APPENDIX G/INITIAL STUDY FOR A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

Environmental Checklist Form for:
Environmental Assessment No. T-6352/P21-05405

1.	**Project title:** Plan Amendment-Rezone Application No. P21-05405 and Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 6352
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:** John George, Planner III City of Fresno Planning and Development Department (559) 621-8073
4.	**Project location:** The 2.10-acre project site [Assessor's Parcel Number (APN): 481-436-01, 481-100-14 and 481-100-16], is located at the southeast corner of S. DeWitt Avenue and E. Laurite Avenue, in the City of Fresno. Figure 1 shows the site's regional and local context. The project site is bounded to the south by existing residential and self-storage land use, to the east, west, and north by existing residential uses. Figure 2 depicts an aerial photograph of the project site and surrounding land uses. Figure 3 shows the project site plan.
5.	**Project sponsor's name and address:** Patricia Rawlings, 1111 Yellowstone Ave Pocatello, ID 83201 Bill and Gail Misaki 8534 E. McKenzie Avenue Fresno, CA 93737

6.	**General & Community plan land use designation:** Current: Medium Low Density Residential Proposed: Medium Density Residential
7.	**Zoning:** Current: RS-4/UGM (Single-Unit Residential, Medium Low Density Residential/Urban Growth Management) Proposed: RS-5 (Single-Unit Residential, Medium Density)
8.	**Description of project:** Plan Amendment-Rezone Application No. P21-05405 and Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 6352 were filed by Patricia Rawlings, and Bill and Gail Misaki (Project Applicant). The Project Applicant proposes to develop a 17-lot single-unit residential subdivision and infrastructure in the project site which is approximately 2.1 acres. The project site is currently zoned RS-4/UGM (*Single-Unit Residential, Medium Low Density/Urban Growth Management*) and the current planned land use designation is Medium Low Density Residential, which is intended to provide for single-unit residential uses. The proposed zoning is RS-5/UGM (*Single-Unit Residential, Medium Density/Urban Growth Management*) and the proposed land use is Medium Density Residential. Therefore, a rezone and General Plan amendment are required. The RS-5 zone district is intended for smaller lots and higher density single unit residential. The proposed RS-5 zoning is similar to the surrounding area. The project proposes to use RS-5 zone district development standards. Sewer, water, and solid waste services will be provided by the City of Fresno. Storm drainage service is provided by Fresno Metropolitan Flood Control District (FMFCD). Electric and natural gas services will be Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E.) Telephone services will be provided by AT&T and fiber/internet will be provided by Comcast. <u>Project Characteristics</u> The proposed project consists of infill development of a 17-lot single unit residential subdivision. The proposed lots will be developed with single-unit homes of similar style and architecture to the existing surrounding homes. <u>Access, Circulation, and Parking</u> As described above, the proposed project would develop a 17-lot single unit residential subdivision providing direct access from E. Laurite Avenue (local street). The proposed project would also include attached garages and allow for additional parking on the driveways.

	Landscaping The proposed project would include landscaping and irrigation of the residential lots in the front yards and rear yards of each lot. Utilities and Infrastructure The project site is located in an urban area and is currently served by existing utilities, including: water, sanitary sewer, storm drainage, electricity, and natural gas infrastructure. Proposed utility connections are discussed below. Water and Wastewater Water supply and wastewater services for the proposed project would be provided by the Department of Public Utilities. The proposed project would connect to existing 8-inch water main located along E. Laurite Avenue. Additionally, the proposed project would connect to eight existing 1-inch wastewater service lines located along E. Laurite Avenue. Stormwater The Fresno Metropolitan Flood Control District (FMFCD) would provide flood control and urban storm water services to the project site. Stormwater from the project site would be directed to E. Laurite Avenue. The existing street improvements, curb, gutter, and roadways direct stormwater runoff to existing FMFCD storm drainage facilities. Electricity and Natural Gas Electricity and natural gas services to the site are provided by Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E). PG&E has existing electric and gas facilities in E. Laurite Avenue. Existing underground utility connections and gas mains provide electricity and gas to the project site. The proposed project would connect to existing service lines in the vicinity of the project site. Grading and Construction Construction of the proposed project is expected to occur over a period of 10 months starting in March 2027 Site preparation would include removal of rocks, debris, and vegetation from the project site. Construction of the proposed project would comply with City standards, including the City's current building code, landscape standards, and lighting standards. In addition, the project site would be graded like other developments throughout the City.

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

	Planned Land Use	Existing Zoning	Existing Land Use
North	Medium Low Density Residential	RS-4/UGM - Single-Unit Residential, Medium Low Density/Urban Growth Management	Single-Unit Residential Neighborhood
East	Medium Density Residential	RS-5/UGM - Single-Unit Residential, Medium Density/Urban Growth Management	Single-Unit Residential Home (2460 S. Clovis Ave)
South	Low Density Residential and Employment – Business Park	RS-3/UGM/cz - Single-Unit Residential, Low Density/Urban Growth Management/conditions of zoning BP/UGM – Employment, Business Park/Urban Growth Management	Low Density Residential (Tract 5103), Self-Storage
West	Medium Low Density Residential	RS-4/UGM - Single-Unit Residential, Medium Low Density/Urban Growth Management	Single-Unit Residential Neighborhood

10. **Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement):**
- Planning & Development Department;
- Building & Safety Services Division;
- Department of Public Works;
- Department of Public Utilities;
- County of Fresno, Department of Public Health;
- City of Fresno Fire Department;
- Fresno Metropolitan Flood Control District (FMFCD);
- San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD); and
- Fresno Irrigation District (FID).

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, before public distribution of the document, 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 March 1, 2023 which included the required 90-day time period for tribes to request consultation, which ended on May 31, 2023. All tribes which were contacted declined or did not request consultation. Currently, the Table Mountain Rancheria Tribe and the Dumna Wo Wah Tribe have requested to be notified pursuant to Assembly Bill 52 (AB 52) Both tribes did not request consultation on this project.

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.

John George, Planner III 08/21/2026____
Planner Name, Title Date

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.

   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 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	
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?

A scenic vista is a viewpoint that provides expansive views of a highly valued landscape for the public's benefit. The City's approved General Plan identifies six locations along the San Joaquin River bluffs as designated vista points from which views should be maintained. Scenic vistas within the Planning Area could provide distant views of features such as the San Joaquin River to the north and the foothills of the Sierra Nevada Mountains to the east.

The project site is located in a primarily developed area of the city and is not located in an area with expansive or far field views. The proposed project would include the construction of 17 single-unit residential homes and associated infrastructure. The project site is bounded to the south by existing residential and self-storage land uses, to the east, west, and north by existing single-unit residential uses. There are no significant trees, rock outcroppings, and/or historic buildings located on the subject property that have been identified as important scenic resources or would otherwise constitute significant landscape features. Therefore, the proposed project would not substantially diminish any scenic vistas within or near the project area and would likewise not substantially block or impede surrounding views.

The project site is not located within any of the scenic vista points identified in the General Plan. Furthermore, the construction of the proposed project would not significantly affect or block a potentially scenic vista in the City.

Therefore, the proposed project would result in a **less-than-significant impact** related to a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista, and no mitigation is required.

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

There are no trees, rock outcroppings, and/or historic buildings located on the subject property that have been identified as important scenic resources or would otherwise constitute significant landscape features. Additionally, there are no officially designated State Scenic Highways in the immediate vicinity of the project site. According to the Caltrans State Scenic Highway Mapping System[1], there are no eligible or officially designated State Scenic Highways within the City of Fresno. However, Fresno County has three eligible State Scenic Highways; the nearest eligible highways include a portion of State Route 180, located approximately 7 miles east of the City, and a portion of State Route 168, located approximately 5 miles east of the City. The nearest officially designated State Scenic Highway is located more than 30 miles northeast of the City within the county of Madera. SR 180 is located 8 miles from the project site. SR-168 is located 11 miles from the project site. Since there are no eligible or officially designated State Scenic Highways within or in close proximity to the project, site implementation of the proposed project would not damage scenic resources within a designated state scenic highway. Therefore, there would be **no impact**.

c) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or

1 California Department of Transportation. Scenic Highways. Available online at: https://dot.ca.gov/programs/design/lap-landscape-architecture-and-community-livability/lap-liv-i-scenic-highways (accessed _March 10, 2023_)

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?

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines, Section 15387, "[u]rbanized area" means a central city or a group of contiguous cities with a population of 50,000 or more, together with adjacent densely populated areas having a population density of at least 1,000 persons per square mile. According to the 2020 Census, the City of Fresno has a population of 542,107. Therefore, the project is considered to be located in an urbanized area.

The project site is located in an urbanized area and is currently vacant. The project site is surrounded by existing single-unit land uses. The proposed project would include the development of 17 single-unit residential lots, and the construction of sidewalk, sewer, water and associated utilities. Although the proposed project would change the visual characteristics of the project site by building 17 residential homes, the design of the additions would be consistent and compatible with the visual character of the project vicinity. The proposed 17 residential homes will be of similar architectural style to the existing surrounding homes and comply with the City of Fresno building height requirements. Although the characteristics of the project site would change, the project would not substantially degrade the visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. Therefore, the proposed project would have 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 project site is located in an urbanized area subject to preexisting exterior lighting from surrounding developments and existing street lighting. The proposed project would introduce new sources of light and glare to the area in the form of low level lighting on the homes at the doors and garages; exterior lights. However, new sources of light and glare associated with the project would be low level and similar in nature to the existing surrounding residential homes. In addition, daytime glare would not be substantial because no highly reflective glass elements or building materials are proposed as part of the project. Compliance with California Building Code (Title 24, California Code of Regulations) standards, and implementation of Mitigation Measures AES-1, AES-2, and AES-3 below would address light and glare impacts to day and night-time views resulting from construction and operation of the proposed project. Therefore, potential light and glare from the proposed project would result in **less-than-significant impact with mitigation incorporated**.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure AES-1

Lighting for Street and Parking Areas.

Lighting systems for street and parking areas shall include shields to direct light to the roadway surfaces and parking areas. Vertical shields on the light fixtures shall also be used to direct light away from adjacent light sensitive land uses such as residences.

Mitigation Measure AES-2

Lighting for Public Facilities. Lighting systems for public facilities such as active play areas shall provide adequate illumination for the activity; however, low intensity light fixtures and shields shall be used to minimize spillover light onto adjacent properties.

Mitigation Measure AES-3
Use of Non-Reflective Materials. Materials used on building facades shall be non-reflective.

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:				

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

DISCUSSION

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 project site is located within an urbanized area of the City of Fresno. The entirety of the project site is identified as being Urban and Built-Up Land by the California Department of Conservation Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP). This area within the Urban and Built-Up Land designation is not identified as being Prime, Unique or of Statewide Importance.

Therefore, proposed project would not result in the conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance to a non-agricultural use and the impact would be **no impact**.

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

The project site is designated as Medium Low Residential Density in the General Plan. Additionally, the project is proposing RS-5 (Single-Unit Residential, Medium Density) zone district and the proposed project would be consistent with uses allowed within this zoning district. The project site is not subject to a Williamson Act contract. Therefore, development of the proposed project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract, and 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))?

Public Resource Code Section 12220(g) defines “Forest land” as “land that can support 10-percent native tree cover of any species, including hardwoods, under natural conditions, and that allows for management of one or more forest resources, including timber, aesthetics, fish and wildlife, biodiversity, water quality, recreation, and other public benefits. The project site is located within an existing urban area and is currently zoned as RS-4 (*Single-Unit Residential, Medium Low Density*). The proposed zone district is RS-5 (*Single-Unit Residential, Medium Density*) and the proposed land use is Medium Density Residential. The proposed project would not conflict with the existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest uses. Therefore, the proposed project would have **no impact**.

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

Public Resource Code Section 12220(g) defines “Forest land” as “land that can support 10-percent native tree cover of any species, including hardwoods, under

natural conditions, and that allows for management of one or more forest resources, including timber, aesthetics, fish and wildlife, biodiversity, water quality, recreation, and other public benefits. The subject property is vacant and does not support native tree species.

"Urbanized area" means a central city or a group of contiguous cities with a population of 50,000 or more, together with adjacent densely populated areas having a population density of at least 1,000 persons per square mile. According to the 2020 Census, the City of Fresno has a population of 542,107. As previously discussed, the project site is located in an urbanized area and is not located in forest land.

Please refer to the discussion for c) above. The proposed project would not result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest uses. Therefore, the proposed project would have **no impact**.

e) Involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

Please refer to the discussion for a) and c) above. The entirety of the project site is identified as being Urban and Built-Up Land by the California Department of Conservation Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP). This area within the Urban and Built-Up Land is not identified as being Prime, Unique or of Statewide Importance. The site is currently vacant and not being used for agricultural purposes. The development of the project site would not result in the conversion of farmland to nonagricultural use. The project site is located in an urbanized area and is not located in forest land. The project site is located within an existing urban environment and would not result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses or forest land to non-forest uses. Therefore, the proposed project would have **no impact**.

Mitigation Measure

There are no mitigation measures relative to Agriculture and Forestry Resources impacts.

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:				

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

DISCUSSION

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

The City of Fresno is part of the San Joaquin Valley Air Basin (SJVAB), which is within the jurisdiction of the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD). The SJVAPCD is responsible for air quality regulation within the eight-county San Joaquin Valley region.

Both the State and the federal government have established health-based Ambient

Air Quality Standards (AAQS) for six criteria air pollutants: carbon monoxide (CO), ozone (O_3), nitrogen dioxide (NO_2), sulfur dioxide (SO_2), lead, and suspended particulate matter ($PM_{2.5}$ and PM_{10}). The SJVAB is designated as non-attainment for O_3 and $PM_{2.5}$ for federal standards and non-attainment for O_3, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$ for State standards.

CEQA requires that certain proposed projects be analyzed for consistency with the applicable air quality plan. An air quality plan describes air pollution control strategies to be implemented by a city, county, or region classified as a non-attainment area. The main purpose of the air quality plan is to bring the area into compliance with the requirements of the federal and State air quality standards. To bring the San Joaquin Valley Air Basin (SJVAB) into attainment, the SJVAPCD adopted the 2022 Plan for the 2015 8-Hour Ozone Standard in December 2022 to satisfy Clean Air Act requirements and ensure attainment of the 70 parts per billion (ppb) 8-hour ozone standard.

To assure the SJVAB's continued attainment of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) respirable particulate matter (PM_{10}) standard, the SJVAPCD adopted the 2007 PM_{10} Maintenance Plan in September 2007. SJVAPCD Regulation VIII (Fugitive PM_{10} Prohibitions) is designed to reduce PM_{10} emissions generated by human activity. The SJVAPCD adopted the 2024 plan 2012 Annual fine particulate matter ($PM_{2.5}$) standard to address the USEPA federal annual $PM_{2.5}$ standard of 12 µg/m3, established in 2012.

The SJVAPCD has established project construction and operational emissions thresholds for criteria pollutants, as shown in Table 1 below[2]. For a project to be consistent with SJVAPCD attainment plans, the pollutants emitted from project operation should not exceed the SJVAPCD daily thresholds, cause a significant impact on air quality, or the project must already have been included in the attainment plans projection. As discussed below, emissions associated with the construction or operation of the proposed project would not result in the generation of criteria air pollutants that would exceed SJVAPCD thresholds of significance.

Short-Term Construction Emissions. During construction, short-term degradation of air quality may occur due to the release of particulate emissions generated by grading, paving, building, and other activities. Emissions from construction equipment are also anticipated and would include CO, NO_X, reactive organic gases (ROG), directly emitted particulate matter ($PM_{2.5}$ and PM_{10}), and toxic air contaminants (TACs) such as diesel exhaust particulate matter.

2 San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District. 2015. Air Quality Thresholds of Significance – Criteria Pollutants. Available online at: http://www.valleyair.org/transportation/0714-GAMAQI-Criteria-Pollutant-Thresholds-of-Significance.pdf (accessed May 31, 2023)

Project construction activities would include site preparation, grading, building construction, paving, and architectural coating activities. Construction-related effects on air quality from the proposed project would be greatest during the site preparation phase due to the disturbance of soils. If not properly controlled, these activities would temporarily generate particulate emissions. Sources of fugitive dust would include disturbed soils at the construction site. Unless properly controlled, vehicles leaving the site would deposit dirt and mud on local streets, which could be an additional source of airborne dust after it dries. PM_{10} emissions would vary from day to day, depending on the nature and magnitude of construction activity and local weather conditions. PM_{10} emissions would depend on soil moisture, silt content of soil, wind speed, and the amount of operating equipment. Larger dust particles would settle near the source, while fine particles would be dispersed over greater distances from the construction site.

Water or other soil stabilizers can be used to control dust, resulting in emission reductions of 50 percent or more. The SJVAPCD has implemented Regulation VIII measures for reducing fugitive dust emissions (PM_{10}). Regulation VIII is a series of rules designed to reduce fugitive dust from construction sites, parking and staging areas, open areas, material storage areas, etc. No permits are required by Regulation VIII, but failure to comply can result in fines and penalties. Measures generally required by Regulation VIII at all construction sites include the following:

1. All disturbed areas, including storage piles, which are not being actively utilized for construction purposes, shall be effectively stabilized of dust emissions using water, chemical stabilizer/suppressant, covered with a tarp or other suitable cover or vegetative ground cover.

2. All on-site unpaved roads and off-site unpaved access roads shall be effectively stabilized of dust emissions using water or chemical stabilizer/suppressant.

3. All land clearing, grubbing, scraping, excavation, land leveling, grading, cut and fill, and demolition activities shall be effectively controlled of fugitive dust emissions utilizing application of water or by presoaking.

4. When materials are transported off-site, all material shall be covered, or effectively wetted to limit visible dust emissions, and at least 6 inches of freeboard space from the top of the container shall be maintained.

5. All operations shall limit or expeditiously remove the accumulation of mud or dirt from adjacent public streets at the end of each workday. (The use of dry rotary brushes is expressly prohibited except where preceded or accompanied by sufficient wetting to limit the visible dust emissions. Use of blower devices is expressly forbidden.)

6. Following the addition of materials to, or the removal of materials from, the surface of out-door storage piles, said piles shall be effectively stabilized of fugitive dust emission utilizing sufficient water or chemical stabilizer/suppressant.

With the implementation of Regulation VIII measures, fugitive dust emissions from construction activities would not result in adverse air quality impacts.

In addition to dust-related PM_{10} emissions, heavy trucks and construction equipment powered by gasoline and diesel engines would generate CO, SO_2, NO_x, ROG, and some soot particulate ($PM_{2.5}$ and PM_{10}) in exhaust emissions. If construction activities were to increase traffic congestion in the area, CO and other emissions from traffic would increase slightly while those vehicles idle in traffic. These emissions would be temporary in nature and limited to the immediate area surrounding the construction site.

Table 1: SJVAPCD Project Construction and Operational Emission Thresholds

	CO	NO_x	ROG	SO_x	PM_{10}	$PM_{2.5}$
Annual Construction Emissions*	100.0	10.0	10.0	27.0	15.0	15.0
Annual Operational Emissions*	100.0	10.0	10.0	27.0	15.0	15.0

Source: San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District. 2015. Air Quality Thresholds of Significance – Criteria Pollutants. Available online at: http://www.valleyair.org/transportation/0714-GAMAQI-Criteria-Pollutant-Thresholds-of-Significance.pdf[2]
*Emission units = Tons per Year (tpy)
CO = carbon monoxide
NOX = nitrogen oxides
PM2.5 = particulate matter less than 2.5 microns in size
PM10 = particulate matter less than 10 microns in size
ROG = reactive organic gas
SJVAPCD = San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District
SOX = sulfur oxides

Construction and operational emissions for the proposed project were analyzed using the California Emissions Estimator Model version 2023 (CalEEMod), refer to modeling results in Appendix C. Model results for construction and operational emissions are shown in Table 2 and Table 3 respectively.

Table 2: Project Construction Emissions (Tons Per Year)

Project Construction	**CO**	**NO_x**	**ROG**	**SO_x**	**PM_{10}**	**$PM_{2.5}$**
Annual Construction Emissions*	1.68	1.52	0.16	.0005	0.16	0.06
SJVAPCD Thresholds	100.0	10.0	10.0	27.0	15.0	15.0
Exceed Threshold?	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**

Source: Appendix C
*Emission units = Tons per Year (tpy)
CO = carbon monoxide
NOX = nitrogen oxides

Table 2: Project Construction Emissions (Tons Per Year)

Project Construction	CO	NO_x	ROG	SO_x	PM_{10}	$PM_{2.5}$

PM2.5 = particulate matter less than 2.5 microns in size
PM10 = particulate matter less than 10 microns in size
ROG = reactive organic gas
SJVAPCD = San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District
SOX = sulfur oxides

Table 3: Project Operational Emissions (Tons per Year)

	ROG	NO_x	CO	SO_x	PM_{10}	$PM_{2.5}$
Area Source Emissions	1.23	0.21	4.86	0.01	0.56	0.54
Energy Source Emissions	0.01	0.16	0.07	0.005	0.01	0.01
Mobile Source Emissions	0.44	0.32	2.65	0.01	0.18	0.005
Total Project Operational Emissions*	1.68	0.69	7.58	0.03	0.75	0.56
SJVAPCD Significance Threshold	10.0	10.0	100.0	27.0	15.0	15.0
Exceed Threshold?	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**

Source: Appendix C
*Emission units = Tons per Year (tpy)
CO = carbon monoxide
NO_X = nitrogen oxides
$PM_{2.5}$ = particulate matter less than 2.5 microns in size
PM_{10} = particulate matter less than 10 microns in size
ROG = reactive organic gas
SJVAPCD = San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District
SO_X = sulfur oxides

The results shown in Tables 2 and 3 indicate that the proposed project's construction and operational emissions would not exceed SJVAPCD criteria pollutant thresholds. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of SJVAPCD air quality plans and the impact would be a **less-than-significant impact**.

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?

CEQA Guidelines Section 15355 defines a cumulative impact as "two or more individual effects, which when considered together, are considerable or which compound or increase other environmental impacts." The SJVAB is designated as non-attainment for O_3 and $PM_{2.5}$ for federal standards and non-attainment for O_3, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$ for State standards. The SJVAPCD's non-attainment status is attributed to the region's development history. Past, present, and future development projects contribute to the region's adverse air quality impacts on a cumulative basis. By its very nature, air pollution is largely a cumulative impact. No single project is sufficient in size to, by itself, result in non-attainment of ambient air quality standards. Instead, a project's individual emissions contribute to existing cumulatively significant adverse air quality impacts. If a project's contribution to the cumulative impact is considerable, then the project's impact on air quality would be considered significant.

Therefore, if annual emissions of construction- or operational-related criteria air pollutants exceed the construction and operations thresholds, refer to Table 1 above, as established by the SJVAPCD, the proposed project would result in a cumulatively significant impact. As discussed above, the proposed project's construction and operational emissions of criteria pollutants would not exceed SJVAPCD established significance thresholds for CO, NOx, ROG, SOx, PM_{10}, or $PM_{2.5}$ emissions during project construction or operation. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to a net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment, and impacts would be **less-than-significant**.

c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

Sensitive receptors are defined as residential uses, schools, daycare centers, nursing homes, and medical centers. Individuals particularly vulnerable to diesel particulate matter are children, whose lung tissue is still developing, and the elderly, who may have serious health problems that can be aggravated by exposure to diesel particulate matter.

Construction of the proposed project may expose surrounding sensitive receptors to airborne particulates, as well as a small quantity of construction equipment pollutants (i.e., usually diesel-fueled vehicles and equipment). However, because construction contractors would be required to implement measures to reduce or eliminate emissions by following the Regulation VIII, Fugitive PM_{10} Prohibitions as required by Mitigation Measure AIR-1, Project construction emissions would be below the SJVAPCD significance thresholds. Once constructed, the project's operational emissions would fall below the SJVAPCD significance thresholds, as indicated in Table 3 above, and the fact that the project complies with SJVAPCD significance thresholds indicates the project would not be a significant source of long-term operational emissions. Therefore, sensitive receptors would not be exposed to substantial pollutant concentrations as a result of the proposed project, and the impact would be a **less-than-significant impact with mitigation incorporated**.

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

During construction, the various diesel-powered vehicles and equipment in use on the site would create localized odors. These odors would be temporary and are not likely to be noticeable for extended periods of time beyond the project site. The potential for construction odor impacts is therefore considered less than significant. In addition, the proposed residential uses that would be developed within the project site are not expected to produce any offensive odors that would result in frequent odor complaints. Additionally, as discussed above, the proposed project will comply with all applicable

air quality plans. The project must comply with the construction and development requirements of the SJVAPCD, therefore, no violations of air quality standards will occur.

All development projects that involve soil disturbance are subject to at least one provision of the SJVAPCD Regulation VIII, Fugitive Dust Rules, related to the control of dust and fine particulate matter. The District's Regulation VIII – Fugitive PM10 prohibitions requires controls for sources of particulate matter necessary for attaining the federal PM10 standards and achieving progress toward attaining the state PM10 Standards. This rule mandates the implementation of dust control measures to reduce the potential for dust to the lowest possible level. The project includes strategies to improve air quality which includes dust control, reducing vehicle idling, a transportation control strategy and a vehicle inspection program.

The proposed project will also be subject to applicable District Rules and Regulations 4002, 4102, 4601 and 4641 as determined by the SJVAPCD.

The closest sensitive receptors are residences approximately 18 feet from the southern border of the project site. Residents are not in the immediate vicinity of the construction equipment and diesel powered equipment fumes; therefore, they would not be subjected to concentrations high enough to evoke a negative response.

Other land uses that are typically identified as sources of objectionable odors include landfills, transfer stations, wastewater pump stations, composting facilities, feed lots, coffee roasters, asphalt batch plants, and rendering plants. The project would not engage in any of these activities. The proposed residential uses that would be developed within the project site are not expected to produce any offensive odors that would result in frequent odor complaints. The proposed residential uses would not create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people during project construction or operation.

The project site is not located within the screening distances of any odor generating facilities. No industrial, agricultural or other uses typically associated with objectionable odors are proposed.

During construction, the various diesel-powered vehicles and equipment in use on-site would create localized odors. These odors would be temporary and are not likely to be noticeable for extended periods of time beyond the project site. The potential for diesel odor impacts is therefore considered less than significant. Additionally, the proposed uses that would be developed within the project site are not expected to produce any offensive odors that would result in frequent odor complaints because substantial odor-generating sources are not proposed, such as land uses including agricultural activities, feedlots, wastewater treatment facilities, landfills, or heavy manufacturing uses. The proposed project would not create objectionable odors

affecting a substantial number of people during project construction or operation, and this impact would be **less-than-significant impact**.

Mitigation Measures

1. The proposed project shall implement and incorporate the air quality related mitigation measures as identified in the attached Mitigation Measure Monitoring Program dated ***[Note to Preparer: Insert date.]***.

Mitigation Measure AIR-1 Construction contractors would be required to implement measures to reduce or eliminate emissions by following the Regulation VIII, Fugitive PM_{10} Prohibitions.

1. All disturbed areas, including storage piles, which are not being actively utilized for construction purposes, shall be effectively stabilized of dust emissions using water, chemical stabilizer/suppressant, covered with a tarp or other suitable cover or vegetative ground cover.

2. All on-site unpaved roads and off-site unpaved access roads shall be effectively stabilized of dust emissions using water or chemical stabilizer/suppressant.

3. All land clearing, grubbing, scraping, excavation, land leveling, grading, cut and fill, and demolition activities shall be effectively controlled of fugitive dust emissions utilizing application of water or by presoaking.

4. When materials are transported off-site, all material shall be covered, or effectively wetted to limit visible dust emissions, and at least 6 inches of freeboard space from the top of the container shall be maintained.

5. All operations shall limit or expeditiously remove the accumulation of mud or dirt from adjacent public streets at the end of each workday. (The use of dry rotary brushes is expressly prohibited except where preceded or accompanied by sufficient wetting to limit the visible dust emissions. Use of blower devices is expressly forbidden.)

6. Following the addition of materials to, or the removal of materials from, the surface of out-door storage piles, said piles shall be effectively stabilized of fugitive dust emission utilizing sufficient water or chemical stabilizer/suppressant.

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES – Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				X
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?				X
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?				X
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?			X	

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?				X
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?				X

DISCUSSION

The analysis in this section is based on the findings of the Biological Resource Assessment prepared in October 2021 for the proposed project. The Biological Resource Assessment is included as Appendix B.

The project site is located in the Central San Joaquin Valley in Fresno County and lies in parts of Section 17, Township 14S, Range 21 East (Figure 1). The project site is bounded by E Laurite Avenue to the north, residential uses to the east, residential and self-storage land use to the south, and residential uses to the west.

The project site is vacant and disturbed from previous discing for fire prevention and maintenance activities. The project site is relatively flat. There are no natural drainage features, depressional wetlands, or riparian areas present within the project site.

The Study Area does not support habitat for special status species or suitable habitat for special status species. There are no waters of the U.S. or wetlands within the Study Area.

Methods. A field survey was conducted in September 2021, which consisted of walking across the project site while identifying land uses and biotic habitats, identifying plant and animal species encountered, and assessing the suitability of the habitats within the project site for special-status species. In addition, an analysis of potential project impacts to biological resources based on the known and potential biotic resources of the project site and vicinity was conducted. Sources of information used in the preparation of this analysis included:

- U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service, Soil Survey of Fresno Area (Soils mapper).

- California Natural Diversity Data Base information (CNDDB), which is administered by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW), formerly known as the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG). This database covers sensitive plant and animal species as well as sensitive natural communities that occur in California.

- Fresno County Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP) 1984-2014

- United States Fish and Wildlife Service's (USFWS) Information for Planning and Conservation (IPaC) Online System, which lists all proposed, candidate, threatened, and endangered species managed by the Endangered Species Program of the USFWS that have the potential to occur on or near a particular site. This database also lists all known critical habitats, national wildlife refuges, and migratory birds that could potentially be impacted by activities from a proposed project.

- The USFWS National Wetlands Inventory was reviewed to determine whether any wetlands or surface waters of the United States have been previously identified in the survey area.

In addition to the databases listed above, historic, and current aerial imagery, existing environmental reports for developments in the project vicinity, and local land use policies related to biological resources were reviewed.

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 following analysis is sourced from a Biological Resource Assessment prepared by Argonaut Ecological Consulting. Inc dated October 2021, refer to Appendix B, for the project.

Special-Status Natural Communities. No special-status natural communities or conservation areas exist within the project site or in adjacent parcels. The project site is completely isolated and distant from all special-status natural communities that occur in the region. Therefore, no special-status natural community would be impacted by the proposed project.

Special-Status Plants. No special-status plants exist within the project site or in

adjacent parcels. The project site does not contain suitable habitat and is situated outside of the species' known distribution. Therefore, as the project site does not contain any special-status plants, special-status plants would not be impacted by the proposed project.

Special-Status Animals. No special-status species were observed on the project site during the on-site survey.

Swainson's hawk (Buteo swainsoni) is listed as State-Threatened under the California Endangered Species Act (April 17, 1983). It is considered an uncommon breeding resident and migrant in Northern California, and occurs primarily in the Central Valley and on the Northeastern Plateau. There is no suitable nesting habitat for Swainson's hawk at the project site as there are no large trees that could be used for nesting.

In addition, nearly all native birds are protected by the Federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act, the California Migratory Bird Protection Act (16 USC Section 703-711), and the California Fish and Game Code Section 1802. Construction activities that occur during the nesting bird season (typically February 1 through August 31) have potential to result in the mortality/disturbance of nesting birds. However, pursuant to Biological Resource Assessment prepared by Argonaut Ecological Consulting. Inc. dated October 2021, there are no potential raptor nesting trees (or many trees) or migratory birds nesting habitat within the Study Area.

Critical Habitat. The project site is not located within or adjacent to critical habitat. Therefore, the project would not result in any impacts to critical habitat, and no mitigation is required.

The project site is located in an urbanized area and is currently vacant. However, the property has been graded and disced in the past. Due to the urban location and lack of landscaping on the site itself, the project site does not provide suitable habitat for special-status animal species. Common wildlife species that are adapted to urban environments are expected to continue to use the site and vicinity after redevelopment. The Study Area is highly disturbed and only supports weedy species. The site is not occupied by, or suited for, any special-status species. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in direct or indirect adverse effects of special-status plants or wildlife, and 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?

Refer to Biological Resource Assessment prepared by Argonaut Ecological Consulting. Inc. dated October 2021, refer to Appendix B. Future development that occurs in the vicinity of the San Joaquin River, its tributaries, any lakes or streams, and/or open grasslands with seasonal wetlands, may result in a significant impact to riparian habitat or a special-status natural community.

Pursuant to the Biological Resource Assessment prepared by Argonaut Ecological Consulting. Inc. dated October 2021, the following determinations were made:

- The Study Area was in agricultural production until the nearly 2000s. Since that time, the site has been routinely disced for fire suppression
- There are no waters of the U.S./waters of the State within the Study Area.
- There were no historic drainages/creeks within the Study Area.
- The Study Area is highly disturbed and only supports weedy species
- There are no potential raptor nesting trees (or many trees) or migratory birds nesting habitat within the Study Area.
- Development of the Study Area will not result in any significant impacts on biological resources.

As a result, 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?

Refer to Biological Resource Assessment prepared by Argonaut Ecological Consulting. Inc., dated October 2021, refer to Appendix B. Future development that occurs in the vicinity of the San Joaquin River corridor may result in significant impacts to protected wetlands. No aquatic resources occur within the project site, or within the vicinity of the project site. The project site consists entirely of developed areas. As a result, the impact 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?

Refer to Biological Resource Assessment prepared by Argonaut Ecological Consulting. Inc., dated October 2021, refer to Appendix B.

Swainson's hawk (Buteo swainsoni) is listed as State-Threatened under the California Endangered Species Act (April 17, 1983). It is considered an uncommon breeding resident and migrant in Northern California, and occurs primarily in the Central Valley and on the Northeastern Plateau. There is no suitable nesting habitat for Swainson's hawk at the project site as there are no large trees that could be used for nesting.

In addition, nearly all native birds are protected by the Federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act (16 USC Section 703-711), the California Migratory Bird Protection Act, and the California Fish and Game Code Section 1802. Construction activities that occur during the nesting bird season (typically February 1 through August 31) have potential to result in the mortality/disturbance of nesting birds. However, pursuant to Biological Resource Assessment prepared by Argonaut Ecological Consulting. Inc. dated October 2021, there are no potential raptor nesting trees (or any trees) or migratory birds nesting habitat within the Study Area. As a result, the impact would be **less than significant**.

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

Refer to Biological Resource Assessment prepared by Argonaut Ecological Consulting. Inc., dated October 2021, refer to Appendix B. Though the proposed project is subject to provisions of the City's Municipal Code regarding trees on public property (Article 3 of Section 13 of the City of Fresno Municipal Code), the proposed project would not conflict with any of the existing ordinances. There are no trees, or biological resources on the subject property. Therefore, the project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources. As a result, the impact 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?

Refer to Biological Resource Assessment prepared by Argonaut Ecological Consulting. Inc. , dated October 2021, refer to Appendix B. The PG&E San Joaquin Valley Operation and Maintenance (O&M) Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP)[3] was approved in 2007 and covers portions of nine counties, including Fresno County. This HCP covers PG&E activities which occur as a result of ongoing O&M that would have an adverse impact on any of the 65 covered species and provides incidental take coverage from the USFWS and CDFW. The project site is not located within the covered area of any HCP, Natural Community Conservation Plan (NCCP), or other adopted local, regional or state HCP. Therefore, the project would not conflict with the provisions of the PG&E HCP and the proposed project and would have **no impact**.

Mitigation Measures

3 Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E). 2007. PG&E San Joaquin Valley Operation & Maintenance Habitat Conservation Plan. Available online at: https://ecos.fws.gov/docs/plan_documents/thcp/thcp_838.pdf (accessed March 2023)

There are no mitigation measures relative to Biological Resources impacts.

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 Cultural and Historical Resources Assessment was prepared for the proposed project, which is included as Appendix A. The Cultural and Historical Resources Assessment included a records search at the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) Southern San Joaquin Valley Information Center (SSJVIC) to identify whether there are any prior cultural resource studies or previously recorded cultural resources in the project area, additional background research, and a pedestrian field survey of the project area. The analysis in this Cultural Resources section is based on the results of the Cultural and Historical Resources Assessment.

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

Refer to Cultural and Historical Resource Assessment prepared by Peak and Associates, Inc., dated October 27, 2021. The Project Area is located in a disturbed tract of land within an existing developed residential neighborhood.

A record search for the Project limits and a ¼-mile radius has been conducted through the Southern San Joaquin Valley Information Center of the California Historical Resources Information System. The search identified that there have been two

cultural resource surveys conducted within the ¼ mile search radius, at the southern edge of the search area near Jensen Avenue in 2005 and 2011 (FR-02260 and FR-02426). One of these reports recorded a building at 5537 East Jensen Avenue as P-10-006976 (See Appendix A for full citations).

The older Malaga USGS topographic map from 1923 has been reviewed, with the map showing no evidence of buildings or historic land use in the past.

In addition, a survey was conducted of the project area with no cultural resources found within or adjacent to the project site. If cultural resources are found during construction, all work should be halted and an archeologist should be consulted for advice.

A historical resource defined by CEQA section 15064.5 includes one or more of the following criteria: 1) the resource is listed, or found eligible for listing in, the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR); 2) listed in a local register of historical resources as defined by Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 5020.1(k); 3) identified as significant in a historical resources survey meeting the requirements of PRC Section 5024.1(g); or 4) determined to be a historical resource by the project's lead agency (PRC Section 21084.1; CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.(a)). Under CEQA, historical resources include built-environment resources and archaeological sites.

As discussed in the Cultural Resources Report/Historic Resource Assessment, attached in Appendix A, no historical resources were identified within or adjacent to the project site. However, project development could result in potential impacts to unknown resources that are located below the ground surface. Adherence to the requirements in Mitigation Measure CULTL-1 would reduce potential impacts to unknown historical resources to **less than significant with mitigation incorporated**.

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

According to the CEQA Guidelines, "When a project will impact an archaeological site, a lead agency shall first determine whether the site is an historical resource" (CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(c)(1)). Those archaeological sites that do not qualify as historical resources shall be assessed to determine if these qualify as "unique archaeological resources" (California PRC Section 21083.2). No archaeological resources were identified in the project site. However, due to the nominal amount of prehistoric archaeological information within the majority of the City, including the project site, there is potential to impact prehistoric archaeological resources during grading and construction activities within previously undisturbed soils. Adherence to the requirements in Mitigation Measure CULTL-2 would reduce potential impacts to

unknown archeological resources to **less than significant with mitigation incorporated**.

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

Disturbance of human remains interred outside of formal cemeteries would result in a significant impact. If human remains are identified during project construction, Section 7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code and Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code shall apply, as appropriate. Although there is no record of isolated human remains or unknown cemeteries on the project site, there is always a possibility that ground-disturbing activities associated with future development may uncover previously unknown buried human remains. Adherence to the requirements Mitigation Measure CULTL-3 would reduce potential impacts to unknown human remains to **less than significant with mitigation incorporated**.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure CULTL-1

If previously unknown resources are encountered before or during grading activities, construction shall stop in the immediate vicinity of the find and a qualified historical resources specialist shall be consulted to determine whether the resource requires further study. The qualified historical resources specialist shall make recommendations to the City on the measures that shall be implemented to protect the discovered resources, including but not limited to excavation of the finds and evaluation of the finds in accordance with Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines and the City's Historic Preservation Ordinance.

If the resources are determined to be unique historical resources as defined under Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines, measures shall be identified by the monitor and recommended to the Lead Agency. Appropriate measures for significant resources could include avoidance or capping, incorporation of the site in green space, parks, or open space, or data recovery excavations of the finds.

No further grading shall occur in the area of the discovery until the Lead Agency approves the measures to protect these resources. Any historical artifacts recovered as a result of mitigation shall be provided to a City-approved institution or person who is capable of providing long-term preservation to allow future scientific study.

Mitigation Measure CULTL-2

Subsequent to a preliminary City review of the project grading plans, if there is evidence that a project will include excavation or construction activities within previously undisturbed soils, a field survey and literature search for prehistoric archaeological resources shall be conducted. The following procedures shall be followed.

If prehistoric resources are not found during either the field survey or literature search, excavation and/or construction activities can commence. In the event that buried prehistoric archaeological resources are discovered during excavation and/or construction activities, construction shall stop in the immediate vicinity of the find and a qualified archaeologist shall be consulted to determine whether the resource requires further study. The qualified archaeologist shall make recommendations to the City on the measures that shall be implemented to protect the discovered resources, including but not limited to excavation of the finds and evaluation of the finds in accordance with Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines. If the resources are determined to be unique prehistoric archaeological resources as defined under Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines, mitigation measures shall be identified by the monitor and recommended to the Lead Agency. Appropriate measures for significant resources could include avoidance or capping, incorporation of the site in green space, parks, or open space, or data recovery excavations of the finds. No further grading shall occur in the area of the discovery until the Lead Agency approves the measures to protect these resources. Any prehistoric archaeological artifacts recovered as a result of mitigation shall be provided to a City-approved institution or person who is capable of providing long-term preservation to allow future scientific study.

If prehistoric resources are found during the field survey or literature review, the resources shall be inventoried using appropriate State record forms and submit the forms to the Southern San Joaquin Valley Information Center. The resources shall be evaluated for significance. If the resources are found to be significant, measures shall be identified by the qualified archaeologist. Similar to above, appropriate mitigation measures for significant resources could include avoidance or capping, incorporation of the site in green space, parks, or open space, or data recovery excavations of the finds. In addition, appropriate mitigation for excavation and construction activities in the vicinity of the resources found during the field survey or literature review shall include an archaeological monitor. The monitoring period shall be determined by the qualified archaeologist. If additional prehistoric archaeological resources are found during excavation and/or construction activities, the procedure identified above for the discovery of unknown resources shall be followed.

Mitigation Measure CULTL-3

In the event that human remains are unearthed during excavation and grading activities of any future development project, all activity shall cease immediately. Pursuant to Health and Safety Code (HSC) Section 7050.5, no further disturbance shall occur until the

County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition pursuant to PRC Section 5097.98(a). If the remains are determined to be of Native American descent, the coroner shall within 24 hours notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). The NAHC shall then contact the most likely descendent of the deceased Native American, who shall then serve as the consultant on how to proceed with the remains. Pursuant to PRC Section 5097.98(b), upon the discovery of Native American remains, the landowner shall ensure that the immediate vicinity, according to generally accepted cultural or archaeological standards or practices, where the Native American human remains are located is not damaged or disturbed by further development activity until the landowner has discussed and conferred with the most likely descendants regarding their recommendations, if applicable, taking into account the possibility of multiple human remains. The landowner shall discuss and confer with the descendants all reasonable options regarding the descendants' preferences for treatment.

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VI. ENERGY – Would the project:				
a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?			X	
b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?			X	

DISCUSSION

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

The project proposes 17 single-unit residential homes and will consume energy in the short-term during project construction and in the long-term during its daily operations. During construction, the project would typically consume energy from construction vehicles and related equipment. Energy consumption would also occur with long term

buildout of the 17 residential lots, such as heating and cooling, refrigeration, lighting, and electronics equipment and during each vehicle trip associated with the proposed use.

The California Building Standards Code (Title 24) addresses regulations that apply to the planning, design, operation, construction, use and occupancy of newly constructed buildings or structures. Per these standards, the California Energy Code and the California Green Building Standards Code, (*CALGreen*) provide mandatory standards to maximize energy conservation with the use of recycled materials and products in order to reduce materials costs. As such, it is anticipated that materials used in construction of the 17 single-unit residential lots would not involve the wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy.

The proposed development would be required to comply with the State-mandated building codes to meet minimum efficiency standards related to various building features, including appliances, water and space heating and cooling equipment, building insulation and roofing, and lighting. Implementation of these standards significantly increases energy savings, and adherence to State mandated code requirements and conservation requirements in the Energy Code and CALGreen would ensure that project development would not result in wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources. As a result, the project will have a less than significant impact on energy.

In addition, proposed new development would be designed and constructed to not rely on natural gas appliances, HVAC, or natural gas plumbing. The project will rely on electric and solar power. The project would also be using energy efficient modern building materials and construction practices, and the proposed project also would be consistent with current Title 24 standards, as discussed above. The expected energy consumption during construction and operation of the proposed project would be consistent with typical usage rates for similar uses; however, energy consumption is largely a function of personal choice and the physical structure and layout of buildings. The project will install solar and electric vehicle charging infrastructure for each residential dwelling in compliance with Calgreen Tier 2 building codes.

PG&E is the private utility that would supply the proposed project's electricity services. In 2021, a total of 50 percent of PG&E's delivered electricity came from renewable sources, including solar, wind, geothermal, small hydroelectric and various forms of bioenergy. PG&E reached California's 2020 renewable energy goal in 2017, and is positioned to meet the State's 60 percent by 2030 renewable energy mandate set forth in Senate Bill (SB) 100. In addition, PG&E plans to continue to provide reliable service to their customers and upgrade their distribution systems as necessary to meet future demand.

The proposed project would be constructed using energy efficient modern building materials and construction practices, and the proposed project would also use new modern appliances and equipment, in accordance with the Appliance Efficiency Regulations (Title 20, CCR Sections 1601 through 1608). It can be assumed that implementation of the proposed project would result in additional energy demand in the City; however, since the proposed project would be located in a developed urban area and would be required to comply with the City's energy efficiency policies, including the General Plan policies related to energy, the proposed project would not result in wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation. Therefore, the project would have a **less than significant impact**.

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

In 2002, the Legislature passed Senate Bill 1389, which required the California Energy Commission (CEC) to develop an integrated energy plan every two years for electricity, natural gas, and transportation fuels, for the California Energy Policy Report. The plan calls for the State to assist in the transformation of the transportation system to improve air quality, reduce congestion, and increase the efficient use of fuel supplies with the least environmental and energy costs. To further this policy, the plan identifies a number of strategies, including assistance to public agencies and fleet operators in implementing incentive programs for zero emission (ZE) vehicles and their infrastructure needs, and encouragement of urban designs that reduce VMT and accommodate pedestrian and bicycle access.

The most recently CEC adopted energy reports are the 2024 Integrated Energy Policy Report. The Integrated Energy Policy Reports provide the results of the CEC's assessments of a variety of energy issues facing California. Many of these issues will require action if the State is to meet its climate, energy, air quality, and other environmental goals while maintaining energy reliability and controlling costs. The Integrated Energy Policy Reports cover a broad range of topics, including implementation of Senate Bill 350, integrated resource planning, distributed energy resources, transportation electrification, solutions to increase resiliency in the electricity sector, energy efficiency, transportation electrification, barriers faced by disadvantaged communities, demand response, transmission and landscape-scale planning, the California Energy Demand Preliminary Forecast, the preliminary transportation energy demand forecast, renewable gas (in response to Senate Bill 1383), updates on Southern California electricity reliability, natural gas outlook, and climate adaptation and resiliency.

The proposed project would be required to comply with the CALGreen Code (CCR Title 24, Part 11) and the California Energy Code (CCR Title 24, Part 6), which

includes provisions related to insulation and design aimed at minimizing energy consumption.

As indicated above, the proposed project would not result in wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation. Because California's energy conservation planning actions are conducted at a regional level, and because the proposed project's total impact to regional energy supplies would be minor, the proposed project would not conflict with California's energy conservation plans as described in the CEC's Integrated Energy Policy Reports. In addition, as identified above, electricity and natural gas demand associated with the proposed project would be less than 0.1 percent of Fresno County's total natural gas demand.

The proposed development would be required to comply with the State-mandated building codes to meet minimum efficiency standards related to various building features, including appliances, water and space heating and cooling equipment, building insulation and roofing, and lighting. Implementation of these standards significantly increases energy savings, and adherence to State mandated code requirements and conservation requirements in the Energy Code and CALGreen would ensure that project development would not result in wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources.

Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict or obstruct state and local plans for energy efficiency and renewable energy, and the impact would be **less than significant**.

Mitigation Measures
There are no mitigation measures relative to Energy impacts.

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	

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

DISCUSSION

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

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

Fault ruptures are generally expected to occur along active fault traces that have exhibited signs of recent geological movement (i.e., in the last 11,000 years). Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zones delineate areas around active faults with potential surface fault rupture hazards that would require specific geological investigations prior to approval of certain kinds of development within the delineated area. The project site is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. In addition, no known active or potentially active faults or fault traces are located in the project vicinity. As a result, potential impacts related to fault ruptures would be **less than significant**.

ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?

The City of Fresno is located in an area with historically low to moderate level of seismicity. However, strong ground shaking could occur within the project site during seismic events and occurrences have the possibility to result in significant impacts. Major seismic activity along the nearby Great Valley Fault Zone or the Nunez Fault, or other associated faults, could affect the project site through strong

seismic ground shaking. Strong seismic ground shaking could potentially cause structural damage to the proposed project. However, due to the distance to the known faults, hazards due to ground shaking would be minimal. In addition, compliance with the California Building Code (Title 24, California Code of Regulations) would ensure that the geotechnical design of the proposed project would reduce potential impacts related to seismic ground shaking to **less than significant**.

iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

The predominant soils within the City of Fresno consist of varying combinations of loose/very soft to very dense/hard silts, clays, sands, and gravels. Groundwater has been encountered near the ground surface in close proximity to water-filled features such as canals, ditches, ponds, and lakes. Based on these characteristics, the potential for soil liquefaction within the City ranges from very low to moderate due to the variable density of the subsurface soils and the presence of shallow groundwater. In addition to liquefaction, the City could be susceptible to induced settlement of loose unconsolidated soils or lateral spread during seismic shaking events. Based on the nature of the subsurface materials and the relatively low to moderate seismicity of the region, seismic settlement and/or lateral spread are not anticipated to represent a substantial hazard within the City during seismic events.

Based on the nature of the subsurface materials and the relatively low to moderate seismicity of the region, potential for seismic related ground failure is low in Fresno.[4] Additionally, compliance with the Fresno Municipal Code and the California Building Code, as well as General Plan Policies NS-2-a through NS-2-d would ensure that potential impacts associated with seismic-related ground failure would be **less than significant**.

iv. Landslides?

A landslide generally occurs on relatively steep slopes and/or on slopes underlain by weak materials. The City of Fresno is located within an area that consists of mostly flat topography within the Central Valley. Accordingly, there is no risk of large landslides in the majority of the City. However, there is the potential for landslides and slumping along the steep banks of rivers, creeks, or drainage basins such as the San Joaquin River bluff and the many unlined basins and canals that trend throughout the City. The project site is located in a relatively flat area, and it is not in the vicinity of the San Joaquin River bluff or any unlined basins or canals. Therefore, the potential for the proposed project to expose people or structures to risk as a result of landslides would be **less than significant**.

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

The total project site is 2.1 acres, which would be disturbed/developed during proposed grading and construction activities. Grading and earthmoving during project construction has the potential to result in erosion and loss of topsoil. Exposed soils could be entrained in stormwater runoff and transported off the project site. However, this impact would be reduced to a less than significant level through compliance with water quality control measures, which include preparation of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) (refer to Section X, Hydrology and Water Quality). Although designed primarily to protect stormwater quality, the SWPPP would incorporate Best Management Practices (BMPs) to minimize erosion. Additional details regarding the SWPPP are provided in Section X, Hydrology and Water Quality of this Initial Study. This impact would be **less than significant**.

c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?

As described in discussion a) in this section, soils on the project site would not be subject to liquefaction, lateral spreading, or landslides. Additionally, the proposed project would be required to conform with the California Building Code, which would reduce risks related to unstable soils. Therefore, the proposed project would have a **less-than-significant impact** related to unstable soils.

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?

The surface and near-surface soils observed throughout the City consist of varying combinations of clays, silts, sands, gravels, and cobbles. The clayey soils, which consist of very fine particles, are considered to be slightly to moderately expansive. The project site contains Exeter sandy loam, a soil with relatively low clay content and shrink-swell potential.

Expansive soils are characterized by the potential for shrinking and swelling as the moisture content of the soil decreases and increases, respectively. Shrink-swell potential is influenced by the amount and type of clay minerals present and can be measured by the percent change of the soil volume. The project shall comply with the California Building Code requirements, which would ensure that geotechnical design of the proposed project would reduce potential impacts related to expansive soils to a less-than-significant level. As such, the risk of expansive soil affecting the proposed project is considered low. Impacts to 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 would be **less than significant**.

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

The project site would be served by a wastewater conveyance system maintained by the Wastewater Management Division (WMD) of the City of Fresno. Wastewater from the City's collection system is treated at the Fresno/Clovis Regional Wastewater Reclamation Facility. Development of the proposed project would not involve the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems. Therefore, the proposed project would have **no impact** related to the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems.

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

Development in the City of Fresno could potentially impact unknown paleontological resources or unique geological features. Implementation of Mitigation Measure GEO-6.1 would ensure that a field survey and record search are conducted prior to construction on a previously undisturbed site, and that paleontological/geological resources found during the field survey or during project construction would be handled and preserved by a qualified paleontologist. Adherence to the requirements in Mitigation Measure GEO 1 would reduce potential impacts to paleontological and geological resources to **less than significant with mitigation incorporated**.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure GEO-1

Subsequent to a preliminary City review of the project grading plans, if there is evidence that a project will include excavation or construction activities within previously undisturbed soils, a field survey and literature search for unique paleontological/geological resources shall be conducted. The following procedures shall be followed:

- If unique paleontological/geological resources are not found during either the field survey or literature search, excavation and/or construction activities can commence. In the event that unique paleontological/geological resources are discovered during excavation and/or construction activities, construction shall stop in the immediate vicinity of the find and a qualified paleontologist shall be consulted

to determine whether the resource requires further study. The qualified paleontologist shall make recommendations to the City on the measures that shall be implemented to protect the discovered resources, including but not limited to, excavation of the finds and evaluation of the finds. If the resources are determined to be significant, mitigation measures shall be identified by the monitor and recommended to the Lead Agency. Appropriate mitigation measures for significant resources could include avoidance or capping, incorporation of the site in green space, parks, or open space, or data recovery excavations of the finds. No further grading shall occur in the area of the discovery until the Lead Agency approves the measures to protect these resources. Any paleontological/geological resources recovered as a result of mitigation shall be provided to a City-approved institution or person who is capable of providing long-term preservation to allow future scientific study.

- If unique paleontological/geological resources are found during the field survey or literature review, the resources shall be inventoried and evaluated for significance. If the resources are found to be significant, mitigation measures shall be identified by the qualified paleontologist. Similar to above, appropriate mitigation measures for significant resources could include avoidance or capping, incorporation of the site in green space, parks, or open space, or data recovery excavations of the finds. In addition, appropriate mitigation for excavation and construction activities in the vicinity of the resources found during the field survey or literature review shall include a paleontological monitor. The monitoring period shall be determined by the qualified paleontologist. If additional paleontological/geological resources are found during excavation and/or construction activities, the procedure identified above for the discovery of unknown resources shall be followed.

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	

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?			X	

DISCUSSION

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

Greenhouse gas emissions (GHGs) are present in the atmosphere naturally, and are released by natural sources, or are formed from secondary reactions taking place in the atmosphere. However, over the last 200 years, human activities have caused substantial quantities of GHGs to be released into the atmosphere. These extra emissions are increasing GHG concentrations in the atmosphere, and enhancing the natural greenhouse effect, which is believed to be causing global climate change. The gases that are widely seen as the principal contributors to human-induced global climate change are:

- Carbon dioxide (CO_2)
- Methane (CH_4)
- Nitrous oxide (N_2O)
- Hydrofluorocarbons
- Perfluorocarbons
- Sulfur Hexafluoride

Certain gases, such as water vapor, are short-lived in the atmosphere. Others remain in the atmosphere for significant periods of time, contributing to climate change in the long term. Water vapor is excluded from the list of GHGs above because it is short-lived in the atmosphere and its atmospheric concentrations are largely determined by natural processes, such as oceanic evaporation.

These gases vary considerably in terms of Global Warming Potential (GWP), which is a concept developed to compare the ability of each GHG to trap heat in the atmosphere relative to another gas. GWP is based on several factors, including the relative effectiveness of a gas to absorb infrared radiation and the length of time that the gas remains in the atmosphere ("atmospheric lifetime").

The GWP of each gas is measured relative to CO_2, the most abundant GHG; the definition of GWP for a particular GHG is the ratio of heat trapped by one unit mass of the GHG to the ratio of heat trapped by one unit mass of CO_2 over a specified time period. GHG emissions are typically measured in terms of pounds or tons of "CO_2 equivalents" (CO_2e).

The *State CEQA Guidelines* indicate that a project would normally have a significant adverse green-house gas emission impact if the project would:

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

- Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases.

Section 15064.4 of the *State CEQA Guidelines* states that: "A lead agency shall make a good-faith effort, based to the extent possible on scientific and factual data, to describe, calculate or estimate the amount of greenhouse gas emissions resulting from a project." In performing that analysis, the lead agency has discretion to determine whether to use a model or methodology to quantify GHG emissions, or to rely on a qualitative analysis or performance-based standards. In making a determination as to the significance of potential impacts, the lead agency then considers the extent to which the project may increase or reduce GHG emissions as compared to the existing environmental setting, whether the project emissions exceed a threshold of significance that the lead agency determines applies to the project, and the extent to which the project complies with regulations or requirements adopted to implement a statewide, regional, or local plan for the reduction or mitigation of GHG emissions.

The City of Fresno does not have a current GHG reduction plan, and the SJVAPCD also does not have adopted thresholds of significance for GHG emissions. Therefore, this analysis evaluates the proposed project's potential GHG emissions based on its design elements, consistent with the Bay Area Air District (BAAD) GHG thresholds. The BAAD adopted the *Justification Report: CEQA Thresholds for Evaluating the Significance of Climate Impacts from Land Use Projects and Plans* (Justification Report), which identifies GHG significance thresholds that would be applicable to the proposed project. These thresholds evaluate a project based on its effect on achieving California's long-term climate goal of carbon neutrality by 2045. Based on this research, the BAAD has determined that new land use development projects must incorporate specified design elements to contribute its "fair share" toward implementation of the goal of carbon neutrality by 2045. If a project is designed and built to incorporate the identified design elements related to natural gas, energy, VMT, and EVs, then it would contribute its portion of what is necessary to achieve

California's long-term climate goals—its "fair share"—and an agency reviewing the project under CEQA can conclude that the project would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to global climate change. If a project does not incorporate these design elements, then it should be found to result in a significant climate impact because it would hinder California's efforts to address climate change.

The Justification Report provides substantial evidence supporting the use of these thresholds for projects throughout California because the thresholds are applicable to meeting the State's established GHG reduction goals. In the absence of any City or SJVAPCD specific guidelines or thresholds, this analysis evaluates the proposed project for consistency with the identified project design elements as the applicable thresholds of significance to establish whether the proposed project is achieving its "fair share" of emission reductions to support long-term State goals for GHG emissions and carbon neutrality.

According to the Justification Report, a project would have a less than significant impact related to GHG emissions if it would include the following project design elements:

1. Buildings

    a. The project will not include natural gas appliances or natural gas plumbing (in both residential and nonresidential development).

    b. The project will not result in any wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary energy usage as determined by the analysis required under CEQA Section 21100(b)(3) and Section 15126.2(b) of the State CEQA Guidelines.

2. Transportation

    a. Achieve a reduction in project-generated vehicle miles traveled (VMT) below the regional average consistent with the current version of the California Climate Change Scoping Plan (currently 15 percent) or meet a locally adopted Senate Bill 743 VMT target, reflecting the recommendations provided in the Governor's Office of Planning and Research's Technical Advisory on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA:

        i. Residential projects: 15 percent below the existing VMT per capita

        ii. Office projects: 15 percent below the existing VMT per employee

        iii. Retail projects: no net increase in existing VMT

    b. Achieve compliance with off-street electric vehicle (EV) requirements in the most recently adopted version of CALGreen Tier 2.

As discussed above, in the absence of any City or SJVAPCD specific guidelines or thresholds, this analysis evaluates the proposed project for consistency with project design elements as the applicable thresholds of significance. If a project is designed and built to incorporate design elements related to natural gas, energy, VMT, and EVs, then it would contribute its portion of what is necessary to achieve California's long-term climate goals—its "fair share"—and an agency reviewing the project under CEQA can conclude that the project would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to global climate change.

Per the significance thresholds described above, a less than significant GHG impact would occur if the project were consistent with all the identified design standards, as evaluated below.

Natural Gas Usage. The proposed project would be all-electric and would not include natural gas. Therefore, the proposed project would be consistent with this design element.

Energy Use. Under this design criterion, the project must not result in any wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary energy usage as determined by the analysis required under CEQA Section 21100(b)(3) and Section 15126.2(b) of the *State CEQA Guidelines.* Energy use consumed by the proposed project would be associated with electricity usage and fuel used for vehicle trips. Energy consumption was estimated for the proposed project using default energy intensities by land use type in CalEEMod.

The estimated potential increased electricity demand associated with the proposed project is 162,737 kWh per year. In 2022, Fresno County consumed 8,384 GWh, or 8,384,408,687 kWh. Therefore, electricity demand associated with the proposed project would be less than 0.002 percent of Fresno County's total electricity demand.

The Title 24 Building Energy Efficiency Standards ("Title 24 Standards") contain energy efficiency requirements for newly constructed buildings, additions to existing buildings, and alterations to existing buildings. The Title 24 Standards establish performance metrics in the form of an "energy budget" based on energy consumption per square foot of floor space. For this reason, the Title 24 Standards include both a prescriptive option, allowing builders to comply by using methods known to be efficient, and a performance option, allowing builders complete freedom in their designs provided the building achieves the same overall efficiency as an equivalent building using the prescriptive option. Reference appendices are adopted along with the Title 24 Standards containing data and various compliance tools to help builders achieve compliance

The proposed project would comply with the latest California Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen) standard building measures and Title 24 standards.

In addition, proposed new development would be constructed using energy efficient modern building materials and construction practices, and the proposed project also would be consistent with current Title 24 standards, as discussed above. The expected energy consumption during construction and operation of the proposed project would be consistent with typical usage rates for similar uses; however, energy consumption is largely a function of personal choice and the physical structure and layout of buildings.

PG&E is the private utility that would supply the proposed project's electricity and natural gas services. In 2022, approximately 40 percent of PG&E's delivered electricity came from renewable sources, including solar, wind, geothermal, small hydroelectric and various forms of bioenergy.[5] PG&E reached California's 2020 renewable energy goal in 2017, and is positioned to meet the State's 60 percent by 2030 renewable energy mandate set forth in Senate Bill (SB) 100. In addition, PG&E plans to continue to provide reliable service to their customers and upgrade their distribution systems as necessary to meet future demand.

Vehicle Miles Traveled. Development that meets a locally adopted SB 743 VMT target would satisfy this design element.

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 threshold for transportation impacts.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3(b)(4) states that "[a] lead agency has discretion to choose the most appropriate methodology 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 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

5 PG&E. 2023. *Exploring Clean Energy Solutions*. Website: https://www.pge.com/en/about/corporate-responsibility-and-sustainability/taking-responsibility/clean-energy-solutions.html (accessed April 2025).

Section 15151 shall apply to the analysis described in this section."

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

The City of Fresno VMT Thresholds 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. The proposed project includes both a General Plan Amendment and a Rezone. As such, a quantitative VMT analysis is required. Pursuant to Appendix C, Section 5.19 (CalEEMod Report), the project has an estimated unmitigated (business as usual) 319,592 vmt/yr. The project has a 30% reduction on VMTs which exceeds the City's goal of 13% reduction threshold. The project is located in an urban area, and is surrounded by existing roadways like Clovis Avenue, Minnewawa Avenue, and Church Avenue that has existing bike lanes, existing sidewalks, and class 1 trails. Implementation of the City's Active Transportation Plan, will help the project achieve its travel demand reduction.

In conclusion, the Project will result in a less than significant VMT impact and is consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3(b).

Electric Vehicle Requirements. Under this design criterion, the project must demonstrate consistency with the Tier 2 measures for off-street EV parking included in the most recently adopted version of CALGreen. As discussed above, The project will install solar and electric vehicle charging infrastructure for each residential dwelling in compliance with Calgreen Tier 2 building codes. Therefore, the proposed project would be consistent with this design element.

As demonstrated above, the proposed project would be consistent with the project design elements related to natural gas, energy, VMT, and EVs, which demonstrate that the project is achieving its "fair share" of GHG emission reductions. Therefore, the proposed project would not generate substantial GHG emissions, and this impact 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 proposed project was analyzed for consistency with the goals of Executive Order (EO) B-30-15, SB 32, AB 197, and the Scoping Plan.

EO B-30-15 added the immediate target of reducing GHG emissions to 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030. 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. CARB released the 2022 Scoping Plan to reflect the 2030 target set by EO B-30-15 and codified by SB 32. SB 32 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.

The Scoping Plan contains GHG reduction measures that work towards reducing GHG emissions, consistent with the targets set by 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 qualitatively discussed below.

Current statewide targets included in the 2017 Scoping Plan and 2022 Scoping Plan Update include; 1) reducing GHG emissions by at least 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030 (SB 32); 2) achieving carbon neutrality no later than 2045 (AB 12797 and Executive Order B-55-18).

Energy efficient measures are intended to maximize energy efficiency building and appliance standards, pursue additional efficiency efforts including new technologies and new policy and implementation mechanisms, and pursue comparable investment in energy efficiency from all retail providers of electricity in California. In addition, these measures are designed to expand the use of green building practices to reduce the carbon footprint of California's new and existing inventory of buildings. The proposed project would be required to comply with the latest Title 24 standards of the CCR, established by the CEC, regarding energy conservation and green building standards. Therefore, the proposed project would comply with applicable energy measures.

Water conservation and efficiency measures are intended to continue efficiency programs and use cleaner energy sources to move and treat water. Increasing the efficiency of water transport and reducing water use would reduce GHG emissions. As noted above, the proposed project would be required to comply with the latest Title

24 standards of the CCR, which includes a variety of different measures, including reduction of wastewater and water use. In addition, the proposed project would be designed to include drought tolerant landscaping. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with any of the water conservation and efficiency measures.

AB 1493 Pavley Regulations and Fuel Efficiency Standards

California AB 1493, enacted on July 22, 2002, required the CARB to develop and adopt regulations that reduce GHGs emitted by passenger vehicles and light duty trucks. Implementation of the regulation was delayed by lawsuits filed by automakers and by the EPA's denial of an implementation waiver. The EPA subsequently granted the requested waiver in 2009, which was upheld by the by the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia in 2011 (CARB 2013c).

The standards are to be phased in during the 2009 through 2016 model years. When fully phased in, the near-term (2009–2012) standards will result in an approximately 22-percent reduction compared with the 2002 fleet, and the mid-term (2013–2016) standards will result in about a 30-percent reduction. Several technologies stand out as providing significant reductions in emissions at favorable costs. These include discrete variable valve lift or camless valve actuation to optimize valve operation rather than relying on fixed valve timing and lift as has historically been done; turbocharging to boost power and allow for engine downsizing; improved multi-speed transmissions; and improved air conditioning systems that operate optimally, leak less, and/or use an alternative refrigerant (CARB 2013).

The second phase of the implementation for the Pavley bill was incorporated into Amendments to the Low-Emission Vehicle Program referred to as LEV III or the Advanced Clean Cars program. The Advanced Clean Car program combines the control of smog-causing pollutants and GHG emissions into a single coordinated package of requirements for model years 2017 through 2025. The regulation will reduce GHGs from new cars by 34 percent from 2016 levels by 2025. The new rules will reduce pollutants from gasoline and diesel-powered cars, and deliver increasing numbers of zero-emission technologies, such as full battery electric cars, newly emerging plug-in hybrid electric vehicles and hydrogen fuel cell cars. The regulations will also ensure adequate fueling infrastructure is available for the increasing numbers of hydrogen fuel cell vehicles planned for deployment in California (CARB 2011).

The goal of transportation and motor vehicle measures is to develop regional GHG emissions reduction targets for passenger vehicles. The second phase of Pavley standards will reduce GHG emissions from new cars by 34 percent from 2016 levels by 2025, resulting in a 3 percent decrease in average vehicle emissions for all vehicles by 2020. All new vehicles traveling to the project site would comply with the Pavley II (LEV III) Advanced Clean Cars Program. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with the identified 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 EO B-30-15, SB 32, AB 197, and would be consistent with applicable plans and programs designed to reduce GHG emissions.

As shown in discussion a) above, the proposed project would be consistent with the applicable strategies from the BAAD Justification Report. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with plans, policies, or regulations adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions. The impact would **less-than-significant**.

Mitigation Measures

There are no mitigation measures relative to Greenhouse Gas Emissions impacts.

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIAL – Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?			X	
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?			X	
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?			X	
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?				X
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?			X	

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

DISCUSSION

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

Construction activities associated with the proposed project would involve the use of limited amounts of potentially hazardous materials, including but not limited to, solvents, paints, fuels, oils, and transmission fluids. However, all materials used during construction would be contained, stored, and handled in compliance with applicable standards and regulations established by the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC), the United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA), and the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA). All storage, handling, and disposal of hazardous materials during project construction and operation would comply with applicable safety standards and regulations, including General Plan Policies NS-4-a, NS-4-e, and NS-4-f.[6] No manufacturing, industrial, or other uses utilizing large amounts of hazardous materials would occur within the project site. Operation of the site would consist of residential uses which would only include the storage and use of small quantities of household products, such as paint and cleaning supplies which would not present a significant hazard to the public. Therefore, the proposed project would have a **less-than-significant impact** associated with the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials, and no mitigation is required.

6 City of Fresno. 2014. Fresno General Plan-Noise and Safety Element, pgs. 9-33, 9-34. Available online at: https://www.fresno.gov/darm/wp-content/uploads/sites/10/2016/11/GP9NoiseandSafety.pdf (accessed _November 5, 2022_).

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?

See discussion a) above. The proposed project would not result in a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the transport of hazardous materials. Additionally, the General Plan includes Objective NS-4 and Policies NS-4-a, NS-4-e, NS-4-f and NS-4-g, which require site and project-specific compliance with local, State and federal standards and procedures to avoid the release or upset of hazardous materials. Therefore, compliance with federal and state regulations and applicable General Plan policies would ensure that the project would not result in significant hazards to the public or environment through the release of hazardous materials. The impact 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 closest existing schools include Phoenix Secondary School and Storey Elementary School, located approximately 0.5 miles west of the project site, and Sanger West High School, located approximately 1.3 miles east of the project site. As previously stated, the proposed project would not result in the use or emission of substantial quantities of hazardous materials that would pose a human or environmental health risk. In addition, all materials would be handled, stored, and disposed of in accordance with applicable standards and regulations. Therefore, because the proposed project does not involve activities that would result in the emission of hazardous materials or acutely hazardous substances to an existing or proposed school, implementation of the proposed project would result in a **less-than-significant impact** in the use or emission of hazardous materials that would adversely affect a school.

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?

According to the DTSC EnviroStor database,[7] the project site is not located on a federal superfund site, State response site, voluntary cleanup site, school cleanup site, evaluation site, school investigation site, military evaluation site, tiered permit site, or corrective action site. Additionally, the project site is not included on the list of

7 California Department of Toxic Substances Control. 2007. EnviroStor. Available online at: https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/map/?myaddress=fresno (accessed _May 31, 2023_)

hazardous waste sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5.[8] As a result, no hazards to the public or environment are anticipated, and 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 nearest airports include the Sierra Sky Airport, located approximately 12.8 miles northwest of the project site, the Fresno Yosemite International Airport, located approximately 3.5 miles north of the project site, and the Fresno Chandler Executive Airport, located approximately 6.3 miles southeast of the project site. In addition, the nearest medical center helipads include the Community Regional Medical Center, located 4.6 miles northwest of the project site. The subject property is not located within any boundaries of airports identified within the Fresno County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP). Due to the distance between the project site and local airports and helipads, operations at these locations are not expected to pose a safety hazard for people on the project site. Therefore, the proposed project would not expose persons to airport-related hazards, and the potential impact would be **less-than-significant**.

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

The California Emergency Services Act requires cities to prepare and maintain an Emergency Plan for natural, manmade, or war-caused emergencies that result in conditions of disaster or in extreme peril to life. The City's full-time Emergency Preparedness Officer (EPO) is responsible for ensuring that Fresno's emergency response plans are up-to-date and implemented properly. The EPO also facilitates cooperation between City departments and other local, State and federal agencies that would be involved in emergency response operations. The City of Fresno Emergency Operations Center (EOC) serves as the coordination and communication between the City of Fresno and Fresno County Operational Area EOC. The proposed project would not result in any alterations of existing roadways that would block the circulation of emergency response services or introduce elements that would conflict with the operations of the EOC. Therefore, the proposed project would not interfere with emergency evacuation plans in the City, and this impact would be **less than significant**.

8 California Environmental Protection Agency. 2018. Government Code Section 65962.5(a) Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List. Available online at: https://calepa.ca.gov/sitecleanup/corteselist/section-65962-5a/ (accessed _May 31, 2023_)

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

The project site is located in an area mapped as Local Responsibility Area (LRA) Unzoned, indicating that the area is urbanized and not susceptible to wildland conflagrations, and is not located within a very high fire hazard severity zone (VHFHSZ).[9] Therefore, the proposed project would not expose people or structures to a significant loss, injury or death involving wildland fires and the impact would be **no impact**.

Mitigation Measures
There are no mitigation measures relative to Hazards and Hazardous Materials impacts.

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	

9 California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE). 2007. *Fresno County Fire Hazard Severity Zones in LRA.* Kune . Available online at: https://osfm.fire.ca.gov/media/6673/fhszl06_1_map10.pdf (accessed _March 10, 2023_)

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 a substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;			X	
ii) Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site:			X	
iii) create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or			X	
iv) impede or redirect flood flows?				X
d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?			X	
e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?			X	

DISCUSSION

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

The State Water Resources Control Board and nine Regional Water Quality Control Boards regulate the water quality of surface water and groundwater bodies throughout California. The proposed project is within the jurisdiction of the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB).

Pollutants of concern during construction include sediments, trash, petroleum products, concrete waste (dry and wet), sanitary waste, and chemicals. During project construction, there would be an increased potential to expose soils to wind and water erosion, which could result in temporary minimal increases in sediment load in nearby water bodies, including San Joaquin River located approximately 11-miles north of the project site.

The project site is 2.1 acres. In compliance with the General Plan, any development project disturbing one or more acres of soil must obtain coverage under the General Permit for Discharges of Storm Water Associated with Construction Activity (Construction General Permit Order 2009-0009-DWQ). Construction activities subject to the Construction General Permit includes clearing, grading, and other ground-disturbing activities such as stockpiling or excavation. The Construction General Permit requires development and implementation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP).

A SWPPP includes features designed to eliminate contact of rainfall and stormwater runoff with sources of pollution that occur on construction sites, the main source being soil erosion resulting from unstabilized soils coming in contact with water and wind. These features are known as Best Management Practices (BMPs). Common BMPs to limit pollution in stormwater runoff from construction sites include maintaining or creating drainages to convey and direct surface runoff away from bare areas and installing physical barriers such as berms, silt fencing, waddles, straw bales, and gabions. The National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Construction General Permit, including the SWPPP and BMPs, would reduce project construction impacts on water quality to less than significant levels.

Long-term operation impacts associated with the proposed project would be reduced to less than significant levels with the implementation of the City's Storm Drainage and Flood Control Master Plan (SDFCMP), which manages the City's stormwater drainage systems, and the City's participation in the Phase 1 NPDES Permit for Stormwater Discharges From Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems (Phase 1 MS4), which requires the City to implement water quality and watershed protection measures for all development projects.

Therefore, impacts associated with the proposed project 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 City of Fresno overlies the Kings Subbasin, which is part of the greater San Joaquin Valley Groundwater Basin. Temporary dewatering from excavations could be necessary during construction. Construction-related dewatering would be temporary and limited to the area of excavations on the project site and would not substantially contribute to depletion of groundwater supplies. Operation of the project would not require groundwater extraction. Following project implementation, there would be an increase in impervious surface area. An increase in impervious surface area decreases infiltration, which can decrease the amount of water that is able to recharge the aquifer/groundwater. As discussed in the Project Description, FMFCD would provide flood control and urban storm water services to the project site. Stormwater from the project site would utilize the existing roadway improvements, curb, and gutters to reach the existing FMFCD underground storm drainage facilities at Minnewawa and Laurite to the west. The existing FMFCD underground storm drainage facilities collect and discharge stormwater runoff to Basin "BG", located the NWC of Minnewawa Ave and Annadale Avenue. As such, the proposed project would connect to existing drainage facilities and would not substantially decrease any infiltration that currently may occur in the area. Therefore, the project would not impede the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board's ability to manage groundwater. Thus, this project would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project would impede sustainable management of the Kings Subbasin. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

Additionally, as discussed below in Section XIX, Utilities and Service Systems, the City receives its water supply from groundwater and surface water. The City has indicated that groundwater wells, pump stations, recharge facilities, water treatment and distribution systems shall be expanded incrementally to mitigate increased water demands. One of the primary objectives of Fresno's future water supply plans detailed in the City's current Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) is to balance groundwater operations through a host of strategies. Through careful planning, Fresno has designed a comprehensive plan to accomplish this objective by increasing surface water supplies and surface water treatment facilities, intentional recharge, and conservation, thereby reducing groundwater pumping. The City continually monitors impacts of land use changes and development project proposals on water supply facilities by assigning fixed demand allocations to each parcel by land use as currently zoned or proposed to be rezoned.

The City relies on groundwater and surface water supplies to meet water demands. In 2007, Fresno updated its Metropolitan Water Resources Management Plan

designed to ensure the Fresno metro area has a reliable water supply through 2050. The plan implements a conjunctive use program, combining groundwater, treated surface water, artificial recharge, and an enhanced water conservation program.

The City has implemented a comprehensive water conservation program to help reduce per capita water usage, and includes conservation programs such as landscaping standards for drought tolerance, irrigation control devices, leak detection and retrofits, water audits, public education and implementing U.S. Bureau of Reclamation Best Management Practices for water conservation to maintain surface water entitlements.

The potable water demand projections in the City's UWMP are based on land use projections. The proposed project site is included in the land use area covered by the City's UWMP. In addition, the proposed project is consistent with the single-unit residential use designation; therefore, it is assumed that demand for water was accounted for in the UWMP. There is no evidence, in consideration of the calculated project water demand, that such demand exceeds that estimated in the UWMP. The adequacy of the water supply for the project is thus consistent with the basis of the analysis of the City's water supply in the adopted UWMP.

Water supply and wastewater services for the proposed project would be provided by the City of Fresno through the Department of Public Utilities (DPU) Water and Wastewater Management Divisions. As discussed below in Section XIX, Utilities and Service Systems, the City receives all of its water supply from groundwater. The City has indicated that groundwater wells, pump stations, recharge facilities, water treatment and distribution systems shall be expanded incrementally to mitigate increased water demands. One of the primary objectives of Fresno's future water supply plans detailed in Fresno's current Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP)[10] is to balance groundwater operations through a host of strategies. Through careful planning, Fresno has designed a comprehensive plan to accomplish this objective by increasing surface water supplies and surface water treatment facilities, intentional recharge, and conservation, thereby reducing groundwater pumping. The City continually monitors impacts of land use changes and development project proposals on water supply facilities by assigning fixed demand allocations to each parcel by land use as currently zoned or proposed to be rezoned.

In 2014, Fresno updated its Metropolitan Water Resources Management Plan designed to ensure the Fresno metro area has a reliable water supply through 2025. The plan implements a conjunctive use program, combining groundwater, treated surface water, artificial recharge and an enhanced water conservation program. In

10 City of Fresno. 2021. 2020 Urban Water Management Plan - Final. Available online at: https://www.fresno.gov/publicutilities/wp-content/uploads/sites/16/2021/07/Fresno-2020-UWMP_Final_2021-07-21.pdf (accessed _March 10, 2023_)

the near future, groundwater will continue to be an important part of the City's supply but will not be relied upon as heavily as has historically been the case. The City is planning to rely on expanding their delivery and treatment of surface water supplies and groundwater recharge activities.

The proposed project would comply with all applicable water conservation programs and regulations required by the City's Urban Water Management Plan.

The proposed project would also be consistent with water management strategies from both the Urban Water Management Plan and the Metropolitan Water Resources Management Plan. Furthermore, the Project Applicant would be required to comply with water management requirements and recommendations of the City of Fresno Department of Public Utilities, which would reduce the project impacts to groundwater recharge to **less than significant**.

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?

During construction, excavated soil would be exposed and disturbed, drainage patterns would be temporarily altered, and there would be an increased potential for soil erosion and sedimentation compared to existing conditions. Additionally, during a storm event, soil erosion and siltation could occur at an accelerated rate. As discussed previously, the Construction General Permit requires preparation of a SWPPP to identify construction BMPs to be implemented as part of the project to reduce impacts to water quality during construction, including those impacts associated with soil erosion and siltation. With compliance with the requirements in the Construction General Permit and implementation of the construction BMPs, and with compliance with the City's Municipal Code, construction impacts related to on- or off-site erosion or siltation would be less than significant.

The project would increase the amount of impervious surface, which would increase the volume of runoff during a storm, and which can more effectively transport sediments to receiving waters. At project completion, much of the project site would be impervious surface area and not prone to on-site erosion or siltation because no exposed soil would be present in these areas. The remaining portion of the site would consist of pervious surface area, which would contain landscaping that would minimize on-site erosion and siltation by stabilizing the soil. Additionally, the project applicant would be required to establish and maintain existing drainage patterns. Therefore, the proposed project would not alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that

would result in an impact related to substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site.

Construction of the proposed project would result in grading on the site that would expose native soils that could be subject to the effects associated with wind and water erosion unless adequate measures are taken to limit the transport of soils in surface water from the site to downstream locations

As required by the General Plan, a SWPPP would be developed prior to any ground disturbance at the project site and would include BMPs to reduce erosion and surface water contamination during construction of the proposed project. Additionally, compliance with the City's grading plan check process, the FMFCD Storm Drainage and Flood Control Master Plan (SDFCMP), and stipulations of the NPDES Construction General Permit would ensure that potential impacts related to erosion and siltation on- and off-site would **be less than significant**.

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

During construction, soil would be disturbed and compacted, and drainage patterns would be temporarily altered, which can increase the volume and velocity of stormwater runoff and increase the potential for localized flooding compared to existing conditions. As discussed above, the Construction General Permit requires the preparation of a SWPPP and implementation of construction BMPs to control and direct surface runoff onsite. With adherence to the Construction General Permit, construction impacts related to altering the existing drainage pattern of the site or area or increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding onsite or offsite would be less than significant.

While the project would permanently increase the impervious surface area, FMFCD would provide flood control and urban storm water services to the project site. Stormwater from the project site would utilize the existing roadway improvements, curb, and gutters to reach the existing FMFCD underground storm drainage facilities at Minnewawa and Laurite to the west. The existing FMFCD underground storm drainage facilities collect and discharge stormwater runoff top Basin "BG", located the northwest corner (NWC) of Minnewawa and Annadale Avenues. As such, the proposed project would maintain the overall on-site drainage patterns and continue to direct surface water to the adjacent roadways that flow into the existing storm drains. Prior to the issuance of building permits, the applicant would be required to provide a stormwater improvement plan to the City to ensure that the stormwater system would be capable of handling a 2-year storm and that the drainage facilities conform to City requirements. Therefore, the project would not alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area or increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on-

or off-site.

Ground-disturbing activities related to project construction, such as grading, excavation, placing fill, and trenching, could change existing surface drainage patterns and increase the potential for flooding, particularly during storm events. Regulatory mechanisms in place that would reduce the effects of construction activities on drainage patterns that would result in flooding on or off the construction site include compliance with the City of Fresno grading plan check process, the SDFCMP, and the NPDES Construction General Permit. Compliance with these required regulations would reduce project construction impacts on grading patterns and flooding on and off of the construction site to **less-than-significant levels**.

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?

Construction. The proposed project would result in an increase in impervious surfaces given that the project site would be mostly built out aside from planting areas located in the parking lot and the perimeter of the project site. However, compliance with pre-existing regulatory requirements, including compliance with the Construction General Permit and implementation of a SWPPP, would reduce or eliminate the potential for project construction to cause substantial additional polluted runoff or runoff in excess of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems. Therefore, construction would not result in additional sources of polluted runoff to be discharged to the storm drain system and impacts would be less than significant.

Operations. As discussed above, the proposed project would result in an increase in impervious surfaces; however, FMFCD would provide flood control and urban storm water services to the project site. Stormwater from the project site would utilize the existing roadway improvements, curb, gutters to reach the existing FMFCD underground storm drainage facilities at Minnewawa and Laurite to the west. The existing FMFCD underground storm drainage facilities collect and discharge stormwater runoff to Basin “BG”, located at the NWC of Minnewawa and Annadale Avenues. As such, the proposed project would connect to existing drainage facilities and would not be expected to 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. Further compliance with existing regulatory requirements, including the MS4, as specified in the Industrial General Permit, would reduce or eliminate the potential for project operations to cause substantial additional polluted runoff or runoff in excess of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems.

Please refer to discussions a) and c) i and ii in this section. The proposed project would increase impervious surfaces at the project site. However, with implementation of a SWPPP, which would require execution of BMPs for controlling pollution sources during project construction, compliance with the FMFCD's Storm Drainage and Flood Control Master Plan (SDFCMP), and implementation of the NPDES Permit, the proposed project would not exceed capacity of stormwater drainage systems or generate additional sources of polluted runoff. Additionally, the Project Applicant would pay the City a Drainage Fee to address impacts related to increased amount of surface runoff resulting from the proposed project. The impact would be **less than significant**.

iv. Impede or redirect flood flows?

The proposed project is not located within the 100-year flood hazard area as mapped by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). Drainage flows from the project site will be directed to Laurite Avenue. Stormwater from the project site would utilize the existing roadway improvements, curb, gutters to reach the existing FMFCD underground storm drainage facilities at Minnewawa and Laurite to the west.

Title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations, Part 257 (40 C.F.R. §257), and the floodplain ordinance of the City of Fresno require that placement and flood provision structures within a floodplain not result in a cumulative change in the floodplain water surface that exceeds one foot. In addition, the regulations under 40 C.F.R. § 257 do not allow placement of structures within a regulatory floodway unless that placement would not result in any increase in the floodplain water surface elevation, meaning that there is no displacement or redirection of the floodway. The City's floodplain ordinance requires that a registered Civil Engineer in the State of California certify that no displacement of floodwater would result from the flood proofing of a structure within a floodplain or a regulatory floodway. The proposed project is not located within the 100-year flood hazard area as mapped by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA).[11] As a result, the impact would be **no impact**.

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

11 Federal Emergency Management Agency. 2020. FEMA Flood Map Service Center: Search By Address. Available online at: https://msc.fema.gov/portal/search?AddressQuery#searchresultsanchor (accessed _November 10, 2022_)

According to Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) Number 05019C2130H dated February 18, 2009, the project site is not located in flood zone, tsunami, or seiche zones. Refer to discussion a) in Section IX, Hazards and Hazardous Materials regarding the use of hazardous materials within the project site. As a result, a **less-than-significant impact** would occur.

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

The project proposes a 17-lot single-unit residential subdivision and does not conflict with the implementation of water quality or groundwater management plans.

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 provides sufficient capacity for adequate quantities of safe drinking water to the metropolitan area well into the twenty-first century, groundwater degradation, increasingly stringent water quality regulations, and an 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.

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 UWMP. 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, is also under revision. 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 City has indicated that groundwater wells, pump stations, recharge facilities, water treatment and distribution systems shall be expanded incrementally to mitigate increased water demands. One of the primary objectives of Fresno's future water supply plans detailed in Fresno's current UWMP is to balance groundwater operations

through a host of strategies. Through careful planning, Fresno has designed a comprehensive plan to accomplish this objective by increasing surface water supplies and surface water treatment facilities, intentional recharge, and conservation, thereby reducing groundwater pumping. The City continually monitors impacts of land use changes and development project proposals on water supply facilities by assigning fixed demand allocations to each parcel by land use as currently zoned or proposed to be rezoned. Until 2004, groundwater was the sole source of water for the City. In June 2004, a $32 million Surface Water Treatment Facility ("SWTF") began providing Fresno with water treated to drinking water standards to meet demands anticipated by the growth implicit in the 2025 Fresno General Plan. Surface water is used to replace lost groundwater through Fresno's artificial recharge program at the City-owned Leaky Acres and smaller facilities in Southeast Fresno. Fresno holds entitlements to surface water from Millerton Lake and Pine Flat Reservoir. In 2006, Fresno renewed its contract with the United States Bureau of Reclamation, through the year 2045, which entitles the City to 60,000 acre-feet per year of Class 1 water. This water supply has further increased the reliability of Fresno's water supply.

Also, in 2006, Fresno updated its Metropolitan Water Resources Management Plan designed to ensure the Fresno metro area has a reliable water supply through 2050. The plan implements a conjunctive use program, combining groundwater, treated surface water, artificial recharge and an enhanced water conservation program. In the near future, groundwater will continue to be an important part of the City's supply but will not be relied upon as heavily as has historically been the case. The City is planning to rely on expanding their delivery and treatment of surface water supplies and groundwater recharge activities.

In addition, the City has implemented a comprehensive water conservation program to help reduce per capita water usage, and includes conservation programs such as landscaping standards for drought tolerance, irrigation control devices, leak detection and retrofits, water audits, public education and implementing US Bureau of Reclamation Best Management Practices for water conservation to maintain surface water entitlements.

Implementation of the Kings Basin Integrated Regional Water Management Plan, City of Fresno UWMP, Fresno-Area Regional Groundwater Management Plan, and City of Fresno Metropolitan Water Resource Management Plan will address the issues of providing an adequate, reliable, and sustainable water supply for the project's urban domestic and public safety consumptive purposes. The recently adopted 2015 UWMP analyzed the Fresno General Plans land use capacity.

The project would be required to adhere to NPDES drainage control requirements during construction and operation as well as to FMFCD drainage control requirements, and would be subject to the requirements of the various Plans discussed above. As a

result, the project would not conflict with any applicable water quality control plan or groundwater management plan, and the impact would be **less than significant**.

Mitigation Measures
There are no mitigation measures relative to Hydrology and Water Quality impacts.

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 physical division of an established community typically refers to the construction of a physical feature (such as an interstate highway or railroad tracks) or removal of a means of access (such as a local road or bridge) that would impair mobility within an existing community, or between a community and outlying areas. For instance, the construction of an interstate highway through an existing community may constrain travel from one side of the community to another; similarly, such construction may also impair travel to areas outside of the community.

The proposed project would develop the currently vacant and undeveloped project site into 17 single-unit residential lots. The proposed project site is currently vacant, and is surrounded by existing residential land uses. The proposed project would include construction of single unit homes, roadways, sidewalks, sewer, water, and associated utilities. These improvements would not affect connectivity and would not divide an established community. Therefore, the proposed project would have **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 project site is currently zoned RS-4 (*Single-Unit Residential, Medium Low Density*), which is intended to provide for single-unit residential lots. The proposed zoning is RS-5 (*Single-Unit Residential, Medium Density*) and the proposed land use is Medium Density Residential intended for smaller lots and higher density single unit residential. The proposed RS-5 zone district is similar to the surrounding area.

The project would require a change to the General Plan land use designation and zoning of the project site, which applications have been accepted and routed to all applicable City departments and responsible agencies. The project will mitigate its environmental effects as discussed throughout this study, and would therefore not conflict with any of the land use plans, policies, or regulations discussed which were adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating environmental effects. The impact of this land use change would be **less than significant** with implementation of the applicable requirements discussed in other sections.

Mitigation Measures
There are no mitigation measures relative to Land Use Planning impacts.

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XII. MINERAL RESOURCES – Would the project:				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?				X
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?				X

DISCUSSION

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

The principal area for mineral resources in the City of Fresno is located along the San Joaquin River Corridor. The California Department of Mines and Geology classifies lands along the San Joaquin River Corridor as Mineral Resource Zones (MRZ) 1, MRZ-2, and MRZ-3. The project site is not located in the vicinity of the San Joaquin River, is not a MRZ, and it doesn't contain a MRZ. As a result, the proposed project would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource of value to the region or residents of the State. Therefore, the impact 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?

Please refer to the discussion for a). The project site is not located in the vicinity of the San Joaquin River, is not a MRZ, and it doesn't contain a MRZ. The proposed project would not result in the loss of availability of any known locally important mineral resource recovery sites. Therefore, the proposed project would have a **no impact**.

Mitigation Measures
There are no mitigation measures relative to Mineral Resources impacts.

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

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				X

DISCUSSION

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

Generally, the three primary sources of substantial noise that affect the City of Fresno and its residents are all transportation-related and consist of local streets and regional highways; airport operations at the Fresno Yosemite International, Fresno-Chandler, and the Sierra Sky Park airports; and railroad operations along the Burlington North Santa Fe (BNSF) Railway and the Union Pacific Railroad lines. Potential noise sources at the subject properties would be roadway noise from the major street (West Alluvial Avenue) east of the project site.

Short-Term (Construction) Noise Impacts. Although there may be some temporary increases in ambient noise levels resulting from the construction of the project, such increases in ambient noise would be temporary in nature. Construction noise would be typical of a construction site, such as tractors, hammering, and other construction related equipment, however, construction activities would only occur during times consistent with the Fresno Municipal Code, typically during daytime hours during the week, and possibly on a limited basis on some weekends. The project would not likely require any type of vibration generating equipment, such as piledriving; therefore, vibration impacts would be minimal.

The immediate vicinity consists of primarily residential users to the north, south, west and east. The surrounding residential land uses, have similar noise level requirements during the day. Although proposed development will create additional activity in the

area, the 17-lot residential subdivision will be required to comply with all noise policies from the Fresno General Plan, the noise provisions in the Citywide Development Code, and the Noise Ordinance of the FMC.

Project construction would result in short-term noise impacts on nearby sensitive receptors. Maximum construction noise would be short-term, generally intermittent depending on the construction phase, and variable depending on receiver distance from the active construction zone. The duration of noise impacts generally would be from one day to several days depending on the phase (e.g., demolition, land clearing, grading, excavation, erection) of construction. Noise produced by construction equipment such as earthmovers, material handlers, and portable generators can reach high levels. Generally, the grading phase of construction involves the most equipment and generates the highest noise levels, although noise ranges are usually similar across all construction phases. Typical noise levels generated by individual pieces of construction equipment generally range from approximately 77 dBA to 90 dBA Lmax at 50 feet. Depending on the equipment required and duration of use, average-hourly noise levels associated with construction activity typically ranges from roughly 65 to 90 dBA Leq at 50 feet.

Certain land uses are considered more sensitive to noise than others. Examples of these include residential areas, educational facilities, hospitals, childcare facilities, and senior housing. The closest sensitive receptors to the proposed project include existing residential land uses to the west of the project site and located approximately 18’ west.

Chapter 10, Article 1 (Noise Regulations), of the Fresno Municipal Code establishes excessive noise guidelines and exemptions. Section 10-109 states that construction noise is exempted from City noise regulations 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 the proposed project could potentially result in a temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity, 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 General Plan or Noise Ordinance or applicable standards of other agencies would be less than significant.

Operational Noise Impacts. Motor vehicles with their distinctive noise characteristics are the dominant noise source in the project vicinity. The amount of noise varies according to many factors, such as volume of traffic, vehicle mix (percentage of cars

and trucks), average traffic speed, and distance from the observer. Implementation of the proposed project would result in new daily trips on local roadways in the project site vicinity. A characteristic of sound is that a doubling of a noise source is required in order to result in a perceptible (3 dBA or greater) increase in the resulting noise level. As discussed below in Section XVII, Transportation, the proposed project would generate approximately 160 daily trips. The project daily trips would not result in a doubling of traffic volumes along any roadway segment in the project vicinity and, therefore, would not result in a perceptible increase in traffic noise levels at receptors in the project vicinity.

The City of Fresno Noise Element sets 65 dB DNL or less as the acceptability criterion within outdoor activity areas of noise-sensitive land uses. Since the development consists of single-unit homes, outdoor activity areas are assumed to be located within individual backyards. The nearest major road is Clovis Avenue, which is designated as an Arterial. The distance from the center of Clovis Avenue to the backyard of the nearest proposed home is 380 feet. Therefore the noise exposure from Clovis Avenue traffic will be less than 65 dBA at 380 feet.

Development of the project site would increase noise at the site. Compliance with the City's General Plan Objective NS-1 and the related applicable policies, and the City's Noise Ordinance, would be implemented by the proposed project. Given the nature of the Project as single-unit residential, and with implementation of General Plan policies and the Noise Ordinance, operation of the proposed project would not substantially increase noise levels over existing conditions, and the impact would be **less than significant**.

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

During construction there may be temporary construction noises from heavy equipment, tools, and construction activities. However, the construction activities will comply with City Noise Ordinance Section 10-109(a), such that construction of the Project shall occur Monday through Saturday from 7:00 am to 10:00 pm. No construction activities shall occur on Sundays. Heavy Construction activities associated with the proposed project, which consist heavy equipment used mainly for grading, excavations, and compaction, are not expected to result in excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels. No vibratory compaction or deep compaction equipment, will be used during construction. The proposed single-unit residential uses will not create any groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels. No permanent noise sources would be located within the project site that would expose persons to excessive groundborne vibration or noise levels. Therefore, the proposed project would not permanently expose persons within or around the project site to excessive groundborne vibration or noise and the impact 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 nearest medical center helipads (HP) to the project site include Community Regional Medical Center located approximately 4.6 miles west of the project site. The nearest airports include the Fresno Yosemite International Airport, located approximately 3.5 miles north of the project site, Fresno Chandler Executive Airport, located approximately 6.3 miles west of the project site, and the Sierra Sky Airport, located approximately 12.8 miles northwest of the project site.

Each of these airports is considered under the Fresno County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP)[12], which guides local jurisdictions in determining appropriate compatible land uses with detailed findings and policies. The City of Fresno General Plan, other City land use plans, and all City land use decisions must be compatible with the adopted ALUCP for Fresno County. The ALUCP includes CNEL noise contours based on projected airport and aircraft operations. The project site is not within 2 miles of any public or private airstrip or helipad. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in the exposure of sensitive receptors to the excessive noise levels from aircraft noise sources. The impact would be **no impact**.

Mitigation Measures
There are no mitigation measures relative to Noise impacts.

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

12 Fresno Council of Governments. 2018. Fresno County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan. Amended December 2021. Available online at: https://www.fresnocog.org/project/airport-land-use-commission-fresno-county/ (accessed March 2023)

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 project site is currently zoned RS-4 (Single-Unit Residential, Medium Low Density), which is intended to provide for single-unit residential lots with minimum 5,000 sf lots. The proposed land use is Medium Density Residential. The RS-5 zone district is intended for smaller lot and higher density single unit residential. The proposed RS-5 zoning is similar to the surrounding area. The project's proposed lot sizes are larger than 5,200 sf, which exceeds and is similar to RS-4 standards. The project, if built in conformance to RS-4 density requirements, would have produced 12 lots, that have an average lot width of 77 feet wide, and average 7,400 sf lots. The project proposes 17 lots, thereby increasing the area by 5 additional homes. Therefore, the increase of 5 additional single unit homes would not be considered substantial.

The project proposes additional single unit homes which would result in direct population growth. However, a slight increase in the density is not substantial, and the land is already planned for residential, such that the General Plan has already anticipated a similar level of population growth in this area. Therefore, the project would not include substantial, nor unplanned, population growth and the impact would be **less than significant**.

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

The project site is currently vacant and proposes to develop 17 single unit residential lots. The proposed project would not necessitate the displacement or removal of existing housing. Therefore, the impact would be **no impact**.

Mitigation Measures
There are no mitigation measures relative to Population and Housing impacts.

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

DISCUSSION

a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, or the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of

which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

i. Fire protection?

The City of Fresno Fire Department (FFD) would provide fire protection services to the proposed project. There are 20 FFD fire stations in Fresno, with the closest fire station, Fire Station 15, located approximately 1.3 miles from the project site. Planned growth under the General Plan would increase calls for fire protection service in the City. The proposed use of the project site is consistent with the site's General Plan designation and does not represent unplanned growth given that the project site would be developed consistent with its land use and zoning designations. The project could result in an incremental increase in the demand for fire protection services because of additional residents to the project site. However, the proposed project would be required to pay a Fire Facilities Fee and a Development Impact Fee pursuant to Chapter 12, Article 4.9 of the City's Code of Ordinances to account for the potential impacts to fire services.

This project is within the primary service area of Fire Station 15 and there are no fire development restrictions related to fire access on the project. The Project is subject to the city wide Fire Service Development Impact fee. There are existing fire hydrants on E. Laurite and no additional hydrants are needed. The existing hydrant in front of proposed lot 10 is to be relocated outside the proposed driveway approach. There are existing water and sewer mains in E. Laurite. There are 8 existing one inch water services stubbed to the proposed lots 1-9 frontage and which are indicated on the tract map extending from proposed lots 1-9. These were apparently for a previous tract map that was never finalized. There is an existing 1" water service indicated on the Laurite frontage at the east parcel line of lot 4 and an additional 1 inch service will be needed to serve lot 5. Lots 10-17 will need to have new 1" water services installed to serve these lots.

The FFD would continue providing services to the project site and would not require additional firefighters to serve the proposed project. The construction of a new or expanded fire station would not be required. The proposed project would not result in a significant impact on the physical environment due to the incremental increase in demand for fire protection and life safety services. The incremental increase in demand for services would not adversely affect existing responses times to the site or within the City. Therefore, construction and operation of the proposed project would have a **less-than-significant impact**.

ii. Police protection?

The City of Fresno Police Department (FPD) provides police protection to the project site. The Police Department Patrol Division is divided into five policing districts with the nearest station is the Southeast District, located at 224 S. Argyle Ave, being approximately 2 miles northeast from the project site. Planned growth under the General Plan would increase calls for police protection service in the City. The proposed use of the project site is consistent with the site's General Plan designation and does not represent unplanned growth given that the project site would be developed consistent with its land use and zoning designation.

The project could result in an incremental increase in the demand for police protection services. However, the proposed project would be required to pay a Police Impact Fee and a Development Impact Fee pursuant to Chapter 12. Article 4.8 of the City's Code of Ordinances to account for the potential impacts to police protection services.

The FPD would continue providing services to the project site and would not require additional personnel to serve the proposed project. The construction of new or expanded police facilities would not be required. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a substantial adverse impact associated with the provision of additional police facilities or services and impacts to police protection would represent **no impact**.

iii. Schools?

Any urban residential development occurring as a result of the proposed project would result in an impact on the Sanger Unified School District's student capacity. According the "Development Fee justification Study", prepared by Odell Planning & Research, Inc, dated May 2022, the TK through 12th grade student generation rate is 0.679 for single unit dwellings. Therefore, the proposed 17 single unit residential homes would add approximately 11.5 new students. Development impact fees for schools are one-time charges on new construction, authorized by California law (Education Code 17620) to fund school facilities, as developers pay for growth-related impacts. The developer would be required to pay appropriate school fees pursuant to Education Code Section 17620 at time of building permits to address potential impacts. The projects impacts would be **less than significant**.

iv. Parks?

On December 14, 2017, the City of Fresno adopted the Fresno Parks Master Plan (PMP) which was an update to the previously adopted 1989 Parks Master Plan. In comparison to the Parks, Open Space, and Schools chapter of the General Plan,

the Fresno Parks Master provides updated data and system overview, revised park classifications, additional goals, recommendations and strategies, and new design guidelines that support and enhance the objectives and policies found in that chapter. The level of population growth proposed by this Project has been anticipated in the Fresno General Plan and related planning documents.

There is an existing pocket park located 0.14 miles southeast of the project site. The Fancher Creek Trail is located 0.25 miles east of the project site.

The project could result in an incremental increase in the demand for parks as a result of additional residents at the project site that might make use of nearby facilities. The developer would be required to pay applicable park facilities fees, pursuant to Chapter 12, Article 4.7 of the City's Municipal Code, to reduce potential impacts of the proposed project on park facilities. Therefore, impacts to parks would be **less than significant**.

v. Other public facilities?

Development of the proposed project could also increase demand for other public services, including libraries, community centers, and public health care facilities. However, the proposed project would not result in significant population growth that would increase the demand for these facilities, such that new facilities would be needed to maintain service standards, as these facilities are not currently overused and have capacity to serve new demand. Therefore, impacts to other public facilities would be **less than significant**.

Mitigation Measures
There are no mitigation measures relative to Public Services impacts.

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	

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 does not include on-site open space. There is an existing pocket park located 0.14 miles to the east of the project site. The Fancher Creek Trail is located 0.25 miles east of the project site.

The proposed project may increase the demand of recreational facilities in the vicinity of the project site. However, the developer would be required to pay park impact fees pursuant to Chapter 12, Article 4.7 of the City's Code of Ordinances at the time building permits are obtained to account for potential impacts to recreational facilities. The impact fees would serve to offset project impact on existing recreational facilities. Therefore, the impact would be **less than significant**.

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

As discussed above, the Project does not propose any on-site open space. The proposed 17 lot residential subdivision project would generate additional demand for parks and recreation. The demands generated by the project is within planned services levels of the City of Fresno Parks and Community Services Department. The project will pay its fair share of the UGM park impact development fee. Therefore, impacts to parks would be less than significant.

There is an existing pocket park located 0.14 miles east of the project site. The Fancher Creek Trail is located 0.25 miles east of the project site. The demand for use of these parks and trails will not be increased by approval of the plan

amendment/rezone, and will only incrementally increase as a result of the eventual development of the proposed 17 lot residential subdivision.

The proposed project would consist of 17 residential homes. The proposed project would not include or require the construction or expansion of existing public recreational facilities. Therefore, the impact would be **less than significant**.

Mitigation Measures
There are no mitigation measures relative to Recreation impacts.

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

DISCUSSION

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

The subject properties are located northwest of the South Clovis Avenue and East Jensen Avenue intersection in the City of Fresno. In the Fresno General Plan Circulation Element, East Jensen Avenue is designated as a super arterial roadway.

South Clovis Avenue is designated as an arterial street with the purpose of moving traffic within and between neighborhoods and to and from freeways and expressways. Arterials typically have four to six lanes with median island separation. The proposed project will be required to construct all necessary street frontage improvements along Laurite Avenue and DeWitt Ave, such as drive approaches, sidewalks, including curb, gutter and pavement to City Standards.

The subject site is located within Traffic Impact Zone III (TIZ-III). TIZ-III represents areas near or outside the city limits but within the sphere of influence. The proposed 17 lot single unit subdivision will not adversely impact the existing and projected roadway and circulation system and the project would generate less than 100 peak hour trips, therefore a Traffic Impact Study would not be required for the proposed 17 lot subdivision proposal. Therefore, the project is anticipated to result in **no impacts**.

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 threshold for transportation impacts.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3(b)(4) states that “[a] lead agency has discretion to choose the most appropriate methodology 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 vehicle miles traveled and any revision to model outputs should be documented and explained in the environmental document prepared for the project. The standard of adequacy in Section 15151 shall apply to the analysis described in this section.”

On June 25, 2020, the City of Fresno adopted CEQA Guidelines for Vehicle Miles Traveled Thresholds pursuant to Senate Bill 743 to be effective of July 1, 2020. The thresholds described therein are referred to herein as the City of Fresno VMT Thresholds. The City of Fresno VMT Thresholds document was prepared and adopted

consistent with the requirements of CEQA Guidelines Sections 15064.3 and 15064.7. The December 2018 Technical Advisory on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA (Technical Advisory) published by the Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR), was utilized as a reference and guidance document in the preparation of the Fresno VMT Thresholds.

The City of Fresno VMT Thresholds 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. The proposed project includes both a General Plan Amendment and a Rezone. As such, a quantitative VMT analysis is required. Pursuant to Appendix C, Section 5.19 (CalEEMod Report), the project has an estimated unmitigated (business as usual) 319,592 vmt/yr. The project has a 30% reduction on VMTs which exceeds the City's goal of 13% reduction threshold. The project is located in an urban area, and is surrounded by existing roadways like Clovis Avenue, Minnewawa Avenue, and Church Avenue that has existing bike lanes, existing sidewalks, and class 1 trails. Implementation of the City's Active Transportation Plan, will help the project achieve its travel demand reduction.

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 would include development of 17 single unit residential homes. Vehicular access to each home would be provided with individual driveways with direct access onto Laurite Avenue. The project site and surrounding local roads, and circulation pattern allows for multiple access points to Minnewawa Avenue, Church Avenue and Clovis Avenue.

The majority of traffic flow occurs on East Laurite Avenue. Project improvements to East Laurite Avenue include construction of sidewalk to connect the proposed residential homes to the existing roadways, to ensure connectivity of pedestrian and alternative transportation infrastructure in the study area. The proposed project would not include any sharp curves or other roadway design elements that would create dangerous conditions. In addition, the project design features would be required to comply with standards set by the City's General Plan and City Engineer. In addition, the proposed project would also be required to submit plans to the FFD for review and approval prior to the issuance of building permits to ensure there are no substantial hazards associated with the project design. The project would not alter pedestrian or vehicle access to the project site or introduce incompatible design features or

equipment that would substantially increase the risk of hazards. Therefore, the project would not substantially increase hazards due to a design feature, and the impact would be **no impact**.

d) Result in inadequate emergency access?

The proposed project would include construction of single unit homes, roadways, sidewalks, sewer, water, and associated utilities. Vehicular access to each home would be provided with individual driveways with direct access onto Laurite Avenue. The project site and surrounding local roads, and circulation pattern allows for multiple access points to Minnewawa Avenue, Church Avenue and Clovis Avenue.

Emergency vehicles would have access to the project site via the existing roadway network. Further, the proposed project's site plan would be subject to review and approval by the FFD to ensure the project includes adequate emergency access. In addition, as discussed in Section IX, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, project implementation would not physically interfere with emergency evacuation or the FFD access to and from the project site. Emergency vehicles would have access to the project site via Laurite Ave, and emergency access would not be modified as a result of the proposed project. Furthermore, roads adjacent to the project site would not require closure during project construction. Therefore, the impact would be **no impact**.

Mitigation Measures
There are no mitigation measures relative to Transportation impacts.

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:				

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

Based on the Cultural and Historical Resources Assessment prepared for the proposed project by Peak & Associates, Inc. dated October 27, 2021, refer to Appendix A, there are no known Native American resources in the project site that are 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).

As previously discussed in Section V, Cultural Resources, the project site does not contain historical resources listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in any local listing for Fresno County or the City of Fresno. Furthermore, the area surrounding the project site does not contain any listed historical resources. As a result, a **less-than-significant impact** would occur.

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

The State requires lead agencies to consider the potential effects of proposed projects and consult with California Native American tribes during the local planning process for the purpose of protecting Traditional Tribal Cultural Resources through the CEQA Guidelines. Pursuant to PRC Section 21080.3.1, the lead agency shall begin consultation with the California Native American tribe that is traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographical area of the proposed project. Such significant cultural resources are either sites, features, places, cultural landscapes, sacred places, and objects with cultural value to a tribe which is either on or eligible for inclusion in the California Historic Register or local historic register, or, the lead agency, at its discretion, and supported by substantial evidence, choose to treat the resources as a Tribal Cultural Resources (PRC Section 21074(a)(1-2)).

Additional information may also be available from the California Native American Heritage Commission's Sacred Lands File per PRC Section 5097.96 and the California Historical Resources Information System administered by the California Office of Historic Preservation. Please also note that PRC Section 21082.3(c) contains provisions specific to confidentiality.

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).

Assembly Bill (AB) 52, which became law January 1, 2015, requires that, as part of the CEQA review process, public agencies provide early notice of a project to California Native American Tribes to allow for consultation between the tribe and the public agency. The purpose of AB 52 is to provide the opportunity for public agencies and tribes to consult and consider potential impacts to Tribal Cultural Resources (TCR's), as defined by the Public Resources Code (PRC) Section

2107(a). Under AB 52, public agencies shall reach out to California Native American Tribes who have requested to be notified of projects in areas within or which may have been affiliated with their tribal geographic range. Pursuant to Assembly Bill 52 (AB 52), the Table Mountain Rancheria Tribe and the Dumna Wo Wah Tribe were invited to consult. A certified letter was mailed to the above-mentioned tribes on March 1, 2023. The 90-day comment period ended on May 31, 2023. Neither tribe requested consultation.

Based on the Cultural and Historical Resources Assessment prepared for the proposed project by Peak & Associates, Inc., there are no known Native American resources in the project site that are 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). Additionally, no specific tribal cultural resources were identified in the project site as a result of Native American consultation conducted for the project per AB 52 and SB 18.

As such, the project would not 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 that is 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).

If any artifacts are inadvertently discovered during ground-disturbing activities, existing federal, State, and local laws and regulations would require construction activities to cease until such artifacts are properly examined and determined not to be of significance by a qualified cultural resource professional. In addition, Mitigation Measures CULTL-1, CULTL-2 and CULTL-3 included above in Section V, Cultural Resources, would apply to the project and would reduce potential impacts to unknown archaeological historical resources to **less than significant with mitigation incorporated**.

Mitigation Measures

1. **Mitigation Measure CULTL-1**

   If previously unknown resources are encountered before or during grading activities, construction shall stop in the immediate vicinity of the find and a qualified historical resources specialist shall be consulted to determine whether the resource requires further study. The qualified historical resources specialist shall make recommendations to the City on the measures that shall be implemented to protect the discovered resources, including but not limited to excavation of the finds and

evaluation of the finds in accordance with Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines and the City's Historic Preservation Ordinance.

If the resources are determined to be unique historical resources as defined under Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines, measures shall be identified by the monitor and recommended to the Lead Agency. Appropriate measures for significant resources could include avoidance or capping, incorporation of the site in green space, parks, or open space, or data recovery excavations of the finds.

No further grading shall occur in the area of the discovery until the Lead Agency approves the measures to protect these resources. Any historical artifacts recovered as a result of mitigation shall be provided to a City-approved institution or person who is capable of providing long-term preservation to allow future scientific study.

2. Mitigation Measure CULTL-2

Subsequent to a preliminary City review of the project grading plans, if there is evidence that a project will include excavation or construction activities within previously undisturbed soils, a field survey and literature search for prehistoric archaeological resources shall be conducted. The following procedures shall be followed.

If prehistoric resources are not found during either the field survey or literature search, excavation and/or construction activities can commence. In the event that buried prehistoric archaeological resources are discovered during excavation and/or construction activities, construction shall stop in the immediate vicinity of the find and a qualified archaeologist shall be consulted to determine whether the resource requires further study. The qualified archaeologist shall make recommendations to the City on the measures that shall be implemented to protect the discovered resources, including but not limited to excavation of the finds and evaluation of the finds in accordance with Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines. If the resources are determined to be unique prehistoric archaeological resources as defined under Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines, mitigation measures shall be identified by the monitor and recommended to the Lead Agency. Appropriate measures for significant resources could include avoidance or capping, incorporation of the site in green space, parks, or open space, or data recovery excavations of the finds. No further grading shall occur in the area of the discovery until the Lead Agency approves the measures to protect these resources. Any prehistoric archaeological artifacts recovered as a result of mitigation shall be provided to a City-approved institution or person who is capable of providing long-term preservation to allow future scientific study.

If prehistoric resources are found during the field survey or literature review, the resources shall be inventoried using appropriate State record forms and submit the forms to the Southern San Joaquin Valley Information Center. The resources shall be evaluated for significance. If the resources are found to be significant, measures shall be identified by the qualified archaeologist. Similar to above, appropriate mitigation measures for significant resources could include avoidance or capping, incorporation of the site in green space, parks, or open space, or data recovery excavations of the finds. In addition, appropriate mitigation for excavation and construction activities in the vicinity of the resources found during the field survey or literature review shall include an archaeological monitor. The monitoring period shall be determined by the qualified archaeologist. If additional prehistoric archaeological resources are found during excavation and/or construction activities, the procedure identified above for the discovery of unknown resources shall be followed.

3. Mitigation Measure CULTL-3

In the event that human remains are unearthed during excavation and grading activities of any future development project, all activity shall cease immediately. Pursuant to Health and Safety Code (HSC) Section 7050.5, no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition pursuant to PRC Section 5097.98(a). If the remains are determined to be of Native American descent, the coroner shall within 24 hours notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). The NAHC shall then contact the most likely descendent of the deceased Native American, who shall then serve as the consultant on how to proceed with the remains. Pursuant to PRC Section 5097.98(b), upon the discovery of Native American remains, the landowner shall ensure that the immediate vicinity, according to generally accepted cultural or archaeological standards or practices, where the Native American human remains are located is not damaged or disturbed by further development activity until the landowner has discussed and conferred with the most likely descendants regarding their recommendations, if applicable, taking into account the possibility of multiple human remains. The landowner shall discuss and confer with the descendants all reasonable options regarding the descendants' preferences for treatment.

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?

As identified in the Project Description, utilities required to serve the proposed project would include water, sanitary sewer, storm water drainage, electricity, natural gas, and telecommunications infrastructure.

Potable Water. The proposed project would require connection to the existing 8-inch water main located along East Laurite Avenue.

Short-term demand for water may occur during excavation, grading, and construction activities on site. Construction activities would require water primarily for dust suppression purposes. Water from the existing potable water lines in the vicinity of the project site would be used. Overall, short-term construction activities would require minimal water and are not expected to have any adverse impacts on the existing water system or available water supplies. The proposed project would not require the construction of new or expanded water conveyance, treatment, or collection facilities with respect to construction activities.

The City of Fresno relies on water supplies from groundwater from the North Kings Subbasin; surface water from Central Valley Project (CVP), through a contract with the United States Bureau of Reclamation (USBR); Kings River water, through a contract with Fresno Irrigation District (FID); and recycled water. According to the Urban Water Management Plan dated July 2021, the City of Fresno has a groundwater yield of 132,480 Acre-Feet Per Year (AFY) as of 2020, with an anticipated groundwater yield of 143,630 by 2030, 60,000 AFY of USBR surface water supplies (under normal year conditions), 131,600 AFY of FID diversions through 2030, 5,910 AFY of recycled Water through 2030, for a combined 341,140 AFY of water supplies through 2030.

Based on the nature of the proposed project as a smaller subdivision made up of only 17 single-unit residences, and the planned residential land use designation for the site being known at the time of adoption of the current General Plan and UWMP, the project-generated increase in water demand would be minimal and would fall within the City's existing capacity and available supply. As such, the proposed project would not necessitate new or expanded water entitlements, and the City would be able to accommodate the increased demand for potable water. As such, the proposed project would not necessitate new or expanded water entitlements, and the City would be able to accommodate the increased demand for potable water.

Wastewater. Wastewater services would also be provided by the City. No significant

increase in wastewater flows is anticipated as a result of construction activities on the project site. Sanitary services during construction would be provided by portable toilet facilities, which transport waste off site for treatment and disposal.

In addition, wastewater generation associated with operation of the proposed project is not anticipated to exceed wastewater treatment requirements or exceed the available capacity to accommodate the increased wastewater flows from the proposed project. The proposed project would not generate a substantial amount of wastewater and would be adequately served by the capacity and the existing wastewater conveyance system. As such, the proposed project would not necessitate new or expanded water entitlements, and the City would be able to accommodate the increased demand for potable water.

The Department of Public Utilities has determined that adequate sanitary sewer and water services would be available to serve the proposed project subject to the payment of any applicable connection charges and/or fees and extension of services in a manner which is compliant with the Department of Public Utilities standards, specifications, and policies.

Stormwater and Drainage Facilities. Impacts to storm drainage facilities have been previously discussed in Section X, Hydrology and Water Quality. FMFCD's existing facilities have the capacity to accommodate the project storm water runoff from the proposed 17 lot residential subdivision. The proposed project does not require construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or the expansion of existing facilities.

The construction storm drainage facilities would be required to comply with the City's grading plan check process, the FMFCD Storm Drainage and Flood Control Master Plan (SDFCMP), and requirements of the NPDES General Construction Permit. As such, construction of storm drainage facilities for the proposed project would be consistent with construction and design standards for the City, and the impact would be less than significant.

Electricity, Natural Gas, and Telecommunication Facilities. Electric power, natural gas, and telecommunication facilities would require connections to the project site. However, because the project site is located within an urbanized area with existing facilities located in Laurite Avenue, connection to these facilities would not cause significant environmental effects.

Summary. The proposed project would not require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded facilities for water, wastewater treatment, storm drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications which could cause significant environmental effects. 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?

As discussed above, the Department of Public Utilities would supply water to the project site. Based on the 2020 Urban Water Management Plan, the water supplies for the City (341,140 AFY through 2030) are adequate to accommodate the demand in the City through 2030 (i.e., 212,756 AFY) and beyond. The proposed project would be consistent with the land uses identified in the General Plan and would therefore be covered by the City's water supply projections. As a result, there would be sufficient water supply for the project, and the impact 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?

As discussed above, the Department of Public Utilities would provide sewer services and wastewater treatment to the project site. The nearest sanitary sewer main to serve the Project is an 8-inch sewer main located in East Laurite Avenue. Installation of separate sewer service branch(es) shall be required to each lot.

The proposed project is not expected to exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board. The City of Fresno owns and operates two wastewater treatment facilities. They are the Fresno/Clovis Regional Wastewater Reclamation Facility and the North Fresno Wastewater Reclamation Facility. The RWRF currently has a capacity of 91.5 million gallons per day (mgd). The North Facility has a capacity of 0.71 mgd. The proposed project is not expected to exceed the capacity of existing wastewater-related services and facilities. Therefore, the impact 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?

Garbage disposed in the City of Fresno is taken to the Cedar Avenue Recycling and Transfer Station. Once trash has been off-loaded at the transfer station, it is sorted, and non-recyclable solid waste is loaded onto large trucks and taken to the American Avenue Landfill located approximately 6 miles southwest of Kerman.

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

29,358,535 cubic yards, with an estimated closure date of August 31, 2031. The maximum permitted throughput is 2,200 tons per day.[13]

Other landfills within the County of Fresno include the Clovis Landfill (City of Clovis Landfill 10-AA-0004) with a maximum remaining permitted capacity of 7,740,000 cubic yards, a maximum permitted throughput of 2,000 tons per day, and an estimated closure date of 2047.[14]

The California Integrated Waste Management Act (AB 939, Sher, Chapter 1095, Statutes of 1989 as amended [IWMA]) made all California cities, counties, and approved regional solid waste management agencies responsible for enacting plans and implementing programs to divert 25 percent of their solid waste by 1995 and 50 percent by year 2000. Later legislation mandates the 50 percent diversion requirement be achieved every year.

In addition, the California Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen) requires diversion of at least 65% of the construction and demolition waste generated during most "new construction" projects.

Construction and Demolition (C&D) Materials includes the following (asphalt, concrete, masonry, drywall, insulation, carpet/carpet padding, tile, metals, plastic, wood, glass, cardboard, pallets, and yard trimmings).

The City of Fresno's C&D recycling program helps the City comply with AB 939, by requiring contractors to submit all recycling and landfill tickets as part of the projects building permit process during construction. Each projects building permits needs to show proof of diverting and recycling 65% of the projects C&D materials. During construction the project will be required to comply with the City's C&D recycling program.

According to CalRecycle, residential land uses generate approximately 12.23 lbs/household/day. Operation of the proposed project would generate approximately 208 pounds of solid waste per day or about 37.9 tons of solid waste per year. Given the available capacity at the landfills, the additional solid waste generated by the proposed project is not anticipated to cause the facility to exceed its daily permitted capacity. As such, the project would be served by a landfill with sufficient capacity to accommodate the project's waste disposal needs, and impacts associated with the disposition of solid waste would be **less than significant**.

---

[13] CalRecycle. Available online at: https://www2.calrecycle.ca.gov/SolidWaste/Site/Summary/352 (accessed _May 31, 2023_)

[14] CalRecycle. Available online at: https://www2.calrecycle.ca.gov/SolidWaste/Site/Summary/347 (accessed _May 31, 2023_)

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

The proposed project would be serviced by the City Department of Utilities solid waste collection. The City of Fresno complies with all state requirements in providing solid waste disposal services. As discussed above, the project would also comply with Cal Green, the City's Construction and Demolition (C&D) Waste Management Guide, and other waste management policies The proposed project would dispose of waste in accordance with applicable federal, state, and local recycling, reduction, and waste requirements and policies. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste, and the impact would be **less than significant**.

Mitigation Measures
There are no mitigation measures relative to Utilities and Service Systems impacts.

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XX. WILDFIRE – If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:				
a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				X
b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?				X

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?				X
d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?				X

DISCUSSION

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

Wildland fires occur in geographic areas that contain the types and conditions of vegetation, topography, weather, and structure density susceptible to risks associated with uncontrolled fires that can be started by lightning, improperly managed campfires, cigarettes, sparks from automobiles, and other ignition sources. According to the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE) Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (VHFHSZ) Map for Fresno County, the project site is not located within a Very or High Fire Hazard Severity Zone.

The proposed project would result in the construction of 17 single unit residential homes and associated infrastructure in an urban area of the City of Fresno. The proposed project would not result in the construction of any elements that may impair emergency access to the site or emergency evacuation in the project area. Emergency vehicles would have access to the project site via E. Laurite Avenue. Furthermore, the proposed project's site plan would be subject to review and approval by the FFD to ensure the project includes adequate emergency access. As a result, project implementation would not physically interfere with evacuation plans or FFD

access to and from the project site. Moreover, since the project site is not located in or near a VHFHSZ nor is it located in or near a State Responsibility Area (SRA), potential impacts associated with emergency access described above would not pertain to wildfire and would more likely be associated with an urban fire or other emergency situations.

The proposed project would not interfere with any emergency evacuation routes within the City of Fresno or an adopted emergency response plan. The project site would not require the alteration of any existing roadways. Therefore, the impact would be **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 project site is in an urban area and is not located within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (VHFHSZ).[15] The project site does not possess physical characteristics that would exacerbate wildfire risks. Therefore, the proposed project would not exacerbate wildfire risks and potentially expose project occupants to pollutants from a wildfire. The impact would be **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?

Utility and infrastructure improvements included as part of the project are described in Section XIX, Utilities and in the Project Description. The project site is not located in or near a VHFHSZ nor is it located in or near an SRA. Utility installations would not exacerbate fire risk due to the location of the project site in an urban area outside of a designated fire hazard zone.

The project site is located in a developed area of the City of Fresno, and it would not require the installation or maintenance of infrastructure that would increase the risk of fire or result in temporary or ongoing environmental impacts, outside of what is already implemented according to City plans. As a result, **no impact** would occur.

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?

15 California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE). 2008. Fresno County Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones in LRA. Available online at: https://osfm.fire.ca.gov/divisions/wildfire-planning-engineering/wildland-hazards-building-codes/fire-hazard-severity-zones-maps/ (accessed _March 10, 2023_)

Landslides and other forms of mass wasting, including mud flows, debris flows, and soil slips, occur as soil moves downslope under the influence of gravity. Landslides are frequently triggered by intense rainfall or seismic shaking but can also occur as a result of erosion and downslope runoff caused by rain following a fire. As previously discussed in Section VII, Geology and Soils, the City of Fresno is located within an area that consists of mostly flat topography within the Central Valley. Accordingly, there is no risk of large landslides in the majority of the City. In addition, the project site is generally level and would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects associated with landslides. As discussed in Section X, Hydrology and Water Quality, the project would not alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area or increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site. Further, as stated previously, the project site is not located in or near a VHFHSZ nor is it located in or near a SRA.

The project site is located on a relatively flat area and is not located adjacent to any hills. In general, the potential for land sliding or slope failure in Fresno is very low and the project site would not be susceptible to landslides. The project site is also not located on a flood hazard zone and would not be susceptible to flooding because of post-fire drainage changes. As discussed above, the project is not located within a VHFHSZ. Therefore, the proposed project would not expose people or structures to significant risks, and **no impact** would occur.

Mitigation Measures

There are no mitigation measures relative to Wildfire impacts.

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?

Refer to discussions in Section IV, Biological Resources and Section V, Cultural Resources. The project site has no biological, wetlands, or habitat. The project site is highly disturbed and does not support any protected species or plants. Therefore, the proposed project would not: 1) degrade the quality of the environment; 2) substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species; 3) cause a fish or wildlife species population to drop below self-sustaining levels; 4) threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community; 5) reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal; or 6) eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history. Therefore, this impact would have **no impact**.

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

The proposed project's impacts would be individually limited and not cumulatively considerable due to the site-specific nature of the potential impacts. The potentially significant impacts that can be reduced to less-than-significant levels with implementation of recommended mitigation measures include the topics of Aesthetics, Air Quality, Cultural Resources, Geology and Soils, and Tribal Cultural Resources. These impacts would primarily be related to construction-period activities, would be temporary in nature, and would not substantially contribute to any potential cumulative impacts associated with these topics.

Implementation of mitigation measures AES-1, AES-2, and AES-3, AIR-1, CULTL-1, CULTL-2, CULTL-3, and GEO-1 would ensure that the impacts of the project would be below established thresholds of significance. Since the proposed project would not result in any significant project-level impacts, the proposed project would not result in any significant impacts that would combine with the impacts of other cumulative projects to result in a cumulatively considerable impact on the environment as a result of project development. As such, this impact would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

For the topic(s) of Agriculture and Forestry Resources, Biological Resources, Energy, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Hydrology and Water Quality, Land Use and Planning, Mineral Resources, Noise, Population and Housing, Public Services, Recreation, Transportation, Utilities and Service Systems, and Wildfire, the project would have no impacts or less-than-significant impacts, and therefore the project would not substantially contribute to any potential cumulative impacts for these topics.

All environmental impacts that could occur as a result of the proposed project would be reduced to a less-than-significant level through the implementation of the mitigation measures recommended in this document. Implementation of these measures would ensure that the impacts of the project would be below established thresholds of significance and that these impacts would not combine with the impacts of other cumulative projects to result in a cumulatively considerable impact on the environment as a result of project development. Therefore, this impact would be **less than significant with mitigations incorporated**.

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

The proposed project's potential to result in environmental effects that could directly or indirectly impact human beings have been evaluated in this Initial Study. Implementation of mitigation measure AIR-1 would ensure that the impacts of the project would be below established thresholds of significance. Since the proposed project would not result in any significant project-level impacts, with implementation of the recommended mitigation measures, all environmental effects that could adversely affect human beings would be **less than significant with mitigation incorporated.**

Appendix A
Cultural Study Peak and Associates

Appendix B
Biological & Wetland Report Argonaut

Appendix C
CALEEMOD Report

Appendix D
Trip Generation Letter