APPENDIX G/INITIAL STUDY FOR A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

Environmental Checklist Form for:
Development Permit Application No. P21-06232 / Plan Amendment Rezone Application No. P22-01086

1.	**Project title:** Development Permit Application No. P21-06232 **/ Plan Amendment Rezone Application No. P22-01086**
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:** Thomas Veatch, Planner City of Fresno Planning and Development Department (559) 621-8076
4.	**Project location:** **8715 North Chestnut Avenue, Fresno, California**: Located on the western side of N Chestnut Ave between E Shepard Ave and E Teague Ave. (APN: 403-532-28)
5.	**Project sponsor's name and address:** Mr. John Ashley Fresno/Newbury LP 1554 Shaw Ave Clovis CA 93611
6.	**General & Community plan land use designation:** Existing: Medium Low Density Proposed: Medium High Density
7.	**Zoning:** Existing: RS-4 (Residential Single Family, Medium Low Density) Proposed: RM-1 (Residential Multi-Family, Medium High Desnity

8.	**Description of project:** Development Permit Application No. P21-06232 / Plan Amendment Rezone Application No. P22-01086 was filed on behalf of John Ashley of Fresno/Newbury LP. The applicant proposes to construct a 32-unit multifamily apartment complex at 8715 N. Chestnut Avenue, Clovis, CA 93619. APN 403-532-28. The 2.11-acre rectangular property is zoned as Medium-Low Density RS-4 and would require a Plan Amendment/Rezone to Medium High-Density RM-1. The parcel is within the Community Plan Area of Woodward Park. To date, no contact with surrounding neighbors has occurred. The Project would replace an existing vacant lot with a 32-unit apartment complex. This change would create uniformity with surrounding parcels. The 32 dwelling units on the 2.11-acre site gives the proposed project a density of 15.16 DU/NA. In total, all proposed roofed structures would cover approximately 0.71-acre of the 2.11-acre site. The dwelling units would be constructed with setbacks of 20 ft from the property line in the front and the rear, and 5 ft on each side. The dwelling units would consist of four (4) main buildings divided into eight (8) apartments, respectively. Two (2) apartment buildings would be located on the northwestern portion of the property, while two (2) apartment buildings, a swimming pool, Leasing office, and Manager's office would be located on the southeastern portion of the property. The northeastern and southwestern portions of the property would be used for both carport and uncovered parking. Parking for the proposed project includes seventy-nine (79) total spaces. These parking spaces include forty-two (42) carport spaces and thirty-seven (37) uncovered spaces. Accessible parking spaces include two (2) carport spaces and three (3) uncovered spaces. Parking for electric vehicles includes ten (10) carport spaces and six (6) uncovered spaces. Two (2) spaces would be used for bicycle parking. The property would be landscaped with various trees, shrubs, and other vegetation. The proposed project includes thirteen (13) large trees and nineteen (19) small trees. These trees would provide approximately 18,000 square feet (sq ft) of shade. Security at the project site would include a six ft high block wall around perimeter of project as well as an automatic front gate with call box. The proposed project would also include the following: • Community patio and pool deck area • Solar carports • Multiple trash enclosures • Storage enclosure

Entitlements
Environmental Assessment No. P21-06232 would require approval of the Development Permit.

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

	Planned Land Use	Existing Zoning	Existing Land Use
North	Medium High Density Residential	RM-1 (Residential Multi-Family, Medium High Density)	Apartments
East	Low Density Residential / Medium Low Density Residential	RS-3 (Residential Single Family Low Density), RS-4 (Residential Single Family, Medium Low Density)	Single Family Homes
South	Medium Low Density Residential	RS-4 (Residential Single Family, Medium Low Density)	Rural Residential Home
West	Medium Low Density Residential	RS-4 (Residential Single Family, Medium Low Density)	Single Family Home

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

City of Fresno (COF) Department of Public Works; COF Department of Public Utilities; COF Building and Safety Services Division; COF Fire Department; Fresno Metropolitan Flood Control District; County of Fresno Department of Public Health; San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District; and, Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCo).

11. **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?**

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. 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. Pursuant to Senate Bill 18 (SB 18), Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area were invited to consult regarding the project based on a list of contacts provided by the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). This list includes tribes that requested notification pursuant to Assembly Bill 52 (AB 52). The City of Fresno mailed notices of the proposed project to each of these tribes on ***[April 27, 2022*** which included the required 90-day time period for tribes to request consultation, which ended on ***July 27, 2022***. The tribes contacted included the Big Sandy Rancheria of Western Mono Indians, Chicken Ranch Rancheria of Me-Wuk Indians Cold Springs Rancheria of Mono Indians, Dumna Wo-Wah Tribal Government, Dunlap Band of Mono Indians, Kings River Choinumni Farm Tribe, Nashville Enterprise Miwok-Maidu-Nishinam Tribe, North Fork Mono Tribe, North Fork Rancheria of Mono Indians, North Valley Yokuts Tribe, North Valley Yokuts Tribe, Picayune Rancheria of Chukchansi Indians, Salinan Tribe of Monterey, San Luis Obispo Counties, Santa Rosa Rancheria Tachi Yokut Tribe, Table Mountain Rancheria, Traditional Choinumni Tribe, Tule River Indian Tribe, Tuolumne Band of Me-Wuk Indians, Wuksache Indian Tribe/Eshom Valley Band, and Xolon-Salinan Tribe. No comments were received.

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.

☐	Aesthetics	☐	Agriculture and Forestry Resources
☐	Air Quality	☐	Biological Resources
☐	Cultural Resources	☐	Energy
☐	Geology/Soils	☐	Greenhouse Gas Emissions
☐	Hazards and Hazardous Materials	☐	Hydrology/Water Quality
☐	Land Use/Planning	☐	Mineral Resources
☐	Noise	☐	Population/Housing
☐	Public Services	☐	Recreation
☐	Transportation	☐	Tribal Cultural Resources
☐	Utilities/Service Systems	☐	Wildfire
☐	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.
_X_	I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
___	I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT (EIR) is required.
___	I find that the proposed project MAY have a “potentially significant impact” or “potentially significant unless mitigated” impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An EIR is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
___	I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are

	imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

_____

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

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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? and;

There are no scenic vistas in the vicinity of the proposed Project. The immediate area is substantially developed with residential and quasi-public uses; therefore, no public scenic vista will be obstructed, and no scenic resources will be damaged by the development of the proposed project. There would be **no impact**.

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

There are no scenic resources, historic buildings, rock outcroppings, valuable vegetation, or state scenic highways in the vicinity of the proposed project. The immediate area is substantially developed with residential and quasi-public uses; therefore, no public scenic vista will be obstructed, and no scenic resources will be damaged by the development of the proposed project. There would be **no impact**.

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

The proposed project site is currently zoned as RS-4, and would be rezoned as RM-1, consistent with the northern adjoining parcel. The proposed project would incorporate architectural features consistent with the surrounding area. To ensure privacy, adequate shade, and visual softening of the paving and architecture, the proposed project would provide landscaping with various trees, shrubs, and other vegetation around each dwelling unit, as well as along the street frontage. Therefore, the proposed project would not degrade the visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings, or conflict with the City's regulations governing scenic quality. There would be a **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 proposed project would result in a new source of light or glare within the area. However, given that the majority of the proposed project site is already surrounded by existing urban, residential, and commercial development which already affects daytime and nighttime views in the area, no significant impact would occur. Furthermore, through the entitlement process, staff will ensure that lights are located in areas that would minimize light sources to the neighboring properties in accordance with mitigation measures of the PEIR. As a result, the proposed project would have a **less than significant impact**.

Mitigation Measures

1. The proposed project shall implement and incorporate, as applicable, the aesthetic related mitigation measures as identified in the attached Project Specific Mitigation Monitoring Checklist dated 3/18/2022.

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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:				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?				X

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				X
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?				X
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				X
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				X

DISCUSSION

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?

The proposed project site is a vacant 2.11-acre parcel. The proposed project site is designated as “Urban and Built-Up Land” by the California Important Farmland Finder Map (DOC 2022). The areas directly adjoining the proposed project site to the north, south, east, and west are also designated as “Urban and Built-Up Land”. The closest areas of designated “Prime Farmland”, “Farmland of Statewide Importance” and “Unique Farmland” are located approximately 0.6-1.5 miles to the northeast of the proposed project site. “Urban and Built-Up Land” is defined as “land

occupied by structures with a building density of at least 1 unit to 1.5 acres, or approximately 6 structures to a 10-acre parcel." Development of the proposed project site would not be converting Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland) to non-agricultural use. Therefore, the proposed project would have **no impact.**

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

The proposed project site is not currently under a Williamson Act contract or surrounded by parcels under a Williamson Act contract, nor is it zoned for agricultural uses or surrounded by parcels zoned for agricultural uses. Therefore, the proposed project would have **no impact.**

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

The proposed project site is currently zoned as RS-4, and would be rezoned as RM-1, consistent with the northern adjoining parcel (COF 2022), thus, the proposed project does not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production. Therefore, the proposed project would result in **no impact.**

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

The proposed project site is currently zoned as RS-4, and would be rezoned as RM-1, consistent with the northern adjoining parcel (COF 2022), thus, the proposed project does not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land. Therefore, the proposed project would result in **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 proposed project site is currently zoned as RS-4, and would be rezoned as RM-1, consistent with the northern adjoining parcel (COF 2022), thus, the proposed project does not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, farmland. Therefore, the proposed project would result in **no impact.**

Mitigation Measure

1. The proposed project shall implement and incorporate the agriculture and forestry resource related mitigation measures as identified in the attached Project Specific Mitigation Monitoring Checklist dated 3/18/2022.

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	

SETTING

The subject site is located in the City of Fresno and within the San Joaquin Valley Air Basin (SJVAB). 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 hemmed in on three sides 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:

Air pollutant emissions overall are constant throughout the year, yet the concentrations of pollutants in the air vary from day to day and even hour to hour. This variability is due to complex interactions of weather, climate, and topography. These factors affect the ability of the atmosphere to disperse pollutants. Conditions that move and mix the atmosphere help disperse pollutants, while conditions that cause the atmosphere to stagnate allow pollutants to concentrate. Local climatological effects, including topography, wind speed and direction, temperature, inversion layers, precipitation, and fog can exacerbate the air quality problem in the SJVAB.

The SJVAB is approximately 250 miles long and averages 35 miles wide and is the second largest air basin in the state. The SJVAB is defined by the Sierra Nevada in the east (8,000 to 14,000 feet in elevation), the Coast Ranges in the west (averaging 3,000 feet in elevation), and the Tehachapi mountains in the south (6,000 to 8,000 feet in elevation). The Valley is basically flat with a slight downward gradient to the northwest. The Valley opens to the sea at the Carquinez Straits where the San Joaquin Sacramento Delta empties into San Francisco Bay. The Valley, thus, could be considered a "bowl" open only to the north.

During the summer, wind speed and direction data indicate that summer wind usually originates at the north end of the Valley and flows in a south-southeasterly direction through the Valley, through Tehachapi pass, into the Southeast Desert Air Basin. In addition, the Altamont Pass also serves as a funnel for pollutant transport from the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin into the region.

During the winter, wind speed and direction data indicate that wind occasionally originates from the south end of the Valley and flows in a north-northwesterly direction. During the winter months, the Valley generally experiences light, variable winds (less than 10 mph). Low wind speeds, combined with low inversion layers in the winter, create a climate conducive to high carbon monoxide (CO) and particulate matter (PM10 and PM2.5) concentrations. The SJVAB has an "Inland Mediterranean" climate averaging over 260 sunny days per year. The Valley floor is characterized by warm, dry summers and cooler winters. For the entire Valley, high daily temperature readings in summer average 95° F.

Temperatures below freezing are unusual. Average high temperatures in the winter are in the 50s, but highs in the 30's and 40's can occur on days with persistent fog and low cloudiness. The average daily low temperature is 45°F.

The vertical dispersion of air pollutants in the Valley is limited by the presence of persistent temperature inversions. Solar energy heats up the Earth's surface, which in turn radiates heat and warms the lower atmosphere. Therefore, as altitude increases the air temperature usually decreases due to increasing distance from the source of heat. A reversal of this atmospheric state, where the air temperature increases with height, is termed an inversion. Inversions can exist at the surface or at any height above the ground and tend to act as a lid on the Valley, holding in the pollutants that are generated here.

DISCUSSION

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

The San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD) is the local regional jurisdictional entity charged with attainment planning, rulemaking, rule enforcement, and monitoring under Federal and State Clean Air Acts and Clean Air Act Amendments.

Project specific emissions of criteria pollutants are not expected to exceed District significance thresholds of 10 tons/year NOX, 10 tons/year ROG, and 15 tons/year PM10, and project specific criteria pollutant emissions would have no significant adverse impact on air quality. These values can be seen in Tables 1 and 2.

Table 1: Criteria Pollutant Levels – Construction

Criteria Pollutant	Estimated (tons/year)	Threshold (tons/year)	Significance
NOX	0.9933	10	LTS
ROG	0.3918	10	LTS
PM10	0.0834	15	LTS

Source: CalEEMod.2020.4.0

Table 2: Criteria Pollutant Levels – Operational

Criteria Pollutant	Estimated (tons/year)	Threshold (tons/year)	Significance
NOX	0.2287	10	LTS
ROG	0.2804	10	LTS
PM10	0.2622	15	LTS

Source: CalEEMod.2020.4.0

The SJVAPCD has developed the San Joaquin Valley 1991 California Clean Air Act Air Quality Attainment Plan (AQAP), which continues to project nonattainment for the

above-noted pollutants in the future. The proposed Project will be subject to applicable SJVAPCD rules, regulations, and strategies. In addition, the project may be subject to the SJVAPCD Regulation VIII, Fugitive Dust Rules, related to the control of dust and fine particulate matter. This rule mandates the implementation of dust control measures to reduce the potential for dust to the lowest possible level.

The proposed Project does not meet the City's thresholds to conduct an Air Quality Impact Analysis or SJVAPCD Indirect Source Review due to the low number of dwelling units and daily automobile trips created. The proposed Project would be small in comparison to typical subdivisions proposed in the Fresno/Clovis area and would be within a planning area that the City of Fresno has developed with residential and related uses in the past. Any emissions from construction equipment would be temporary in nature. Impacts would be **less than significant**.

b) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?

As stated previously, the proposed Project's emissions of criteria pollutants are not expected to exceed SJVAPCD significance thresholds of 10 tons/year NOX, 10 tons/year ROG, and 15 tons/year PM10, and project specific criteria pollutant emissions would have no significant adverse impact on air quality. Due to the low number of dwelling units and trips generated by the proposed Project, no Air Quality Impact Analysis or SJVAPCD Indirect Source Review is needed to assess potential impacts. Therefore, impacts would be **less than significant.**

c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

Due to the close proximity of other residential uses surrounding the proposed Project site, the proposed Project, as shown in Tables 1 and 2, would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. A Health Risk Assessment for the proposed Project was not required due to the fact that the proposed Project was unlikely to produce any criteria pollutant at a level of 18.25 tons per year. Impacts would be **less than significant**.

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

As stated previously, as shown in Tables 1 and 2, the proposed Project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial emissions or odors. Impacts would be **less than significant**.

Mitigation Measures

1. The proposed project shall implement and incorporate the air quality related mitigation measures as identified in the attached Project Specific Mitigation Monitoring Checklist dated 3/18/2022.

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

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?				X
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?				X
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?				X

SETTING

The proposed Project is located on a site where no urban development has occurred. Because of this, a biological study was prepared for this Initial Study, as mandated by the City of Fresno. Soar Environmental prepared a Biological Resource Assessment (**Appendix A**) for Fresno/Newbury LP in support of CEQA requirements.

The proposed Project site is a flat parcel at an elevation between approximately 366 and 368 ft above mean sea level within the *Clovis* 7.5. Minute U.S.G.S. quadrangle and is bounded by residential development to the north, east and west. The soil type on the parcel is Ramona sandy loam (Rb) – hard substratum according to the USDA NRCS Soil Survey of Eastern Fresno Area, California. These are soils derived from granite and are not listed as hydric soils. The proposed Project site is a vacant field with a mixture of native and non-native grasses. There is a similar grassy lot adjacent to the south, which is also bounded on all other sides by residential development. Oak and evergreen trees are scattered throughout surrounding neighborhoods. Trees and shrubs sparsely surround the perimeter of the proposed Project site. Habitat conditions are unlikely to support listed wildlife or plant species.

DISCUSSION

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

The proposed Project site is located in an urban built-up area in the City of Fresno surrounded by urban development with access from an arterial street. According to the BRA conducted for the proposed Project, there would be no affect to any sensitive, special status, or candidate species, nor would it modify any habitat that supports them. There would be **no impact**.

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?

As stated in the BRA, there is no riparian habitat or any other sensitive natural community identified in the vicinity of the proposed project by the California Department of Fish and Game or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. There would be **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?

As stated in the BRA, no federally protected wetlands are located on the proposed Project site. There would be **no impact.**

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?

The proposed Project site is located in an urban setting. There are no bodies of water on the subject site or in the immediate vicinity of the subject site. The proposed Project would have no impact on the movement of migratory fish or wildlife species or on an established wildlife corridor. There would be **no impact**.

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

The proposed Project would comply with all applicable local ordinances. According to the BRA conducted for the proposed Project, there is no suitable habitat for listed or special status species on the proposed Project site. There would be **no impact**.

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?

There are no existing Habitat Conservation Plans or Natural Community Conservation Plans that pertain to the proposed Project site. There would be **no impact** to any adopted plan**.**

Mitigation Measures

1. The proposed project shall implement and incorporate the biological resource related mitigation measures as identified in the attached Project Specific Mitigation Monitoring Checklist dated 3/18/2022.

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

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

The proposed project site is not within a designated or proposed historic district, and there are no structures which exist on or within the immediate vicinity that are listed on or considered to be eligible for the National or Local Register of Historic Places. No Historic Resources Evaluation is required for the proposed Project due to the lack of historical resources in the Project area. Mitigation Measure CUL-1 included in the

Mitigation Monitoring Checklist would provide necessary protocols to reduce impacts to previously undiscovered resources. Therefore, the proposed project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of any historical resource and would result in **no impact.**

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

The proposed project site is not located within an archaeological resource site. No CHRIS Records Search was required due to the proposed Project taking place on previously disturbed land. Therefore, the proposed project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of any historical or archaeological resource and would result in **no impact.**

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

There is no evidence that human remains exist on the proposed project site, or surrounding area. However, due to the ground disturbing activities that will occur as a result of the proposed project, the relevant mitigation measures would be employed should any human remains be discovered in the process. Therefore, the proposed project would have **no impact.**

Mitigation Measures

1. The proposed project shall implement and incorporate the cultural resource related mitigation measures as identified in the attached Project Specific Mitigation Monitoring Checklist dated 3/18/2022.

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	

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?				X

DISCUSSION

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

During construction of the proposed project, energy would be consumed in the form of petroleum-based fuels used to power construction vehicles and equipment on the proposed project site, construction worker vehicles and delivery truck trips to and from the proposed project site. Construction would consist of site preparation, grading, and the construction/installation of the proposed apartment buildings, swimming pool, offices, enclosures, and parking.

There are no unusual project characteristics that would need construction equipment or practices that would be less energy efficient than at comparable construction sites in the region or State. Construction activity would be temporary, and its fuel consumption would cease upon construction completion. Further, any construction equipment requiring electrical power would be supplied by the property's current PG&E supply. Due to the temporary nature of construction activities, the fuel and energy needed during project construction would not be considered a wasteful or inefficient use of energy. Therefore, it is expected that construction energy consumption associated with the proposed project would be comparable to other similar construction projects, and would therefore not be inefficient, wasteful, or unnecessary. Energy usage can be seen in Tables 3 and 4.

Table 3: Operational Energy Usage – Electricity

Land Use	Electricity Use (kWh/yr)	Total CO2 (MT/yr)	CH4 (MT/yr)	N2O (MT/yr)	CO2e (MT/yr)
Apartments Low Rise	132193	12.2310	1.9800e-003	1.9800e-003	12.3519

Source: CalEEMod.2020.4.0

Table 4: Operational Energy Usage – Natural Gas

Land Use	Electricity Use (kBTU/yr)	Total CO2 (MT/yr)	CH4 (MT/yr)	N2O (MT/yr)	CO2e (MT/yr)
Apartments Low Rise	436705	23.3042	4.5000e-004	4.3000e-004	23.4427

Source: CalEEMod.2020.4.0

During operation of the project's proposed apartment complex, energy would be consumed in the form of petroleum-based fuels, fuel for staff and resident vehicles, and the property's PG&E supply would be used for HVAC systems, electronic equipment and lighting. As part of the proposed project, Solar carports would be installed to generate power for use on site. The energy use from operation of the proposed project would not result in the wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources. Energy use from operation of the proposed project would be similar to other apartment complexes in the County. Therefore, the proposed project would result in a **less than significant impact.**

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

Due to the limited energy use that would result from the proposed project, it is not anticipated that the proposed project would conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency. Applicable energy plans include the 2022 California Department of General Services CALGreen Codes and the 2014 City of Fresno General Plan. As noted above, the proposed project would be similar to other apartment complexes in the City and County and would incorporate its own solar energy for use on site. Therefore, the proposed Project would result in **no impact**.

Mitigation Measures

1. The proposed project shall implement and incorporate the energy related mitigation measures as identified in the attached Project Specific Mitigation Monitoring Checklist dated 3/18/2022.

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

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.				X
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?				X
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?				X
iv) Landslides?				X
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?			X	
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?				X
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?				X
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?				X

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?				X

DISCUSSION

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

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

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. As such, the proposed project would not directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving rupture of a known earthquake fault. Therefore, the proposed project would result in **no impact.**

ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?

Although there are no known active earthquake faults in Fresno, the entire northern California region is subject to the potential for moderate to strong seismic shaking due to distant seismic sources. Seismic shaking can be generated on faults many miles from the proposed project vicinity. Seismic shaking potential is considered minimal, and the hazard is not higher or lower at the proposed project site than throughout the region. Standard design and construction practices meeting current California Building Code (where applicable) would provide adequate protection for the structures and related facilities proposed by the project. In compliance with these standards, the proposed project would not directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving strong

seismic ground shaking. Therefore, the proposed project would result in **no impact.**

iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

Although located in a seismically active region (northern California), the proposed project site is not likely to be subject to seismic shaking of adequate strength or duration to generate secondary seismic effects. Likely seismic sources are too far from the proposed project site to generate sufficient long-duration strong shaking. Construction standards that meet the current California Building Codes (as applicable) would provide adequate protection for buildings and related facilities proposed by the project. In compliance with these standards, the proposed project will not directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction. Therefore, the proposed project would result in **no impact**.

iv. Landslides?

The proposed project site and surrounding parcels are geologically flat with an elevation of approximately 368 feet above mean sea level. There are no documented landslide hazard areas identified within the immediate vicinity of the proposed project site that would have an impact on the proposed project. The proposed Project is located on an area of Ramona sandy loam soil (USDA WSS 2023). This soil is considered to be well drained and in a low runoff class. As such, the proposed project would not directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving landslides. Therefore, the proposed project would result in **no impact**.

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

Construction activities associated with the proposed project would include cut and fill grading, trenching, and removing and replanting trees and other vegetation. These activities would include ground disturbance which could potentially result in short-term soil erosion. However, because the proposed project footprint is greater than one (1) acre, it would be subject to the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit requirements for construction site stormwater discharges and would comply with those requirements. A Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) is required to be prepared and implemented under these requirements, which includes appropriate erosion-control and water-quality-control measures during site preparation, grading, construction, and post-construction. Implementation of the SWPPP for the proposed project would minimize short-term erosion impacts. Long-term impacts of the proposed project would not result in substantial erosion, as the soils would be covered by buildings, pavement, vegetation, and landscaping. With the

implementation of **MM GEO-2**, proposed project impacts related to erosion would be **less than significant after mitigation is incorporated**.

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?

As discussed previously under subsection a), the proposed project would have **no 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 are those that undergo a change in volume when exposed to fluctuations in moisture, causing shrinking when dry and swelling when moist. Such a change in volume can distort structural elements and damage structures. Typically, soils with high clay contents are most susceptible to these processes. There are no documented expansive soils located on the proposed project site. The proposed project site consists of primarily Ramona sandy loam, hard substratum, a soil composed of alluvium and derived from granite that is well drained. Thus, the proposed project would not be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property. Therefore, the proposed project would result in **no impact**.

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

The proposed project must comply with all applicable building and development codes. State and local regulations require preparation for a site-specific soils study by a qualified, licensed engineering professional. Said soils study must be approved by the City Engineer and others to assure compliance with mandatory soils, geologic and related grading requirements. Therefore, in compliance with the relevant codes and regulations, the proposed project site would be capable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater; **no impact** would result.

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

Paleontological resources are classified as nonrenewable scientific resources, such as vertebrate, invertebrate, and plant fossils. No paleontological resources, sites, or unique geologic features have been identified on the proposed project site, and the potential for their occurrence is considered minimal, as the entire proposed project

site has been previously disturbed. Therefore, the proposed project would result in **no impact.**

Mitigation Measures

1. The proposed project shall implement and incorporate the geology and soils related mitigation measures as identified in the attached Project Specific Mitigation Monitoring Checklist dated 3/18/2022.

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	

SETTING

Gases that trap heat in the atmosphere are referred to as GHGs. The effect is analogous to the way a greenhouse retains heat. Common GHGs include water vapor, CO2, CH4, NOx, chlorofluorocarbons, hydrofluorocarbons, perfluorocarbons, sulfur hexafluoride, ozone, and aerosols. Natural processes and human activities emit GHGs. The presence of GHGs in the atmosphere affects the earth's temperature. It is believed that emissions from human activities, such as electricity production and vehicle use, have elevated the concentration of these gases in the atmosphere beyond the level of naturally occurring concentrations.

Climate change is a change in the average weather of the earth that is measured by alterations in wind patterns, storms, precipitation, and temperature. These changes are assessed using historical records of temperature changes occurring in the past, such as during previous ice ages. More recent climate change is assessed through measurements of temperatures at the surface and throughout the atmosphere, and from the sea which absorbs and stores heat from the atmosphere.

An individual project cannot generate enough GHG emissions to effect a discernible change in global climate. However, the project participates in the potential for global climate change by its incremental contribution of GHGs combined with the cumulative increase of all other sources of GHGs, which when taken together constitute potential influences on global climate change.

GHGs do not generally produce direct health impacts like criteria air pollutants, but GHGs and associated climate change could affect the health of populations not only in the U.S., but also around the world. Potential impacts related to climate change include sea level rise that displaces populations, causes economic and infrastructure damage, disrupts agriculture, increases heat related illnesses, exacerbates the effects of criteria pollutants, spreads infectious diseases through proliferation of mosquitoes and other vectors carrying tropical diseases into temperate climate zones, and alters/endangers natural flora and fauna in terrestrial and aquatic environments. Of specific concern for the San Joaquin Valley is the potential for loss of snowpack in the Sierra Nevada and its effect on the region's water supply.

DISCUSSION

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

Tables 5 and 6 show estimated GHG emissions from the proposed Project.

Table 5: Project GHG Emissions – Construction

GHG	Estimated (MT/yr)	Threshold	Significance
CO2	150.6724	N/A	N/A
CH4	0.0280	N/A	N/A
N2O	8.5000e-004	N/A	N/A
CO2e	151.6256	BMPs	LTS

Source: CalEEMod.2020.4.0

Table 56: Project GHG Emissions – Operational

GHG	Estimated (MT/yr)	Threshold	Significance
CO2	294.7031	N/A	N/A
CH4	0.2605	N/A	N/A
N2O	0.2605	N/A	N/A
CO2e	305.9108	BMPs	LTS

Source: CalEEMod.2020.4.0

As stated previously, in Section III, the proposed Project does not meet the City's thresholds to conduct an Air Quality Impact Analysis or SJVAPCD Indirect Source

Review due to the low number of dwelling units and daily automobile trips created. The proposed Project would be small in comparison to typical subdivisions proposed in the Fresno/Clovis area and would be within a planning area that the City of Fresno has developed with residential and related uses in the past. Any potential emissions from construction equipment would be temporary in nature. Impacts would be **less than significant.**

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

The SJVAPCD has adopted a Climate Change Action Plan (CCAP), which includes suggested best performance standards (BPS) for proposed development projects. However, the SJVAPCD's CCAP was adopted in 2009 and was prepared based on the State's 2020 GHG targets, which are now superseded by State policies (i.e., the 2019 California Green Building Code) and the 2030 GHG targets, established in SB 32. As discussed above, the proposed project is consistent with the City's GHG Reduction Plan Update. In addition, the proposed project was analyzed for consistency with the goals of AB 32 and the AB 32 Scoping Plan. The following discussion evaluates the proposed project according to the goals of AB 32, the AB 32 Scoping Plan, Executive Order (EO) B-30-15, SB 32, and AB 197.

AB 32 is aimed at reducing GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020. AB 32 requires the California Air Resources Board (CARB) to prepare a Scoping Plan that outlines the main State strategies for meeting the 2020 deadline and to reduce GHGs that contribute to global climate change. The AB 32 Scoping Plan has a range of GHG reduction actions, which includes direct regulations, alternative compliance mechanisms, monetary and non-monetary incentives, voluntary actions, market-based mechanisms such as a cap-and-trade system, and an AB 32 implementation fee to fund the program.

EO B-30-15 added the immediate target of reducing GHG emissions to 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030. CARB released a second update to the Scoping Plan, the 2017 Scoping Plan, to reflect the 2030 target set by EO B-30-15 and codified by SB 32. SB 32 affirms the importance of addressing climate change by codifying into statute the GHG emissions reductions target of at least 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030 contained in EO B-30-15. SB 32 builds on AB 32 and keeps the State on the path toward achieving the 2050 objective of reducing emissions to 80 percent below 1990 levels. The companion bill to SB 32, AB 197, provides additional direction to the CARB related to the adoption of strategies to reduce GHG emissions. Additional direction in AB 197 intended to provide easier public access to air emissions data that are collected by CARB was posted in December 2016.

As identified above, the AB 32 Scoping Plan contains GHG reduction measures that work towards reducing GHG emissions, consistent with the targets set by AB 32, EO B-30-15 and codified by SB 32 and AB 197. The measures applicable to the proposed

project include energy efficiency measures, water conservation and efficiency measures, and transportation and motor vehicle measures.

As such, the proposed project would comply with existing State regulations adopted to achieve the overall GHG emissions reduction goals identified in AB 32 and would be consistent with applicable plans and programs designed to reduce GHG emissions. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs and impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

1. The proposed project shall implement and incorporate the greenhouse gas emission related mitigation measures as identified in the attached Project Specific Mitigation Monitoring Checklist dated 3/18/2022.

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

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

DISCUSSION

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

Small quantities of potentially hazardous substances (e.g., petroleum and other chemicals used to operate and maintain equipment,) would be used during construction and operation of the proposed Project. Compliance with standard transport and handling procedures of the chemical manufacturers, and the existing regulatory requirements of the City would ensure that impacts from the proposed Project would be **less than significant**.

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

The proposed project could expose workers, the public, or the environment to hazardous materials through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment. Small quantities of potentially hazardous substances (e.g., petroleum and other chemicals used to operate and maintain equipment) would be used during construction and operation of the proposed project. Accidental releases of these substances could potentially contaminate soils and degrade the quality of surface water and groundwater, resulting in a public safety hazard. Compliance with standard safety procedures, and hazardous materials handling regulations would minimize potential impacts from the proposed project. **Impacts would 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 proposed Project is not located within 0.25-mile of an existing or proposed school. There would be **no impact**.

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?

There are no known existing hazardous material conditions on the site and the proposed Project would not be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. No hazardous materials cleanup sites are active within 5,000 feet of the proposed Project site (DTSC 2023). The proposed Project would not conflict with the City or County Hazard Mitigation Plans or emergency response plans. There would be **no impact.**

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

The proposed Project is not located within 2 miles of an existing or proposed airport or airport land use plan. There would be **no impact**.

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

The proposed Project would comply with all local and state emergency response and evacuation plans. There would be **no impact**.

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

The proposed Project is not located in a documented wildfire risk area. There would be **no impact**.

Mitigation Measures

1. The proposed project shall implement and incorporate the hazards and hazardous material related mitigation measures as identified in the attached Project Specific Mitigation Monitoring Checklist dated 3/18/2022.

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		

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

SETTING

Fresno is one of the largest cities in the United States still relying primarily on groundwater for its public water supply. Surface water treatment and distribution has been implemented in the northeastern part of the City, 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 historic trend of high consumptive use of water on a per capita basis (some 250 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.

Fresno has attempted to address these issues through metering and revisions to the City's Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP). The Fresno Metropolitan Water Resource Management Plan, which has been adopted and the accompanying Final EIR

(SCH #95022029) certified. The purpose of these management plans is to provide safe, adequate, and dependable water supplies in order to meet 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.

The 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 PEIR No. SCH 2012111015 for the Fresno General Plan, and EIR No. SCH 95022029 for the Fresno Metropolitan Water Resource Management Plan, et al. These conditions include water quality degradation due to dibromochloropropane (DBCP), arsenic, iron, and manganese concentrations; low water well yields; limited aquifer storage capacity and recharge capacity; and, intensive urban or semi-urban development occurring up gradient from the Fresno Metropolitan Area.

In response to the need for a comprehensive long-range water supply and distribution strategy, the Fresno General Plan recognizes the Kings Basin's Integrated Regional Water Management Plan, Fresno-Area Regional Groundwater Management Plan, and City of Fresno Metropolitan Water Resource Management Plan and cites the findings of the City of Fresno 2010 Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP). The purpose of these management plans is to provide safe, adequate, and dependable water supplies to meet the 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 proposed project is located within the north Fresno area where Urban Growth Management (UGM) is in place. There is currently a water connection fee program to support the development of water supply, treatment, conveyance, and recharge facilities. In accordance with the provisions of the Fresno General Plan and PEIR No. SCH 2012111015 mitigation measures, project specific water supply and distribution requirements must assure that an adequate source of water is available to serve the project.

DISCUSSION

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

As a condition of approval, any pre-existing on-site domestic or agricultural water wells that may be on the site would be properly abandoned, in order to prevent the spread of contaminants from the ground surface or from shallow groundwater layers into deeper levels of the aquifer. As a condition of approval, any pre-existing septic systems would be properly abandoned in accordance with all applicable State and County Health standards

and regulations. The developer would be required to provide improvements which would convey surface drainage to Master Plan inlets and which will provide a path for major storm conveyance. When development permits are issued, the subject site would be required to pay drainage fees pursuant to the Drainage Fee Ordinance.

Occupancy of this site would generate wastewater containing human waste, which is required to be conveyed and treated by the Fresno-Clovis Regional Wastewater Treatment and Reclamation Facility. There would not be any onsite wastewater treatment system. The proposed project would be required to install sewer mains and branches, and to pay connection and sewer facility fees to provide for reimbursement of preceding investments in sewer trunks to connect this site to a publicly owned treatment works.

There are no aspects of this project that would result in impacts to water quality beyond those analyzed in the Master Environmental Impact Report SCH No. 2012111015 for the Fresno General Plan. Impacts would be **less than significant**.

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

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

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 proposed project site is currently a vacant lot. The proposed project would add approximately 1.58-acres of new impervious surfaces. Due to the amount of total acreage disturbed, the proposed project would be required to implement **MM GEO-2**, a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). Measures included in the SWPPP would reduce any potential erosion of siltation on or off-site. Impacts would be **less than significant with mitigation incorporated**.

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

As stated previously, the proposed project site is currently a vacant lot. The proposed project would add approximately 1.58-acres of new impervious surfaces. Due to the amount of total acreage disturbed, the proposed project would be required to implement a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). Measures included in the SWPPP would reduce any potential surface runoff on-site. Impacts would be **less than significant with mitigation incorporated**.

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

The existing drainage on site was designed with capacity to serve the project with the existing residential medium low density land use. Therefore, mitigation has been provided that requires the developer to mitigate impacts of the increased runoff from the proposed medium high density residential type land use. The developer would be required to provide improvements which would convey surface drainage to Master Plan inlets and would provide a path for major storm conveyance. When development permits are issued, the subject site would be required to pay drainage fees pursuant to the Drainage Fee Ordinance. Impacts would be **less than significant with mitigation incorporated**.

iv. Impede or redirect flood flows?

According to the Fresno Metropolitan Flood Control District (FMFCD), the subject site is not located within a flood prone area. There would be **no impact**.

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

According to the Fresno Metropolitan Flood Control District (FMFCD), the subject site is not located within a flood prone or hazard area. There would be **no impact.**

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

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 mitigation measures of approved environmental review documents will address the issues of providing an adequate, reliable, and sustainable water supply for the project's urban domestic and public safety consumptive purposes. There would be **no impact.**

Mitigation Measures

1. 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 3/18/2022.

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 proposed project does not have the potential to, nor does it propose to physically divide an established community. The proposed project site is within the Fresno City limits and within an urbanized area of the City of Fresno that includes the infrastructure necessary to serve the proposed development. Primary access to the proposed project site is provided via N Chestnut Avenue. Therefore, the proposed project would result in **no impact.**

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 site is currently zoned RS-4 and designated as Rural Residential land use. The proposed project would require a rezone to RM-1 and a designation of medium high density residential land use, which would be consistent with the northern adjoining parcel. Objective UF-1 of the General Plan states: "Emphasize the opportunity for a diversity of districts, neighborhoods, and housing types". The proposed Project would complement the adjacent parcel to the north by adding additional multi-family housing in the area, while also creating diversity from other single-family homes in the vicinity.

Considering that the proposed Project site has been previously disturbed and cleared of any valuable vegetation, and the geographical and geological lay of the land is not at high risk of natural impacts such as wildfire, flooding, soil inadequacy, etc., (as discussed in the relevant sections), the construction and operation of the proposed project would not cause a significant environmental impact due to this change in land use. Therefore, impacts from the proposed project would be **less than significant.**

Mitigation Measures

1. The proposed project shall implement and incorporate the land use and planning related mitigation measures as identified in the attached Project Specific Mitigation Monitoring Checklist dated 3/18/2022.

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?
and;

A mineral resource is land on which known deposits of commercially viable mineral or aggregate deposits exist. The designation is applied to sites determined by the California Geological Survey as being a resource of regional significance and is intended to help maintain any quarrying operations and protect them from encroachment of incompatible uses. The proposed project would 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. There would be **no impact.**

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

The proposed project would not result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site. The proposed project site is not located in an area designated as an important mineral resource recovery site by a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan or by the State of California. Therefore, the proposed project would result in **no impact**.

Mitigation Measures

1. The proposed project shall implement and incorporate the mineral resource related mitigation measures as identified in the attached Project Specific Mitigation Monitoring Checklist dated 3/18/2022

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	

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

SETTING

In developed areas of the community, noise conflicts often occur when a noise sensitive land use is located adjacent to a noise generator. Noise in these situations frequently stems from on-site operations, use of outdoor equipment, uses where large numbers of persons assemble, and vehicular traffic. Some land uses, such as residential dwellings, are considered noise sensitive receptors and involve land uses associated with indoor and/or outdoor activities that may be subject to stress and/or significant interference from noise.

Generally, the three primary sources of substantial noise that affect the City of Fresno and its residents are transportation-related and consist of major streets and regional highways; airport operations at the Fresno Yosemite International, the Fresno-Chandler Downtown, and the Sierra Sky Park Airports; and railroad operations along the BNSF Railway and the Union Pacific Railroad lines. The project site is not located within the vicinity of any rail lines, the Fresno Yosemite Airport, or any other airport or private air strip.

Potential noise sources at the project site would occur primarily from roadway noise from North Chestnut Avenue along the east of the proposed project site and stationary noise sources from the adjacent sites to the north, west, and south. The City of Fresno Noise Element of the Fresno General Plan establishes a land use compatibility criterion of 60dB DNL for exterior noise levels in outdoor activity areas of new residential developments. Outdoor activity areas generally include open areas, private patios, etc. of multiple family residential developments. The intent of the exterior noise level requirement is to provide an acceptable noise environment for outdoor activities and recreation.

Furthermore, the Noise Element also requires that interior noise levels attributable to exterior noise sources not exceed 45 dB DNL. The intent of the interior noise level standard is to provide an acceptable noise environment for indoor communication and sleep. For stationary noise sources, the noise element establishes noise compatibility criteria in terms of the exterior hourly equivalent sound level (Leq) and maximum sound level (Lmax). The standards are more restrictive during the nighttime hours, defined as 10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m. The standards may be adjusted upward (less restrictive) if the existing ambient noise level without the source of interest already exceeds these standards. The Noise Element standards for stationary noise sources are: (1) 50 dBA Leq for the daytime and 45 dBA Leq for the nighttime hourly equivalent sound levels; and, (2) 70 dBA Lmax for the daytime and 65 dBA Lmax for the nighttime maximum sound levels. If the existing ambient noise levels equal or exceed these levels, mitigation is required to limit noise to the ambient noise level plus 5 dB.

DISCUSSION

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

This mitigated negative declaration prepared for the proposed project is tiered from PEIR SCH No. 2012111015 prepared for the Fresno General Plan, which contains measures to mitigate projects' individual and cumulative noise impacts. Therefore, the purpose of this initial study is to evaluate potential project related impacts which were not evaluated fully within the scope of the PEIR.

The subject site is currently vacant land. Therefore, it is reasonable to assume that the proposed project could result in an increase in temporary and/or periodic ambient noise levels on the subject property above existing levels. However, as discussed above, this increase in noise would be mitigated to an acceptable level. Some increases in ambient noise levels would occur during the time of construction, but project construction would be limited to normal business hours (7am to 7pm) to minimize the impact on the adjacent neighborhood.

The construction of a project involves short-term, construction related noise. Pursuant to the Fresno General Plan PEIR, as set forth by Chapter 10, Article 1, Section 10-109 - Exemptions, the provisions of Article 1 - Noise Regulations of the FMC shall not apply to:

> Construction, repair or remodeling work accomplished pursuant to a building, electrical, plumbing, mechanical, or other construction permit issued by the city or other governmental agency, or to site preparation and grading, provided such work takes place between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 10:00 p.m. on any day except Sunday.

Thus, although development activities associated with build-out of the Planning Area could potentially result in temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity (as addressed in Impact NOI-4 of the PEIR), 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. Therefore, short-term construction impacts associated with the exposure of persons to or the generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance or applicable standards of other agencies would be less than significant. Construction noise levels can be seen in Table 7.

Table 7 – Anticipated Construction Noise Levels at 50 feet

Construction Phase	Duration (days)	L(max)	L(eq)
Site Preparation	3	85	83.8
Grading	6	85	83.6
Building Construction	220	85	86.5
Paving	10	89.5	86.9
Architectural Coating	10	77.7	73.7

Source: CalEEMod v 2020.4.0, FHWA 2006

The subject property would be rezoned to RM-1/UGM, which allows for multiple family residential developments. Adjacent properties are comprised of a Christian community center to the south and residential land uses to the north, east, and west, which have similar noise level requirements during the day. Although the project would create some additional activity in the area, the project would be required to comply with all noise policies from the Fresno General Plan. It may be noted however that a six-foot high screening wall is required by the Fresno Municipal Code to be constructed on the interior lot lines where multi-family development of four or more units abuts a single-family residential district. In accordance with the requirements of the Fresno Municipal Code, a block wall along all shared property lines with existing single-family development is incorporated as part of the project design. This screening wall will further reduce potential noise intrusion upon surrounding residential uses. Further, a dense perimeter landscape is proposed to further screen neighboring residences from any noise produced on site. The wall and landscaping vegetation would also shield the residence from vehicle traffic noise from N Chestnut Ave.

Upon completion of construction and occupancy of the proposed project, on-site operational noise would be generated mainly by on-site traffic and vehicles. However, the overall noise levels generated by operations are not expected to increase current noise levels beyond existing significance thresholds. Although the proposed project would create additional activity in the area, the proposed project would not include any stationary noise generators. All new construction would meet required setbacks from property lines

and would be separated by landscaping and a block wall. The proposed project would be required to comply with all noise policies from the Fresno General Plan and noise ordinance of the Fresno Municipal Code. Impacts would be **less than significant**.

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

Construction activities associated with the development of the proposed project could expose persons or structures to groundborne vibration or increased noise levels. The PEIR for the Fresno General Plan references Caltrans standards to determine impacts. Caltrans considers a peak-particle velocity (ppv) threshold of 0.04 inches per second (in/sec) for continuous vibration as the minimum perceptible level for human annoyance of ground borne vibration. Continuous/frequent vibrations in excess of 0.10 in/sec ppv is defined as distinctly perceptible, with levels of .4 in/sec ppv can be expected to result in severe annoyance to people. Ground vibration generated by common construction equipment, including large tractors and loaded trucks, ranges from 0.089 ppv (in/sec) to 0.003 ppv (in/sec) at 25 feet. Given that much of the construction will take place more than 25 feet away from neighboring properties and the threshold for severe annoyance is so much higher than what is expected of construction equipment (0.4 compared to 0.089) the project's impact of groundborne vibrations would be **less than significant**.

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

The proposed project is not within an airport land use plan or within 2 miles of an airport. There would be **no impact**.

Mitigation Measures

1. The proposed project shall implement and incorporate the noise related mitigation measures as identified in the attached Project Specific Mitigation Monitoring Checklist dated 3/18/2022.

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

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

DISCUSSION

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

The proposed project site is currently zoned RS-4 and would require a rezone to RM-1, consistent with the northern adjoining parcel to allow for construction of the project's proposed 32-unit multi-family apartment complex. These figures do not represent a substantial population growth. The proposed project site is surrounded by urban uses, remaining as an infill site with all services such as sewer and water already constructed to serve the site and surrounding area. Therefore, the proposed project would not directly or indirectly induce substantial unplanned population growth in the area and would result in a **less than significant impact.**

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

The proposed project does not have the potential to displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere, as the proposed project site is currently vacant. Therefore, the proposed project would have **no impact.**

Mitigation Measures

1. The proposed project shall implement and incorporate the population and housing related mitigation measures as identified in the attached Project Specific Mitigation Monitoring Checklist dated 3/18/2022

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:			X	
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?
and;

The proposed Project site is located within an existing residential neighborhood and would comply with the applicable service delivery requirements necessary

to provide no less than the minimum acceptable level of fire protection facilities and services appropriate for urban uses. Fresno City Fire Department Stations 17 and 13 are 2.2 and 2.5 miles from the proposed Project site, respectively. Policy PU-2-E of the General Plan states that an effective first response time is a minimum of three firefighters to the scene within 5 minutes and 20 seconds. The proposed Project would not interfere with these standards. Impacts would be **less than significant**.

ii. Police protection?

The proposed Project site is located within an existing residential neighborhood and would comply with the applicable service delivery requirements necessary to provide no less than the minimum acceptable level of police protection facilities and services appropriate for urban uses. Northeast Policing District Station is 1.3 miles from the proposed Project site. Policy PU-1-G of the General Plan establishes a goal of 1.5 unrestricted officers per 1,000 residents. The proposed Project would not substantially raise the population of the area. Therefore, impacts would be considered **less than significant.**

iii. Schools?
and;

The City of Fresno is made up of four major Unified School Districts. Combined, the public school districts have the capacity to serve 144,000 school aged children between the grades of K-12, and private schools can serve another 4,200 students. With 136,000 students currently in the public school districts, there remains space for up to 8,000 additional students. Clovis, Fresno, Central and Sanger USDs are planning new schools to increase student capacities as they plan for future growth in the Fresno Planning Area.

The City of Fresno has several schools in the vicinity of the proposed Project:

School	Address	Distance
Maple Creek Elementary	2025 E Teague Ave	0.5 miles
Kastner Intermediate	7676 N First Street	2.03 miles
Clovis West High	1070 E Teague Ave	1.26 miles
Copper Hills Elementary	1881 E Plymouth Ave	1.33 miles
Riverview Elementary	2491 E Behymer Ave	1.24 miles
Granite Ridge Intermediate	277 E International Ave	1.96 miles
Clovis North High	2770 E International Ave	2.02 miles
Garfield Elementary	1315 N Peach Ave	1.33 miles
Alta Sierra Vista Intermediate	380 W Teague Ave	1.18 miles
Buchannan High	1560 N Minnewawa Ave	1.49 miles

The application was provided to the Clovis Unified School District for review and comment. Correspondence from CUSD dated September 20, 2022, indicates that Maple Creek Elementary, Kastner Intermediate, and Clovis West High have sufficient capacity to serve the project at the time of their review. The letter indicated based on overall growth in the District and the District Plans for construction of new school facilities, it's possible that adjustment of attendance areas could require students in the project area attend a different elementary school other than the elementary school provided, and that students may attend more than one elementary school during those years. The letter also described applicable school facilities fees that the project will be required to contribute towards.

While the development of the proposed Project could attract families that may have school age children who contribute to the total student enrollment in these schools, the implementation of the proposed Project would not result in a significant increase in the number of families or school-age children or cause a significant environmental impact as a result. The proposed Project would be subject to and comply with all relevant school impact fees. Therefore, the potential impacts are considered **less than significant**.

iv. Parks?

In 2008, the City Council approved the Urban Growth Management Impact Fee and Reimbursement policy. The current citywide park fee is based upon a ratio of 3.0 acres per 1,000 residents; this was established under the City's previous Urban Growth Management Program and 1989 Master Plan for Parks and Recreation. This 3.0-acre parkland standard was maintained through the adoption of the 2025 Fresno General Plan, the subsequent Park Facilities Impact Fee & Parkland Dedication Study, and the adoption of the citywide park Facilities Fee ordinance. The proposed Project would comply with this ordinance.

The City of Fresno has various parks in the vicinity of the proposed Project. While the development of the proposed Project could attract families that may wish to use these parks, the implementation of the proposed project would not result in a significant increase in the number of families or school-age children or cause a significant environmental impact as a result. The proposed Project would be subject to and comply with all relevant park impact fees. Therefore, the potential impacts are considered **less than significant**.

v. Other public facilities?

The proposed project would comply with the requirements of relevant local departments and districts to ensure minimal impact to existing facilities which currently serve the proposed project site. Therefore, the potential impacts are considered **less than significant.**

Mitigation Measures

1. The proposed project shall implement and incorporate the public service related mitigation measures as identified in the attached Project Specific Mitigation Monitoring Checklist dated 3/18/2022.

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?

The proposed project would not result in substantial physical deterioration of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities, as the project does not propose a land use that would add significant new numbers of people to the area. The proposed Project would be subject to and comply with all relevant park impact fees. Therefore, the proposed project would result in **no impact.**

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

The proposed project includes a swimming pool which will be constructed and maintained in compliance with applicable state and local regulations and would not have an adverse physical effect on the environment. Therefore, the proposed project would result in **no impact.**

Mitigation Measures

1. The proposed project shall implement and incorporate the recreation related mitigation measures as identified in the attached Project Specific Mitigation Monitoring Checklist dated 3/18/2022

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

SETTING

The subject site is comprised of approximately 2.11 acres of property located on the west side of N Chestnut Ave between E Teague and E Shepherd Avenues. The subject site location is adjacent to low and medium density residential and open space (developed

with a Christian community center) land uses which provide for a pattern of development with the potential to increase the number of average daily vehicle trips.

In the Fresno General Plan, N Chestnut Avenue is designated as a four-lane, divided, arterial street, which has a primary purpose of moving traffic between collector streets and to or from freeways and expressways.

The proposed project proposes to re-zone the subject property from the RS-4/UGM *(Residential Single Family, Medium low Density/Urban Growth Management)* zone district to the RM-1/UGM *(Residential Multiple Family, Medium High Density/Urban Growth Management)* zone district. The rezone would increase the traffic volume. The trips would be directed onto N Chestnut Ave, an existing four-lane divided arterial street adjacent to the property according to the Fresno General Plan and the Woodward Park Community Plan.

DISCUSSION

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

A Trip Generation Analysis dated March 11, 2022, was completed by JLB Engineering, Inc. for the proposal to construct 32 multi-family residential units. The development is expected to generate a maximum of approximately 234 daily trips. Of these vehicle trips, it is projected that fifteen (15) would occur during the morning (7 to 9 a.m.) peak hour travel period and eighteen (18) would occur during the evening (4 to 6 p.m.) peak hour travel period. The comparison of the projected trips over the existing trips is a maximum difference of 121 total trips, six (6) morning peak hour, and six (6) evening peak hour trips.

The proposed project site is located in Traffic Impact Zone (TIZ) lll which allows for 100 peak hour trips to be generated by a project before a Traffic Impact Study is required. Because the proposed project is projected to generate less than 100 peak hour trips, a Traffic Impact Study was not required and considered the change in traffic to be negligible. Impacts would be **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, dated June 25, 2020, 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. These criteria may be size, location, proximity to transit, of trip making potential. In general development projects that are consistent with the City's General Plan and Zoning and that that meet one or more of the following criteria can be screened out from a quantitative VMT analysis.

1. Project Located in a Transit Priority Area/High Quality Transit Corridor (within 0.5 miles of a transit stop).
2. Project is Local-serving Retail of less than 50,000 square feet.
3. Project is a Low Trip Generator (Less than 500 average daily trips.
4. Project has a High Level of Affordable Housing Units
5. Project is an institutional/Government and Public Service Uses
6. Project is located in a Low VMT Zone

The City of Fresno VMT Thresholds Section 3.1 regarding Development Projects states that if a project constitutes a General Plan Amendment or a Rezone, none of the screening criteria may apply, and that the City must evaluate such projects on a case-by-case basis. Here the Project includes both a General Plan Amendment and a Rezone

and does not meet the screening criteria. As such, a quantitative VMT analysis is required.

For projects that are not screened out, a quantitative analysis of VMT impacts must be prepared and compared against the adopted VMT thresholds of significance. The Fresno VMT Thresholds document includes thresholds of significance for development projects, transportation projects, and land use plans. These thresholds of significance were developed using the County of Fresno as the applicable region, and the required reduction of VMT (as adopted in the Fresno VMT Thresholds) corresponds to Fresno County's contribution to the statewide GHG emission reduction target. In order to reach the statewide GHG reduction target of 15%, Fresno County must reduce its GHG emissions by 13%. The method of reducing GHG by 13% is to reduce VMT by 13% as well.

VMT is simply the product of a number of trips and those trips' lengths. The first step in a VMT analysis is to establish the baseline average VMT, which requires the definition of a region. The CEQA Guidelines for Vehicle Miles Traveled Thresholds for the City of Fresno (June 25, 2020) provide that the Fresno County average VMT per capita (appropriate for residential land uses) and employee (appropriate for office land uses) are 16.1 VMT per capita and 25.6 VMT per employee, respectively. The City's threshold targets a 13% reduction in VMT for residential and office land uses.

The City's adopted thresholds for development projects correspond to the regional thresholds set by the Fresno Council of Governments (COG). For residential and non-residential (except retail) development projects, the adopted threshold of significance is a 13% reduction, which means that projects that generate VMT in excess of a 13% reduction from the existing regional VMT per capita or per employee would have a significant environmental impact. Projects that reduce VMT by more than 13% are less than significant. For retail projects, the adopted threshold is any net increase in VMT per employee compared to existing VMT per employee.

Per the City of Fresno VMT Guidelines, Project VMT may be calculated using the Fresno COG VMT Calculation Tool for residential projects having less than or equal to 500 dwelling units or office projects having less than or equal to 375 employees. Because this project is for multi-family residential and there are less than 500 dwelling units, the Fresno COG VMT Analysis Tool was used to determine the Project VMT.

Quantitative assessments of the VMT generated by the Project have been determined using the Fresno COG VMT Analysis Tool. The number of units and location were entered to conduct a Project-specific VMT analysis using the Fresno COG VMT Analysis Tool. Based on the output, the Project is expected to have a VMT of 12.9 per capita and does not exceed the City's VMT threshold of 16.01 VMT per capita.

Based on these results, there is not a significant impact to VMT associated with this Project pursuant to the City of Fresno VMT analysis guidelines concerning consistency with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3(b).

Additionally, had the proposed project not required a general plan amendment or rezone, the development of the 32 unit apartment project would have otherwise been eligible to screen out because it would have been considered a low trip generator due to the project proposing a total of 234 Active Daily Trips, which is below the threshold of 500 ADT.

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 proposed project does not include any potentially hazardous design features related to transportation. There would be **no impact**.

d) Result in inadequate emergency access?

The proposed project would comply with all applicable accessibility requirements for emergency vehicles. There would be **no impact**.

Mitigation Measures

1. The proposed project shall implement and incorporate the transportation related mitigation measures as identified in the attached Project Specific Mitigation Monitoring Checklist dated 3/18/2022.

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

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

As mentioned in section 3.5, the proposed project site is not within a designated or proposed historic district, and there are no structures which exist on or within the immediate vicinity that are listed on or considered to be eligible for the National or Local Register of Historic Places. Due to the proposed Project taking place on previously disturband land, no CHRIS records search was required. Therefore, the proposed project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resources listed in or eligible for listing in the NRHP, CRHR, CHL, or a local register, and the proposed project would result in **no impact.**

ii. A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of 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.

There are no known Native American resources within or adjacent to the proposed project site. Given that the proposed project site has previously been disturbed, there is a low potential for encountering unrecorded TCRs. As noted in the sections above, several tribes were contacted in accordance with SB18 and AB52, The tribes contacted included the Big Sandy Rancheria of Western Mono Indians, Chicken Ranch Rancheria of Me-Wuk Indians Cold Springs Rancheria of Mono Indians, Dumna Wo-Wah Tribal Government, Dunlap Band of Mono Indians, Kings River Choinumni Farm Tribe, Nashville Enterprise Miwok-Maidu-Nishinam Tribe, North Fork Mono Tribe, North Fork Rancheria of Mono Indians, North Valley Yokuts Tribe, North Valley Yokuts Tribe, Picayune Rancheria of Chukchansi Indians, Salinan Tribe of Monterey, San Luis Obispo Counties, Santa Rosa Rancheria Tachi Yokut Tribe, Table Mountain Rancheria, Traditional Choinumni Tribe, Tule River Indian Tribe, Tuolumne Band of Me-Wuk Indians, Wuksache Indian Tribe/Eshom Valley Band, and Xolon-Salinan Tribe. No comments were received. In the event that a TCR is discovered on site, the relevant mitigation measures will take effect. Therefore, the proposed would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource determined to be significant, and the proposed project would result in **no impact.**

Mitigation Measures

1. 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 3/18/2022.

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:				

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?

The proposed project would be served by existing utility and service systems available to the site subject to the payment of any 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 City-wide program for the completion of incremental expansions to facilities for planned water supply treatment, and storage. Power to the proposed project would by supplied by PG&E.

The subject site is not located within a flood prone or hazard area, however, the existing drainage system was designed with capacity to serve the project with the existing residential medium low density land use. Therefore, mitigation has been provided that requires the developer to mitigate impacts of the increased runoff from the proposed medium high density residential type land use. The developer would be required to provide improvements which would convey surface drainage to Master Plan inlets and which would provide a path for major storm conveyance. When development permits are issued, the subject site would be required to pay drainage fees pursuant to the Drainage Fee Ordinance.

The proposed project would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board. The Fresno-Clovis Regional Wastewater Reclamation Facility (RWRF) has a treatment capacity of 88 mgd and treats an average of 68 mgd (COF 2022). The proposed project's estimated water use would be a negligible increase to existing conditions. Impacts would be **less than significant**.

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

The Fresno Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) is updated every five years and outline each suppliers' long-term water resource planning to ensure there is enough water to meet both existing and future demands. The UWMP sets the roadmap for how the City will use water over the coming years. The 2020 Fresno UWMP stated a water usage goal of 247 gallons per-day per-capita (GPCD). The water service area in 2020 was estimated to be approximately 550,217 residents. The water use by the proposed Project over a year of operation is estimated to be approximately 3.4 million gallons for an estimated 92 residents. This leads to an estimated water usage of approximately 101 GPCD for the proposed Project, which would be well below any current or future water usage goals.

As stated previously, the proposed project would be served by existing utility and service systems available to the site subject to the payment of any 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 City-wide program for the completion of incremental expansions to facilities for planned water supply treatment, and storage. The proposed Project site is located in an existing neighborhood with existing utility and service systems. Impacts would be **less than significant**.

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

The Fresno-Clovis Regional Wastewater Reclamation Facility (RWRF) has a treatment capacity of 88 mgd and treats an average of 68 mgd. As stated previously, the proposed Project would use approximately 3.4 million gallons of water over the course of an operational year. The proposed project's estimated water use would be a negligible increase to existing conditions. Impacts would be **less than significant**.

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

The American Avenue Landfill has a maximum permitted throughput of 2,200 tons per day, and a remaining capacity of over 29.3 million cubic yards (CalRecycle 2018). The proposed Project is estimated to create approximately 14.7 tons of solid waste per year. While the proposed project would result in an increase in solid waste generation over existing conditions, the amount would be considered negligible, and the American Avenue Landfill would have adequate capacity. Therefore, the proposed project would result in a **less than significant impact.**

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

The proposed project would comply with all applicable regulations related to solid waste. Therefore, the proposed project would result in **no impact.**

Mitigation Measures

1. The proposed project shall implement and incorporate the utilities and service systems related mitigation measures as identified in the attached Project Specific Mitigation Monitoring Checklist dated 3/18/2022.

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 proposed project site is not located within a State Responsibility Area. Use of the proposed project site during construction and operation will not impair any adopted emergency response or evacuation plans and would result in **no impact.**

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

The proposed project site and surrounding parcels are on geologically flat land and are not in an area classified as very high FHSZ. Therefore, the proposed project would not exacerbate wildfire risks or expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire. The proposed project would result in **no impact.**

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

The proposed project does not include the addition of new roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines, or other utilities, and would therefore not exacerbate fire risk or result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment. The proposed project would result in **no impact.**

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

The location of the proposed project does not fall within a Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) flood hazard area, nor are there any sheer or unstable cliffs in the immediate area. Neither the occupants nor the structures would be exposed to significant risks from flooding or landslides as a result of post-fire runoff. Therefore, the proposed project would result in **no impact.**

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

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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	
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 proposed project does not have the potential to significantly 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. Impacts would 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.)

Given the dense urban landscape surrounding the proposed project the cumulative impacts from this infill development project are not expected to be significant. This development is resulting in the loss of less than 2.5 acres of previously disturbed and cleared urban undeveloped land. The loss of the property does not involve the loss of regionally important plant communities, such as native oak woodlands or vernal pool wetlands, or represent the loss of wildlife habitat in the form of native grassland or riparian woodland. The proposed project provides regionally abundant and low quality wildlife and native plant potential habitat. Impacts would be **less than significant**.

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

Therefore, as noted in preceding sections of this Initial Study, there is no evidence in the record to indicate that incremental environmental impacts facilitated by this project would be cumulatively significant. There is also no evidence in the record that the proposed project would have any adverse impacts directly, or indirectly, on human beings. Impacts would be **less than significant.**