status natural community with the potential to occur in the Planning Area, compensatory habitat-based mitigation shall be required to reduce project impacts. Compensatory mitigation must involve the preservation or restoration or the purchase of off-site mitigation credits for impacts to riparian habitat and/or a special-status natural community. Mitigation must be conducted in-kind or within an approved mitigation bank in the region. The specific mitigation ratio for habitat-based mitigation shall be determined through consultation with the appropriate agency (i.e., CDFW or USFWS) on a case-by-case basis. The project applicant/developer for a proposed project shall develop and implement appropriate mitigation regarding impacts on their respective jurisdictions.</p>	Project Applicant and qualified biologist	Prior to and During construction	PDD and CDFW	
<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</p>	Project Applicant and qualified historical	Planning and Development Department to review contract	PDD	

Mitigation Measure	Party responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Implementation Timing	Party responsible for Monitoring	Verification (name/date)
<p>specialist shall 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>		

Mitigation Measure	Party responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Implementation Timing	Party responsible for Monitoring	Verification (name/date)
<p>CUL-1.2: Prior to approval of any discretionary project that could result in an adverse change to a potential historic and/or cultural resource, the City shall require a site-specific evaluation of historic and/or cultural resources by a professional who meets the Secretary of Interior's Qualifications. The evaluation shall provide recommendations to mitigate potential impacts to historic and/or cultural resources and shall be approved by the Director of Planning and Development.</p>	<p>Project Applicant and qualified historical resources specialist</p>	<p>Prior to commencement of, and during, construction activities.</p>	<p>PDD</p>	
<p>CUL-2: Subsequent to a preliminary City review of the project grading plans, if there is evidence that a project will include excavation or construction activities within previously undisturbed soils, a field survey and literature search for prehistoric archaeological resources shall be conducted. The following procedures shall be followed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If prehistoric resources are not found during either the field survey or literature search, excavation and/or construction activities can commence. In the event that buried prehistoric archaeological resources are discovered during excavation and/or construction activities, construction shall stop in the immediate vicinity of the find, and a qualified archaeologist shall be 	<p>Project Applicant and qualified historical resources specialist</p>	<p>Prior to commencement of, and during, construction activities.</p>	<p>PDD</p>	

Mitigation Measure	Party responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Implementation Timing	Party responsible for Monitoring	Verification (name/date)
<p>consulted to determine whether the resource requires further study. The qualified archaeologist 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 CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5. If the resources are determined to be unique prehistoric archaeological resources as defined under Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines, mitigation 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. No further grading shall occur in the area of the discovery until the Lead Agency approves the measures to protect these resources. Any prehistoric archaeological 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>				

Mitigation Measure	Party responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Implementation Timing	Party responsible for Monitoring	Verification (name/date)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If prehistoric resources are found during the field survey or literature review, the resources shall be inventoried using appropriate State record forms and submit the forms to the Southern San Joaquin Valley Information Center. The resources shall be evaluated for significance. If the resources are found to be significant, measures shall be identified by the qualified archaeologist. Similar to above, appropriate mitigation 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. In addition, appropriate mitigation for excavation and construction activities in the vicinity of the resources found during the field survey or literature review shall include an archaeological monitor. The monitoring period shall be determined by the qualified archaeologist. If additional prehistoric archaeological resources are found during excavation and/or construction activities, the procedure identified above for the discovery of unknown resources shall be followed. 				

Mitigation Measure	Party responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Implementation Timing	Party responsible for Monitoring	Verification (name/date)
<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 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</p>	<p>Project Applicant and qualified historical resources specialist</p>	<p>Planning and Development Department to review construction specifications to ensure inclusion of provisions included in mitigation measure.</p>	<p>PDD</p>	

Mitigation Measure	Party responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Implementation Timing	Party responsible for Monitoring	Verification (name/date)
and confer with the descendants all reasonable options regarding the descendants' preferences for treatment.				
<p>GEO-6.1: Subsequent to a preliminary City review of the project grading plans, if there is evidence that a project will include excavation or construction activities within previously undisturbed soils, a field survey and literature search for unique paleontological/geological resources shall be conducted. The following procedures shall be followed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If unique paleontological/geological resources are not found during either the field survey or literature search, excavation and/or construction activities can commence. In the event that unique paleontological/geological resources are discovered during excavation and/or construction activities, construction shall stop in the immediate vicinity of the find, and a qualified paleontologist shall be consulted to determine whether the resource requires further study. The qualified paleontologist shall make recommendations to the City on the measures that shall be implemented to 	Project Applicant and project architect	Prior to development approvals	Division of the Development and Resource Management Department.	

Mitigation Measure	Party responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Implementation Timing	Party responsible for Monitoring	Verification (name/date)
<p>protect the discovered resources, including but not limited to, excavation of the finds and evaluation of the finds. If the resources are determined to be significant, mitigation measures shall be identified by the monitor and recommended to the Lead Agency. Appropriate mitigation 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. No further grading shall occur in the area of the discovery until the Lead Agency approves the measures to protect these resources. Any paleontological/geological resources 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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If unique paleontological/geological resources are found during the field survey or literature review, the resources shall be inventoried and evaluated for significance. If the 				

Mitigation Measure	Party responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Implementation Timing	Party responsible for Monitoring	Verification (name/date)
<p>resources are found to be significant, mitigation measures shall be identified by the qualified paleontologist. Similar to the above, appropriate mitigation 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. In addition, appropriate mitigation for excavation and construction activities in the vicinity of the resources found during the field survey or literature review shall include a paleontological monitor. The monitoring period shall be determined by the qualified paleontologist. If additional paleontological/geological resources are found during excavation and/or construction activities, the procedure identified above for the discovery of unknown resources shall be followed.</p>				
<p>GHG-1.1: Prior to the City’s approval of subsequent discretionary projects, the Director of the City Planning and Development Department, or designee, shall confirm that development projects are consistent with the</p>	Project Applicant	Planning and Development Department to review construction	PDD	

Mitigation Measure	Party responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Implementation Timing	Party responsible for Monitoring	Verification (name/date)
<p>Recirculated GHG Reduction Plan Update (2021) and shall implement all measures deemed applicable to the project through the GHG Reduction Plan Update-Project Consistency Checklist (Appendix B to the GHG Reduction Plan Update).</p>		<p>specifications to ensure inclusion of provisions included in mitigation measure.</p>		
<p>HYD-3.1: The City shall implement the following measures to reduce the impacts on the capacity of existing or planned SDFCMP collection systems:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coordinate with FMFCD to implement the existing Storm Drainage and Flood Control Master Plan (SDFCMP) for collection systems in drainage areas where the amount of imperviousness is unaffected by the change in land uses. • Coordinate with FMFCD to update the SDFCMP in those drainage areas where the amount of imperviousness increased due to the change in land uses to determine the changes in the collection systems that would need to occur to provide adequate capacity for the stormwater runoff from the 	<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>increased imperviousness.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As development is proposed, implement current SDFCMP to provide stormwater collection systems that have sufficient capacity to convey the peak runoff rates from the areas of increased imperviousness. Require developments that increase site imperviousness to install, operate, and maintain FMFCD-approved on-site detention systems to reduce the peak runoff rates resulting from the increased imperviousness to the peak runoff rates that will not exceed the capacity of the existing stormwater collection systems. 				
<p>HYD-3.2: The City shall implement the following measures to reduce the impacts on the capacity of existing or planned SDFCMP retention basins: Prior to approval of development projects, coordinate with FMFCD to analyze the impacts to existing and planned retention basins to determine remedial measures required to reduce the impact on retention basin</p>	<p>Department of Public Utilities</p>	<p>Prior to issuance of building permits.</p>	<p>PDD</p>	

Mitigation Measure	Party responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Implementation Timing	Party responsible for Monitoring	Verification (name/date)
<p>capacity to less than significant. Remedial measures would include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase the size of the retention basin through the purchase of more land or deepening the basin, or a combination for planned retention basins. • Require developments that increase runoff volume to install, operate, and maintain Low Impact Development (LID) measures to reduce runoff volume to the runoff volume that will not exceed the capacity of the existing retention basins. 				
<p>HYD-3.3: The City shall implement the following measures to reduce the impacts on the capacity of existing or planned SDFCMP urban detention (stormwater quality) basins:</p> <p>Prior to approval of development projects, coordinate with FMFCD to determine the impacts to the urban detention basin weir overflow rates and determine remedial measures required to reduce the impact on the detention basin capacity to less than significant. Remedial measures would include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Modify overflow weir to maintain the suspended solids removal rates adopted 	Department of Public Utilities	Prior to development approvals	PDD	

Mitigation Measure	Party responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Implementation Timing	Party responsible for Monitoring	Verification (name/date)
<p>by the FMFCD Board of Directors.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase the size of the urban detention basin to increase residence time by purchasing more land. The existing detention basins are already at the adopted design depth. • Require developments that increase runoff volume to install, operate, and maintain Low Impact Development (LID) measures to reduce peak runoff rates and runoff volume to the runoff rates and volumes that will not exceed the weir overflow rates of the existing urban detention basins. 				
<p>HYD-3.4: The City shall implement the following measures to reduce the impacts on the capacity of existing or planned SDFCMP pump disposal systems:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prior to approval of development projects, coordinate with FMFCD to determine the extent and degree to which the capacity of the existing pump system will be exceeded. • Require new developments to install, 	Department of Public Utilities	Prior to development approvals	PDD	

Mitigation Measure	Party responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Implementation Timing	Party responsible for Monitoring	Verification (name/date)
<p>operate, and maintain on-site detention facilities, consistent with FMFCD design standards, to reduce peak stormwater runoff rates to existing planned peak runoff rates.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide additional pump system capacity to the maximum allowed by existing permitting to increase the capacity to match or exceed the peak runoff rates determined by the SDFCMP. 				
<p>UTL-1.1.1: The City shall evaluate the water conveyance system and, at the time that discretionary projects are submitted for approval by the City, the City shall not approve development that would demand additional water and exceed the capacity of a facility until additional capacity is provided. The following capacity improvements shall be evaluated for potential environmental impacts and constructed by the City by approximately 2025.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construct 65 new groundwater wells, in accordance with Chapter 9 and Figure 9-1 of the 2014 Metro Plan Update. • Construct a 2.0 million gallon potable 	Department of Public Utilities	Prior to development approvals	PDD	

Mitigation Measure	Party responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Implementation Timing	Party responsible for Monitoring	Verification (name/date)
<p>water reservoir (Reservoir T2) near the intersection of Clovis and California Avenues, in accordance with Chapter 9 and Figure 9-1 of the 2014 Metro Plan Update.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construct a 4.0 million gallon potable water reservoir (Reservoir T5) near the intersection of Ashlan and Chestnut Avenues, in accordance with Chapter 9 and Figure 9-1 of the 2014 Metro Plan Update. • Construct a 4.0 million gallon potable water reservoir (Reservoir T6) near the intersection of Ashlan Avenue and Highway 99, in accordance with Chapter 9 and Figure 9-1 of the 2014 Metro Plan Update. • Construct 50.3 miles of regional water transmission mains ranging in size from 24-inch to 48-inch, in accordance with Chapter 9 and Figure 9-1 of the 2014 Metro Plan Update. • Construct 95.9 miles of 16-inch transmission grid mains in accordance with Chapter 9 and 				

Mitigation Measure	Party responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Implementation Timing	Party responsible for Monitoring	Verification (name/date)
<p>Figure 9-1 of the 2014 Metro Plan Update.</p> <p>Prior to initiating construction of any of the capacity improvement projects identified above, the City shall conduct appropriate environmental analyses for each project to determine whether environmental impacts would occur.</p>				
<p>UTL-1.2.1: The City shall evaluate the water supply system at the time discretionary projects are submitted and shall not approve development that would demand additional water until additional capacity is provided. By approximately the year 2025, the following capacity improvements shall be evaluated for potential environmental impacts and constructed by the City.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construct an approximately 30 mgd expansion of the existing northeast surface water treatment facility for a total capacity of 60 mgd, in accordance with Chapter 9 and Figure 9-1 of the 2014 Metro Plan Update. • Construct an approximately 20 mgd surface water treatment facility in the 	Department of Public Utilities	Prior to development approvals	PDD	

Mitigation Measure	Party responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Implementation Timing	Party responsible for Monitoring	Verification (name/date)
<p>southwest portion of the City, in accordance with Chapter 9 and Figure 9-1 of the 2014 Metro Plan Update.</p> <p>Construct a 25,000 AF/year recycled water facility as an expansion to the RWRf in accordance with the January 2014 City of Fresno Metropolitan Water Resources Management Plan. This improvement is required after the year 2025.</p>				
<p>UTL-1.3.1: The City shall evaluate the wastewater system at the time discretionary projects are submitted and shall not approve development that contributes wastewater to the wastewater treatment facility that could exceed capacity until additional capacity is provided. By approximately the year 2025, the City shall evaluate the potential environmental impacts and construct the following improvements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Construct an approximately 70 mgd expansion of the Regional Wastewater Treatment Facility prior to flows reaching 80 percent of rated capacity, and obtain revised waste discharge permits as the generation of wastewater is increased. <p>Construct an approximately 0.49 mgd expansion of the North Facility and obtain</p>	Department of Public Utilities	Prior to approval	PDD	

Mitigation Measure	Party responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Implementation Timing	Party responsible for Monitoring	Verification (name/date)
revised waste discharge permits as the generation of wastewater is increased.				
<p>UTL-1.3.2: The City shall evaluate the wastewater system at the time discretionary projects are submitted and shall not approve development that contributes wastewater to the wastewater treatment facility that could exceed capacity until additional capacity is provided. After approximately the year 2025, the City shall evaluate the potential environmental impacts of and construct the following improvements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construct an approximately 24 mgd Wastewater Treatment Facility within the Southeast Development Area and obtain revised waste discharge permits as the generation of wastewater is increased. • Construct an approximately 9.6 mgd expansion of the Regional Wastewater Treatment Facility and obtain revised waste discharge permits as the generation of wastewater is increased. 	Department of Public Utilities	Prior to approval	PDD	
<p>UTL-1.4.1: Consistent with the Sewer System Management Plan, the City shall evaluate the wastewater collection system at the time discretionary projects are submitted and shall not approve development that would generate additional wastewater and exceed the capacity of a facility until additional capacity is provided.</p>	Department of Public Utilities	Prior to approval	PDD	

Mitigation Measure	Party responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Implementation Timing	Party responsible for Monitoring	Verification (name/date)
<p>NOI-2: Construction Vibration. The use of heavy construction equipment within 25 feet of existing structures shall be prohibited.</p>	Project applicant	During Construction	PDD	