

## Exhibit F

Addendum to the Subsequent Environmental Impact  
Report for the  
**Copper River Ranch Project**

Prepared for:

City of Fresno  
Development and Resource Management Department  
2600 Fresno Street  
Fresno, CA 93721  
(559) 621-8044  
Contact: Israel Trejo, Supervising Planner

Prepared by:



Crawford & Bowen Planning, Inc.  
113 N. Church Street, Suite 310  
Visalia, CA 93291  
(559) 840-4414

Contact: Travis Crawford, AICP

March 13, 2024

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION ONE – INTRODUCTION .....	1
1.1 Addendum Purpose .....	1
1.2 Environmental Analysis and Conclusions .....	1
1.3 Incorporation by Reference .....	2
1.4 Addendum Process .....	2
SECTION TWO – PROJECT DESCRIPTION .....	3
2.1 Location and Setting.....	3
2.2 Original Project Description.....	3
SECTION THREE – CEQA CHECKLIST .....	4
3.1 Checklist Evaluation Categories .....	5
3.2 Environmental Analysis .....	6

## SECTION ONE – INTRODUCTION

This environmental document is an Addendum to the *Copper River Ranch Project* (Approved Project) Subsequent Environmental Impact Report (SEIR), certified on December 9, 2021 (State Clearinghouse (2000021003), by the City of Fresno.

In order to clarify the timing of installation of Project traffic signals, the City has determined that an Addendum should be prepared to the previous Project SEIR. As demonstrated in this Addendum, there will be no additional impacts and the SEIR continues to serve as the appropriate document addressing the environmental impacts of these changes, pursuant to California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

### 1.1 Addendum Purpose

When a proposed project is changed, there are changes in environmental setting, or new information becomes available, a determination must be made by the Lead Agency as to whether an Addendum or Subsequent EIR or MND is prepared. CEQA Guidelines Sections 15162 and 15164 sets forth criteria to assess which environmental document is appropriate. The criteria for determining whether an Addendum or Subsequent EIR is prepared are outlined below. If the criteria below are true, then an Addendum is the appropriate document:

- No new significant impacts will result from the project or from new mitigation measures.
- No substantial increase in the severity of environment impact will occur.
- No new feasible alternatives or mitigation measures that would reduce impacts previously found not to be feasible have, in fact been found to be feasible.

Based upon the information provided in Section Three of this document, the new Project information will not result in new significant impacts or substantially increase the severity of impacts previously identified in the EIR, and there are no previously infeasible alternatives that are now feasible. None of the other factors set forth in Section 15162(a)(3) are present.

As such, an Addendum is appropriate, and this Addendum has been prepared to address the environmental effects of the modified Project.

### 1.2 Environmental Analysis and Conclusions

The previously Approved Project was evaluated under CEQA with a Subsequent EIR that was certified in 2021. This Addendum addresses the environmental effects associated with the Project

to determine if there are any new or increased environmental impacts due to implementation of the Project within the current regulatory and environmental setting. The conclusions of the analysis in this Addendum remain consistent with those made in the original SEIR. No new significant impacts will result, and no substantial increase in severity of impacts will result from those previously identified in the EIR.

### 1.3 Incorporation by Reference

In compliance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15150, this Addendum has incorporated by reference the *Copper River Ranch Project* Subsequent EIR certified on December 9, 2021 (State Clearinghouse #2000021003). Information from this document incorporated by reference into this Addendum have been briefly summarized in the appropriate section(s) which follow, and the relationship between the incorporated part of the referenced document and this Addendum has been described. The documents and other sources which have been used in the preparation of this Addendum can be found as footnotes in the sections where they are referenced.

### 1.4 Addendum Process

As described in Section 1.1, an addendum to a certified EIR may be prepared if only minor technical changes or additions are necessary or none of the conditions described in Section 15162 calling for the preparation of a subsequent EIR or negative declaration have occurred.<sup>1</sup> An addendum need not be circulated for public review but can be included in or attached to the Final EIR or Negative Declaration.<sup>2</sup> The decision-making body shall consider the addendum with the final EIR or adopted negative declaration prior to making a decision on the project.<sup>3</sup> Once adopted, the Addendum, along with the original EIR or Negative Declaration, is placed in the Administrative Record, and the CEQA process is complete. A copy of the Addendum will be transmitted to the State Clearinghouse.

---

<sup>1</sup> CEQA Guidelines, Section 15164(a)

<sup>2</sup> CEQA Guidelines, Section 15164(c)

<sup>3</sup> CEQA Guidelines Section 15164(d)

## SECTION TWO – PROJECT DESCRIPTION

### 2.1 Location and Setting

The Copper River Ranch Project consists of two areas of development. The first consists of adding approximately 109 acres to the Copper River Ranch development that were not included in the original 2003 Copper River Ranch FEIR. The second consists of proposed land use designation changes within the existing 706.5 acre Copper River Ranch Development.

The existing Copper River Ranch development area consists of approximately 706.5 acres situated generally between Friant Road, Copper Avenue, Willow Avenue and Silaxo Road. The existing development has been building out / developed since the original EIR was approved in 2003. The area consists of residential housing, commercial establishments, a golf course, parks/trails and related improvements.

The proposed new areas of development that were assessed by the SEIR, will occur on approximately 109 acres adjacent and east of the existing Copper River Ranch footprint. The new 109-acre development area has been mostly disturbed (graded, disced, or developed) and supports residential development, portions of a golf course, and disturbed land with patches of ruderal vegetation. The proposed new development area is surrounded by residential development to the north; residential development, portions of a golf course, and disturbed land to the south; orchards, residential development, portions of a golf course, and disturbed land to the east; and residential development, commercial development, portions of a golf course, and disturbed land to the west. Refer to Chapter Two – Project Description in the SEIR for more information.

### 2.2 Original Project Description

The approved Copper River Ranch Project modified certain General Plan designations to reflect both the actual built out conditions of Copper River Ranch today and to identify any proposed land use designations and zone districts that are planned for the future. The changes to land use designations and zone districts will facilitate various subdivisions of land for residential development. The tentative tract maps pertaining to the approved Copper River Ranch Project include: Vesting Tentative Tract Map Nos. 6238, 6246, 6248, 6250 and 6269 and other developments within the subject area. The approved Copper River Ranch Project will occur within the original 706 acres as well as the additional 109 acres.

The approved Copper River Ranch Project will facilitate the construction of up to 3,216 total residential units within the proposed Development. Thus, the total number of “new” units at full buildout beyond what was analyzed in the 2003 FEIR is 379 additional units. The additional 379 units is derived by taking the difference between the 2003 FEIR total buildout (2,837 units) and the proposed number of units (3,216). Although only 379 units are being added to the development, the SEIR evaluated the impacts of all 3,216 units. Refer to Chapter Two – Project Description of the Draft SEIR for the full breakdown of the proposed land use changes.

### New Information

The City has determined that the timing of improvements to five intersections will be modified from the Conditions of Approval and/or Development Agreement referenced in the certified SEIR. These intersections are as follows:

- Willow Avenue at Alicante Drive
- Millbrook Avenue at Olympic Avenue
- Cedar Avenue at Olympic Avenue
- Chestnut Avenue at Behymer Avenue
- Sommerville Avenue at Chestnut Avenue

There are no proposed or anticipated changes to the intensity, density, or nature of the approved Copper River Ranch Project and there are no proposed or anticipated changes to construction or operational activities of the Project. The proposed changes contemplated by this addendum are limited to changes in the construction timing of already anticipated infrastructure improvements. The Conditions of Approval and/or Development Agreement will be modified to reflect the changes shown in the attached Traffic Memorandum, dated January 17, 2024 (Attachment A). Refer to Section XVII – Transportation herein for the specific information regarding each intersection. There are no changes to the SEIR mitigation measures or SEIR traffic analysis. The changes involve clarification to the timing of improvements to the intersections.

## SECTION THREE – CEQA CHECKLIST

The purpose of the checklist is to evaluate the categories in terms of any changed condition (e.g., changed circumstances, project changes, or new information of substantial importance) that may result in a

changed environment result (e.g., a new significant impact or substantial increase in the severity of a previously identified significant effect).<sup>4</sup>

The questions posed in the checklist come from Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines. A “no” answer does not necessarily mean that there are no potential impacts relative to the environmental category, but that there is no change in the condition or status of the impact since it was analyzed and addressed with mitigation measures in the EIR prepared for the project. These environmental categories might be answered with a “no” in the checklist, since the proposed project does not introduce changes that would result in modification to the conclusion of the certified EIR.

### 3.1 Checklist Evaluation Categories

**Conclusion in Prior EIR** – This column provides a cross reference to the section of the EIR where the conclusion may be found relative to the environmental issue listed under each topic.

**Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?** – Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a)(1), this column indicates whether the changes represented by the revised project will result in new significant environmental impacts not previously identified or mitigated by the EIR, or whether the changes will result in a substantial increase in the severity of a previously identified significant impact.

**New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?** – Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a)(2), this column indicates where there have been substantial changes with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken that will require major revisions to the EIR, due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects.

**New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?** – Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a)(3)(a-d), this column indicates whether new information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time of the previous EIR was certified as complete.

**Certified EIR Mitigation Measures** – Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a)(3), this column indicates whether the EIR provides mitigation measures to address effects in the related impact category.

---

<sup>4</sup> CEQA Guidelines Section 15162



### 3.2 Environmental Analysis

As explained in Section One, this comparative analysis has been undertaken pursuant to the provisions of CEQA Sections 15162 and 15164 to provide the City with the factual basis for determining whether any changes in the project, any changes in circumstances, or any new information since the EIR was certified require additional environmental review or preparation of a Subsequent EIR to the EIR previously prepared.

# I. AESTHETICS

Environmental Issue Area	Certified EIR Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Certified EIR Mitigation Measures
<i>Would the project:</i>					
a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	Less Than Significant.	<b>No.</b> There are no identified scenic vistas in the area.	<b>No.</b> There are no identified scenic vistas in the area.	<b>No.</b> There are no identified scenic vistas in the area.	None.
b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	Less Than Significant.	<b>No.</b> There are no scenic resources in the project area.	<b>No.</b> There are no scenic resources in the project area.	<b>No.</b> There are no scenic resources in the project area.	None.
c. In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?	Less Than Significant with Mitigation.	<b>No.</b> The project would not substantially degrade site existing visual character.	<b>No.</b> The project would not substantially degrade site existing visual character.	<b>No.</b> The project would not substantially degrade site existing visual character.	AES - 1

d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	Less Than Significant with Mitigation.	<b>No.</b> The project would not create a source of substantial light or glare.	<b>No.</b> The project would not create a source of substantial light or glare.	<b>No.</b> The project would not create a source of substantial light or glare.	AES – 2 AES – 3 AES – 4 AES – 5 AES - 6
---	--	---	---	---	---

## DISCUSSION

The previously certified EIR determined that the proposed Project would have less than significant impacts with mitigation to aesthetic resources. No additional construction or operational activities will occur other than as stated in the certified EIR. There are no changes to the Project that would cause an increase in impacts beyond what was previously analyzed. Therefore, the Project impact remains less than significant.

## FINAL EIR MITIGATION MEASURES

AES – 1, AES – 2, AES – 3, AES – 4, AES – 5, AES - 6

## CONCLUSION

The conclusions from the SEIR remain unchanged.

## II. AGRICULTURAL AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

Environmental Issue Area	Certified EIR Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Certified EIR Mitigation Measures
<i>Would the project:</i>					
a. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency to non-agricultural use?	No Impact.	<b>No.</b> The project will not remove any land from agricultural production.	<b>No.</b> The project will continue to not remove any land from agricultural production.	<b>No.</b> The proposed project remains the same concerning agricultural resources.	None.
b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	No Impact.	<b>No.</b> The project will not remove any land from agricultural production.	<b>No.</b> The project will not remove any land from agricultural production.	<b>No.</b> The proposed project remains the same concerning agricultural resources.	None.
c. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?	No Impact.	<b>No.</b> The project will not remove any land from agricultural production.	<b>No.</b> The project will not remove any land from agricultural production.	<b>No.</b> The proposed project remains the same concerning agricultural resources.	None.
d. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	No Impact.	<b>No.</b> There is no forest land on site.	<b>No.</b> There is no forest land on site.	<b>No.</b> There is no forest land on site.	None.
e. Involve other changes in the existing	Less Than Significant	<b>No.</b> The project will	<b>No.</b> The project will	<b>No.</b> The project will	AG - 1

<b>Environmental Issue Area</b>	<b>Certified EIR Conclusion</b>	<b>Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?</b>	<b>New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?</b>	<b>New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?</b>	<b>Certified EIR Mitigation Measures</b>
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?	with Mitigation.	not remove any land from agricultural production.	not remove any land from agricultural production.	not remove any land from agricultural production.	

## DISCUSSION

The previously certified EIR determined that the proposed Project would have less than significant impacts with mitigation to agricultural or forestry resources. The site is within the City limits of Fresno and is designated and zoned for a variety of urban uses including residential, commercial, office, open space, golf course and related uses. No additional construction or operational activities will occur other than as stated in the certified EIR. There are no changes to the Project that would cause an increase in impacts beyond what was previously analyzed. Therefore, there remains less than significant.

## FINAL EIR MITIGATION MEASURES

AG - 1

## CONCLUSION

The Project will have continue to have less than significant impacts on agricultural or forestry resources.

### III. AIR QUALITY

Environmental Issue Area	Certified EIR Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Certified EIR Mitigation Measures
<i>Would the project:</i>					
a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	Significant and unavoidable.	<b>No.</b> The project would not create new significant increases in air emissions that would conflict or obstruct implementation of an available air quality plan.	<b>No.</b> The project would not create new significant increases in air emissions that would conflict or obstruct implementation of an available air quality plan.	<b>No.</b> The project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard.	AIR - 1
b. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?	Significant and Unavoidable	<b>No.</b> The project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard.	<b>No.</b> The project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard.	<b>No.</b> The project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard.	AIR – 1 2.3.1-a 2.3-.1-b 2.3.2-a 2.3.2-b
c. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.	Less Than Significant Impact.	<b>No.</b> The project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial	<b>No.</b> The project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial	<b>No.</b> The project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial	None.

Environmental Issue Area	Certified EIR Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Certified EIR Mitigation Measures
		pollutant concentrations.	pollutant concentrations.	pollutant concentrations.	
d. Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?	Less Than Significant Impact.	<b>No.</b> The project would not result in other emissions that would affect a substantial number of people.	<b>No.</b> The project would not result in other emissions that would affect a substantial number of people.	<b>No.</b> The project would not result in other emissions that would affect a substantial number of people.	None.

## DISCUSSION

The previously certified EIR determined that the proposed Project would have a significant and unavoidable impact on air quality. No additional construction or operational activities will occur other than as stated in the certified EIR. There are no changes to the Project that would cause an increase in impacts beyond what was previously analyzed. Therefore, the impact remains significant and unavoidable.

## FINAL EIR MITIGATION MEASURES

AIR – 1, 2.3.1-a, 2.3-1-b, 2.3.2-a, 2.3.2-b

## CONCLUSION

The conclusions from the EIR remain unchanged.

## IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Environmental Issue Area	Certified EIR Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Certified EIR Mitigation Measures
<i>Would the project:</i>					
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?	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation.	<b>No.</b> There are no changes to the Project description that would result in an increase in biological impacts from the previous EIR.	<b>No.</b> There are no changes to the Project description that would result in an increase in biological impacts from the previous EIR.	<b>No.</b> There are no changes to the Project description that would result in an increase in biological impacts from the previous EIR.	BIO - 1 BIO - 2
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 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	No Impact.	<b>No.</b> The site does not contain any biologically unique or riparian habitat.	<b>No.</b> The site does not contain any biologically unique or riparian habitat.	<b>No.</b> The site does not contain any biologically unique or riparian habitat.	None.
c. Have a substantial adverse effect on state or 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?	No Impact.	<b>No.</b> The site does not contain any wetlands or other waters that would be impacted.	<b>No.</b> The site does not contain any wetlands or other waters that would be impacted.	<b>No.</b> The site does not contain any wetlands or other waters that would be impacted.	None.
d. Interfere substantially with the movement of	Less than significant	<b>No.</b> The project will not	<b>No.</b> The project will not	<b>No.</b> The project will not	BIO - 3



<b>Environmental Issue Area</b>	<b>Certified EIR Conclusion</b>	<b>Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?</b>	<b>New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?</b>	<b>New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?</b>	<b>Certified EIR Mitigation Measures</b>
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?	with Mitigation.	interfere with any fish or wildlife movement or corridors.	interfere with any fish or wildlife movement or corridors.	interfere with any fish or wildlife movement or corridors.	
e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	No impact.	<b>No.</b> No additional construction is proposed.	<b>No.</b> No additional construction is proposed.	<b>No.</b> No additional construction is proposed.	None.
f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	No Impact.	<b>No.</b> The Project is not subject to any adopted biological conservation plans.	<b>No.</b> The Project is not subject to any adopted biological conservation plans.	<b>No.</b> The Project is not subject to any adopted biological conservation plans.	None.

## DISCUSSION

The previously certified EIR determined that the proposed Project would have less than significant impacts with mitigation on biological resources. No additional construction or operational activities will occur other than as stated in the certified EIR. There are no changes to the Project that would cause an increase in impacts beyond what was previously analyzed. Therefore, the impact remains less than significant.

## FINAL EIR MITIGATION MEASURES

BIO – 1, BIO – 2, BIO – 3

## CONCLUSION

The conclusions from the EIR remain unchanged.

## V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

Environmental Issue Area	Certified EIR Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Certified Mitigation Measures
<i>Would the project:</i>					
a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?	Less Than Significant with Mitigation.	<b>No.</b> There are no known historic or archaeological resources exist on site.	<b>No.</b> There are no known historic or archaeological resources exist on site.	<b>No.</b> There are no known historic or archaeological resources exist on site.	CUL - 1
b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	Less Than Significant with Mitigation.	<b>No.</b> The project will not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource.	<b>No.</b> The project will not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource.	<b>No.</b> The project will not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource.	CUL - 1
c. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	Less Than Significant with Mitigation.	<b>No.</b> The project will not disturb any human remains.	<b>No.</b> The project will not disturb any human remains.	<b>No.</b> The project will not disturb any human remains.	CUL - 2

## DISCUSSION

The previously certified EIR determined that the proposed Project would have less than significant impacts with mitigation on cultural resources. No additional construction or operational activities will occur other than as stated in the certified EIR. There are no changes to the Project that would cause an increase in impacts beyond what was previously analyzed. Therefore, the impact remains less than significant.

## FINAL EIR MITIGATION MEASURES

CUL - 1, CUL - 2

## CONCLUSION

The conclusions from the EIR remain unchanged.

## VI. ENERGY

Environmental Issue Area	Certified EIR Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Certified EIR Mitigation Measures
<i>Would the project:</i>					
a. Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?	Less Than Significant.	<b>No.</b> The Project will not result in inefficient or wasteful use of energy during construction or operation.	<b>No.</b> The Project will not result in inefficient or wasteful use of energy during construction or operation.	<b>No.</b> The Project will not result in inefficient or wasteful use of energy during construction or operation.	None.
b. Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	Less Than Significant.	<b>No.</b> The Project does not conflict with any applicable energy use plans.	<b>No.</b> The Project does not conflict with any applicable energy use plans.	<b>No.</b> The Project does not conflict with any applicable energy use plans.	None.

## DISCUSSION

The previously certified EIR determined that the proposed Project would have less than significant impacts on energy. No additional construction or operational activities will occur other than as stated in the certified EIR. There are no changes to the Project that would cause an increase in impacts beyond what was previously analyzed. Therefore, the impact remains less than significant.

## FINAL EIR MITIGATION MEASURES

None.

## CONCLUSION

The conclusions from the original EIR remain unchanged.

## VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Environmental Issue Area	Certified EIR Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Certified EIR Mitigation Measures
<i>Would the project:</i>					
a. Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:					
i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	Less Than Significant Impact.	<b>No.</b> The project would not be exposed to fault rupture. However, current building code regulations will be required to be implemented to address potential ground shaking.	<b>No.</b> The project would not be exposed to fault rupture. However, current building code regulations will be required to be implemented to address potential ground shaking.	<b>No.</b> The project would not be exposed to fault rupture. However, current building code regulations will be required to be implemented to address potential ground shaking.	None.
ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?	Less Than Significant.	<b>No.</b> The project would not increase exposure to risks associated with strong seismic ground shaking. However, current	<b>No.</b> The project would not increase exposure to risks associated with strong seismic ground shaking. However, current building code	<b>No.</b> The project would not increase exposure to risks associated with strong seismic ground shaking. However, current building code	None.

Environmental Issue Area	Certified EIR Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Certified EIR Mitigation Measures
		building code regulations will be required to be implemented to address potential ground shaking.	regulations will be required to be implemented to address potential ground shaking.	regulations will be required to be implemented to address potential ground shaking.	
iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	Less Than Significant.	<b>No.</b> The project would not increase exposure to seismic-related ground failure including liquefaction.	<b>No.</b> The project would not increase exposure to seismic-related ground failure including liquefaction.	<b>No.</b> The project would not increase exposure to seismic-related ground failure including liquefaction.	None.
iv. Landslides?	Less Than Significant.	<b>No.</b> The project would not increase exposure to landslides.	<b>No.</b> The project would not increase exposure to landslides.	<b>No.</b> The project would not increase exposure to landslides.	None.
b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	Less Than Significant.	<b>No.</b> The project would not result in soil erosion or the loss of topsoil.	<b>No.</b> The project would not result in soil erosion or the loss of topsoil.	<b>No.</b> The project would not result in soil erosion or the loss of topsoil.	None.
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	Less Than Significant Impact.	<b>No.</b> The project would not increase exposure to risks associated with unstable	<b>No.</b> The project would not increase exposure to risks associated with unstable geologic units or soils.	<b>No.</b> The project would not increase exposure to risks associated with unstable geologic units or soils.	None.

Environmental Issue Area	Certified EIR Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Certified EIR Mitigation Measures
spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?		geologic units or soils.			
d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the most recently adopted Uniform Building Code creating substantial risks to life or property?	Less Than Significant.	<b>No.</b> The project would not increase exposure to risks associated with expansive soil.	<b>No.</b> The project would not increase exposure to risks associated with expansive soil.	<b>No.</b> The project would not increase exposure to risks associated with expansive soil.	None.
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?	Less Than Significant Impact.	<b>No.</b> The project would not implement septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems.	<b>No.</b> The project would not implement septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems.	<b>No.</b> The project would not implement septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems.	None.
f. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	Less Than Significant with Mitigation.	<b>No.</b> The project would not destroy a paleontological resource or geologic feature.	<b>No.</b> The project would not destroy a paleontological resource or geologic feature.	<b>No.</b> The project would not destroy a paleontological resource or geologic feature.	CUL - 1

## DISCUSSION

The previously certified EIR determined that the proposed Project would have less than significant impacts with mitigation on geology and soils. No additional construction or operational activities will occur other than as stated in the certified EIR. There are no changes to the Project that would cause an increase in impacts beyond what was previously analyzed. Therefore, the impact remains less than significant.



## FINAL EIR MITIGATION MEASURES

### CUL - 1

## CONCLUSION

The conclusions from the EIR remain unchanged.

## VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Environmental Issue Area	Certified EIR Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Certified EIR Mitigation Measures
<i>Would the project:</i>					
a. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	Less Than Significant.	<b>No.</b> The project would not generate a significant amount of greenhouse gas emissions.	<b>No.</b> The project would not generate a significant amount of greenhouse gas emissions.	<b>No.</b> The project would not generate a significant amount of greenhouse gas emissions.	None.
b. Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	Less Than Significant.	<b>No.</b> The project would not conflict with an applicable GHG reduction plan.	<b>No.</b> The project would not conflict with an applicable GHG reduction plan.	<b>No.</b> The project would not conflict with an applicable GHG reduction plan.	None.

### DISCUSSION

The previously certified EIR determined that the proposed Project would have less than significant impacts on greenhouse gas emissions. No additional construction or operational activities will occur other than as stated in the certified EIR. There are no changes to the Project that would cause an increase in impacts beyond what was previously analyzed. Therefore, the impact remains less than significant.

### FINAL EIR MITIGATION MEASURES

None.

### CONCLUSION

The conclusions from the EIR remain unchanged.

## IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Environmental Issue Area	Certified EIR Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Certified EIR Mitigation Measures
<i>Would the project:</i>					
a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	Less Than Significant.	<b>No.</b> The project would not create new or increased impact involving hazardous materials.	<b>No.</b> The project would not create new or increased impact involving hazardous materials.	<b>No.</b> The project would not create new or increased impact involving hazardous materials.	None.
b. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	Less Than Significant with Mitigation.	<b>No.</b> The project would not create additional significant hazard to the public or environmental through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions.	<b>No.</b> The project would not create additional significant hazard to the public or environmental through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions.	<b>No.</b> The project would not create additional significant hazard to the public or environmental through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions.	2.10.8-a
c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	Less Than Significant.	<b>No.</b> There continues to be no school within one-quarter mile of the site.	<b>No.</b> There continues to be no school within one-quarter mile of the site.	<b>No.</b> There continues to be no school within one-quarter mile of the site.	None.
d. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	Less Than Significant.	<b>No.</b> The project is not designated as a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5.	<b>No.</b> The project is not designated as a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5.	<b>No.</b> The project is not designated as a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5.	None.
e. For a project located within an airport land	Less Than Significant.	<b>No.</b> The project is not within an	<b>No.</b> The project is not within an	<b>No.</b> The project is not within an	None.

Environmental Issue Area	Certified EIR Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Certified EIR Mitigation Measures
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?		airport land use plan area.	airport land use plan area.	airport land use plan area.	
f. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	Less Than Significant.	<b>No.</b> The project would not impair emergency evacuation or response.	<b>No.</b> The project would not impair emergency evacuation or response.	<b>No.</b> The project would not impair emergency evacuation or response.	None.
g. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?	Less Than Significant.	<b>No.</b> The project site is not located in an area susceptible to extreme fire hazards or wildland fires.	<b>No.</b> The project site is not located in an area susceptible to extreme fire hazards or wildland fires.	<b>No.</b> The project site is not located in an area susceptible to extreme fire hazards or wildland fires.	None.

## DISCUSSION

The previously certified EIR determined that the proposed Project would have less than significant impacts with mitigation on hazards and hazardous materials. No additional construction or operational activities will occur other than as stated in the certified EIR. There are no changes to the Project that would cause an increase in impacts beyond what was previously analyzed. Therefore, the impact remains less than significant.

## FINAL EIR MITIGATION MEASURES

### 2.10.8-a CONCLUSION

The conclusions from the EIR remain unchanged.

## X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Environmental Issue Area	Certified EIR Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Certified EIR Mitigation Measures
<i>Would the project:</i>					
a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation.	<b>No.</b> The project would not violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements.	<b>No.</b> The project would not violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements.	<b>No.</b> The project would not violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements.	HYD – 1
b. Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation.	<b>No.</b> The project would not substantially deplete groundwater resources or impair groundwater recharge.	<b>No.</b> The project would not substantially deplete groundwater resources or impair groundwater recharge.	<b>No.</b> The project would not substantially deplete groundwater resources or impair groundwater recharge.	HYD – 2A HYD – 2B 2.9.1-a 2.9.1-c 2.9.1-d 2.9.1-e 2.9.2-a 2.9.2-b 2.9.2-c 2.9.3-a 2.9.3-b 2.9.3-c 2.9.4-a 2.9.6-a
c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would:					
i. result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	Less than Significant Impact.	<b>No.</b> The project would not substantially alter the existing site drainage pattern and it would not alter	<b>No.</b> The project would not substantially alter the existing site drainage pattern and it would not alter	<b>No.</b> The project would not substantially alter the existing site drainage pattern and it would not alter	None.

Environmental Issue Area	Certified EIR Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Certified EIR Mitigation Measures
		the course of a stream or river or result in erosion or siltation on or off site.	the course of a stream or river or result in erosion or siltation on or off site.	the course of a stream or river or result in erosion or siltation on or off site.	
ii. substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	Less than Significant Impact.	<b>No.</b> The project would not substantially increase the rate of runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off- site.	<b>No.</b> The project would not substantially increase the rate of runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off- site.	<b>No.</b> The project would not substantially increase the rate of runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off- site.	None.
iii. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation.	<b>No.</b> The project would not increase the rate of runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off- site.	<b>No.</b> The project would not increase the rate of runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off- site.	<b>No.</b> The project would not increase the rate of runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off- site.	HYD - 3
iv. Impede or redirect flood flows?	Less than Significant Impact.	<b>No.</b> The project would not impede or redirect flood flows.	<b>No.</b> The project would not impede or redirect flood flows.	<b>No.</b> The project would not impede or redirect flood flows.	None.
d. In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	No Impact.	<b>No.</b> The project would not release pollutants due to project inundation.	<b>No.</b> The project would not release pollutants due to project inundation.	<b>No.</b> The project would not release pollutants due to project inundation.	None.
e. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable	Less than Significant Impact.	<b>No.</b> The project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water	<b>No.</b> The project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water	<b>No.</b> The project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water	None.

Environmental Issue Area	Certified EIR Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Certified EIR Mitigation Measures
groundwater management plan?		quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan.	quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan.	quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan.	

## DISCUSSION

The previously certified EIR determined that the proposed Project would have less than significant impacts with mitigation on hydrology and water quality. No additional construction or operational activities will occur other than as stated in the certified EIR. There are no changes to the Project that would cause an increase in impacts beyond what was previously analyzed. Therefore, the impact remains less than significant.

## FINAL EIR MITIGATION MEASURES

HYD – 1, HYD – 2A, HYD – 2B, HYD – 3, 2.9.1-a, 2.9.1-c, 2.9.1-d, 2.9.1-e, 2.9.2-a, 2.9.2-b, 2.9.2-c, 2.9.3-a, 2.9.3-b, 2.9.3-c, 2.9.4-a, 2.9.6-a

## CONCLUSION

The conclusions from the EIR remain unchanged.

## XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING

Environmental Issue Area	Certified EIR Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Certified EIR Mitigation Measures
<i>Would the project:</i>					
a. Physically divide an established community?	Less Than Significant	<b>No.</b> The project would not divide an established community.	<b>No.</b> The project would not divide an established community.	<b>No.</b> The project would not divide an established community.	None.
b. Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	<b>No.</b> The project is consistent with the allowable land use.	<b>No.</b> The project is consistent with the allowable land use.	<b>No.</b> The project is consistent with the allowable land use.	2.1.7-a

## DISCUSSION

The previously certified EIR determined that the proposed Project would have less than significant impacts with mitigation on land use and planning. No additional construction or operational activities will occur other than as stated in the certified EIR. There are no changes to the Project that would cause an increase in impacts beyond what was previously analyzed. Therefore, the impact remains less than significant.

## FINAL EIR MITIGATION MEASURES

2.1.7-a

## CONCLUSION

The conclusions from the EIR remain unchanged.



## XII. MINERAL RESOURCES

Environmental Issue Area	Certified EIR Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Certified EIR Mitigation Measures
<i>Would the project:</i>					
a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	No Impact.	<b>No.</b> The project would not result in the loss of known mineral resources.	<b>No.</b> The project would not result in the loss of known mineral resources.	<b>No.</b> The project would not result in the loss of known mineral resources.	None.
b. Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	No Impact.	<b>No.</b> The project would not result in the loss of known mineral resources.	<b>No.</b> The project would not result in the loss of known mineral resources.	<b>No.</b> The project would not result in the loss of known mineral resources.	None.

## DISCUSSION

The previously certified EIR determined that the proposed Project would have no impact on mineral resources. No additional construction or operational activities will occur other than as stated in the certified EIR. There are no changes to the Project that would cause an increase in impacts beyond what was previously analyzed. Therefore, there remains no impact.

## FINAL EIR MITIGATION MEASURES

None.

## CONCLUSION

The conclusions from the EIR remain unchanged.

### XIII. NOISE

Environmental Issue Area	Certified EIR Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Certified EIR Mitigation Measures
<i>Would the project:</i>					
a. Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in the ambient noise levels in vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	Significant and Unavoidable.	<b>No.</b> The project would not expose persons to or generate noise levels in excess of standards established by applicable local, regional or national regulations.	<b>No.</b> The project would not expose persons to or generate noise levels in excess of standards established by applicable local, regional or national regulations.	<b>No.</b> The project would not expose persons to or generate noise levels in excess of standards established by applicable local, regional or national regulations.	NOI – 1 2.6.2-a 2.6.3-a 2.6.4-a
b. Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	Less Than Significant.	<b>No.</b> The project would not expose persons to excessive groundborne vibration.	<b>No.</b> The project would not expose persons to excessive groundborne vibration.	<b>No.</b> The project would not expose persons to excessive groundborne vibration.	None.
c. For a project located within a private airstrip or 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?	No Impact.	<b>No.</b> The project is not within the established airport noise contour.	<b>No.</b> The project is not within the established airport noise contour.	<b>No.</b> The project is not within the established airport noise contour.	None.

### DISCUSSION

The previously certified EIR determined that the proposed Project would have a significant and unavoidable impact on noise. No additional construction or operational activities will occur other than as stated in the certified EIR. There are no changes to the Project that would cause an increase in impacts beyond what was previously analyzed. Therefore, the impact remains significant and unavoidable.

## FINAL EIR MITIGATION MEASURES

NOI – 1, 2.6.2-a, 2.6.3-a, 2.6.4-a

## CONCLUSION

The conclusions from the EIR remain unchanged.

## XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING

Environmental Issue Area	Certified EIR Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Certified EIR Mitigation Measures
<i>Would the project:</i>					
a. Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	Less Than Significant.	<b>No.</b> The project would not induce substantial growth in the project area.	<b>No.</b> The project would not induce substantial growth in the project area.	<b>No.</b> The project would not induce substantial growth in the project area.	None.
b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	No Impact.	<b>No.</b> The project will not displace existing housing.	<b>No.</b> The project will not displace existing housing.	<b>No.</b> The project will not displace existing housing.	None.

## RESPONSES

The previously certified EIR determined that the proposed Project would have less than significant impacts on population and housing. No additional construction or operational activities will occur other than as stated in the certified EIR. There are no changes to the Project that would cause an increase in impacts beyond what was previously analyzed. Therefore, the impact remains less than significant.

## FINAL EIR MITIGATION MEASURES

None.

## CONCLUSION

The conclusions from the EIR remain unchanged.

## XV. PUBLIC SERVICES

Environmental Issue Area	Certified EIR Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Certified EIR Mitigation Measures
<i>Would the project:</i>					
a. Would the project 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?	Less Than Significant with Mitigation.	<b>No.</b> The project would not result in a need for new or expanded fire protection facilities.	<b>No.</b> The project would not result in a need for new or expanded fire protection facilities.	<b>No.</b> The project would not result in a need for new or expanded fire protection facilities.	PUB - 1 2.10.1-a 2.10.2-a 2.10.2-b 2.10.2-c
Police protection?	Less Than Significant with Mitigation.	<b>No.</b> The project would not result in a need for new or expanded police protection facilities.	<b>No.</b> The project would not result in a need for new or expanded police protection facilities.	<b>No.</b> The project would not result in a need for new or expanded police protection facilities.	PUB - 1 2.10.1-a 2.10.1-b 2.10.1-c 2.10.1-d
Schools?	Less Than Significant with Mitigation.	<b>No.</b> The project would not result in a need for new or	<b>No.</b> The project would not result in a need for new or	<b>No.</b> The project would not result in a need for new or	PUB - 1

		expanded school facilities.	expanded school facilities.	expanded school facilities.	
Parks?	Less Than Significant with Mitigation.	<b>No.</b> The project would not result in a need for new or expanded park facilities.	<b>No.</b> The project would not result in a need for new or expanded park facilities.	<b>No.</b> The project would not result in a need for new or expanded park facilities.	PUB – 1 REC - 1
Other public facilities?	Less Than Significant with Mitigation.	<b>No.</b> The project would not result in a need for new or expanded other facilities.	<b>No.</b> The project would not result in a need for new or expanded other facilities.	<b>No.</b> The project would not result in a need for new or expanded other facilities.	2.10.9-a

## DISCUSSION

The previously certified EIR determined that the proposed Project would have less than significant impacts with mitigation on public services. No additional construction or operational activities will occur other than as stated in the certified EIR. There are no changes to the Project that would cause an increase in impacts beyond what was previously analyzed. Therefore, the impact remains less than significant.

## FINAL EIR MITIGATION MEASURES

PUB – 1, 2.10.1-a, 2.10.1-b, 2.10.1-c, 2.10.1-d, 2.10.2-a, 2.10.2-b, 2.10.2-c, 2.10.9-a, REC – 1

## CONCLUSION

The conclusions from the EIR remain unchanged.

## XVI. RECREATION

Environmental Issue Area	Certified EIR Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Certified EIR Mitigation Measures
<i>Would the project:</i>					
a. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	Less Than Significant with Mitigation.	<b>No.</b> The project would not result in the deterioration of an existing park.	<b>No.</b> The project would not result in the deterioration of an existing park.	<b>No.</b> The project would not result in the deterioration of an existing park.	REC – 1 2.10.5-b
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?	Less Than Significant with Mitigation.	<b>No.</b> The project would not result in a need for new or expanded park facilities.	<b>No.</b> The project would not result in a need for new or expanded park facilities.	<b>No.</b> The project would not result in a need for new or expanded park facilities.	REC – 1 2.10.5-b

## DISCUSSION

The previously certified EIR determined that the proposed Project would have less than significant impacts with mitigation on recreation. No additional construction or operational activities will occur other than as stated in the certified EIR. There are no changes to the Project that would cause an increase in impacts beyond what was previously analyzed. Therefore, the impact remains less than significant.

## FINAL EIR MITIGATION MEASURES

REC – 1, 2.10.5-b

## CONCLUSION

The conclusions from the EIR remain unchanged.

## XVII. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

Environmental Issue Area	Certified EIR Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Certified EIR Mitigation Measures
<i>Would the project:</i>					
a. Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?	Less Than Significant with Mitigation.	<b>No.</b> The project would not conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy regarding the circulation system.	<b>No.</b> The project would not conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy regarding the circulation system.	<b>No.</b> The project would not conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy regarding the circulation system.	TRA – 1 TRA – 2 2.2.1-a 2.2.1-c
b. Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	Less Than Significant with Mitigation.	<b>No.</b> The project would not conflict with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b).	<b>No.</b> The project would not conflict with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b).	<b>No.</b> The project would not conflict with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b).	TRA – 3
c. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	Less Than Significant.	<b>No.</b> The project would not increase hazards due to a design feature.	<b>No.</b> The project would not increase hazards due to a design feature.	<b>No.</b> The project would not increase hazards due to a design feature.	None.
d. Result in inadequate emergency access?	Less Than Significant.	<b>No.</b> The project would not result in inadequate emergency access.	<b>No.</b> The project would not result in inadequate emergency access.	<b>No.</b> The project would not result in inadequate emergency access.	None.

## DISCUSSION

The previously certified EIR determined that the proposed Project would have a less than significant impact with mitigation on transportation. No additional construction or operational activities will occur other than as stated in the certified EIR.



The City has determined that the timing of improvements to five intersections has been modified from the Conditions of Approval and/or Development Agreement referenced in the SEIR. These intersections are as follows:

- Willow Avenue at Alicante Drive
- Millbrook Avenue at Olympic Avenue
- Cedar Avenue at Olympic Avenue
- Chestnut Avenue at Behymer Avenue
- Sommerville Avenue at Chestnut Avenue

There are no changes to the SEIR mitigation measures or SEIR traffic analysis. The changes involve clarification of the timing of improvements to the intersections as indicated in the numbered list below and in the attached Traffic Memorandum, dated January 17, 2024 (Attachment A). The Conditions of Approval and/or Development Agreement will be modified to reflect the updated conditions as follows:

1. This project shall pay its Traffic Signal Mitigation Impact (TSMI) Fee per the Master Fee Schedule at the time of building permit.

The TSMI fee facilitates project impact mitigation to the City of Fresno Traffic Signal infrastructure so that costs are applied to each new project/building based on the generated ADT. The TSMI fee is credited against traffic signal installation/modifications and/or Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) improvements (constructed at their ultimate location) that plan to build out the General Plan Circulation Element and are included in the Nexus Study for the TSMI fee. If the project is conditioned with traffic signal improvements in excess of their TSMI fee amount, the applicant may apply for fee credits (security/bonding and/or developer agreement required) and/or reimbursement for work in excess of their fee as long as the infrastructure is in place at the ultimate location. The applicant should work with the Public Works Department and identify, with a Professional Engineers estimate, the costs associated with the improvements prior to paying the TSMI fee to determine any applicable fee credits and/or reimbursements.

For project specific impacts that are not consistent with the General Plan, Public Works Standards, and/or are not incorporated into the TSMI fees, the infrastructure costs will not be eligible. Failure to pay this fee or construct improvements that are credited/reimbursable with this fee will result in a significant unmitigated impact as this fee is applied to all projects within the City Sphere of Influence.

Improvements at the following study intersections are included in the TSMI fee program:

- Willow Avenue at Alicante Drive
  - Millbrook Avenue at Olympic Avenue
  - Cedar Avenue at Olympic Avenue
  - Chestnut Avenue at Behymer Avenue
  - Sommerville Avenue at Chestnut Avenue
2. This project shall pay its Fresno Major Street Impact (FMSI) Fee, which will be determined at time of building permit. This FMSI fee is creditable towards major street roadway improvements included in the nexus study for the FMSI fee.
  3. The project shall pay the Regional Transportation Mitigation Fee (RTMF). Pay the RTMF fee to the Joint Powers Agency located at 2035 Tulare Street, Suite 201, Fresno, CA 93721; (559) 233-4148, ext. 200; [www.fresnocog.org](http://www.fresnocog.org). Provide proof of payment or exemption, based on vesting rights, prior to issuance of building permits.
  4. The proposed project shall pay the \$525 Traffic Study review fee for review of the document. Proof of payment shall be provided to the Traffic Operations and Planning Division.
  5. The proposed project shall install a traffic signal with protected left-turn phasing per City of Fresno standards at the intersection of Chestnut Avenue and Behymer Avenue prior to the occupancy of building permits for development of the proposed project generating up to 950 average daily trips (ADT) of the 32,452 ADT projected to be generated by the remaining build out of the project (See Remaining to be Built 2020 in Table above). This improvement will improve the crossing conditions for students. The traffic signal poles shall be installed in the ultimate location and may require the acquisition of right-of-way. The intersection shall be constructed to include the following configuration:
    - Eastbound – one (1) left-turn lane, two (2) through lanes and one (1) right-turn lane
    - Westbound – one (1) left-turn lane, two (2) through lanes and one (1) right-turn lane
    - Northbound – one (1) left-turn lane, one (1) through lane and one (1) right-turn lane
    - Southbound – one (1) left-turn lane, one (1) through lane and one (1) right-turn lane
    - Bike lanes shall be provided in all directions
  6. The proposed project shall install a traffic signal with protected left-turn phasing per City of Fresno standards at the intersection of Cedar Avenue and Olympic Avenue prior to the occupancy of building permits for development of the proposed project generating up to 2,400 average daily trips (ADT) of the 32,452 ADT projected to be generated by the remaining build out of the project (See Remaining to be Built 2020 in Table above). This improvement will improve the crossing conditions for students. The traffic signal poles shall be installed in the ultimate

location and may require the acquisition of right-of-way. The intersection shall be constructed to include the following configuration:

- Eastbound – one (1) left-turn lane and one (1) right-turn lane
- Northbound – one (1) left-turn lane and two (2) through lanes
- Southbound –two (2) through lanes and one (1) right turn lane
- Bike lanes shall be provided in all directions

7. The proposed project shall install a traffic signal with protected left-turn phasing per City of Fresno standards at the intersection of Millbrook Avenue and Olympic Avenue prior to the occupancy of building permits for development of the proposed project generating up to 2,400 average daily trips (ADT) of the 32,452 ADT projected to be generated by the remaining build out of the project (See Remaining to be Built 2020 in Table above). This improvement will improve the crossing conditions for students. The traffic signal poles shall be installed in the ultimate location and may require the acquisition of right-of-way. The intersection shall be constructed to include the following configuration:

- Westbound – one (1) left-turn lane and one (1) right-turn lane
- Northbound –two (2) through lanes and one (1) right turn lane
- Southbound – one (1) left-turn lane and two (2) through lanes
- Bike lanes shall be provided in all directions

8. The project has proposed a full access intersection on Willow Avenue at Alicante Drive. Willow Avenue is a super arterial which allows for limited access points. All full access intersections along a super arterial shall be signalized. This intersection shall be modified to restrict eastbound left-turn movements. Prior to the project utilizing eastbound left-turn movements, the traffic signal at the intersection shall be operational. The traffic signal poles shall be installed in the ultimate location and may require the acquisition of right-of-way. The signalized intersection shall be constructed to include the following configuration:

- Eastbound – one (1) left-turn lane and one (1) right turn lane
- Northbound – one (1) left-turn lane and one (1) through lane
- Southbound – one (1) left-turn lane, two (2) through lanes and one (1) right-turn lane
- Bike lanes shall be provided along the west side of Willow in the southbound direction

9. The proposed project shall widen/construct Willow Avenue between Copper Avenue and Alicante Drive prior to the occupancy of building permits for development of the proposed project generating up to 20,000 average daily trips (ADT) of the 32,452 ADT projected to be generated by the remaining build out of the project (See Remaining to be Built 2020 in Table above). The segment shall be widened/constructed to include two (2) 12' travel lanes in each direction, shoulder, and a raised median island. The northbound portion of the segment should

reduce to one northbound through lane prior to the intersection of Alicante Drive, utilizing a 55 mph design speed and 55:1 taper, following a series of three Type VI lane drop arrows north of Copper Avenue. The roadway segment shall be constructed per City of Fresno standards and may require the acquisition of right-of-way. Note, the intersection of Alicante Drive and Willow Avenue shall conform to the configuration in condition #8 above.

10. The proposed project shall install a traffic signal with protected left-turn phasing per City of Fresno standards at the intersection of Chestnut Avenue and Sommerville Drive prior to the occupancy of building permits for development of the proposed project generating up to 4,800 average daily trips (ADT) of the 32,452 ADT projected to be generated by the remaining build out of the project (See Remaining to be Built 2020 in Table above). This improvement will improve the crossing conditions for students. The traffic signal poles shall be installed in the ultimate location and may require the acquisition of right-of-way. The intersection shall be constructed to include the following configuration:
  - Westbound – one (1) left-turn lane and one (1) right-turn lane
  - Northbound – one (1) left-turn lane, one (1) through lane, and one (1) shared through-right-turn lane
  - Southbound – one (1) left-turn lane and two (2) through lanes
  - Bike lanes shall be provided in all directions
11. The project has proposed a full access intersection on Willow Avenue north of Alicante. Willow Avenue is a super arterial which allows for limited access points. All full access intersections along a super arterial shall be signalized. The City is not supportive of a traffic signal or a full access intersection at this location. The intersection shall be designed and constructed to include the following configuration:
  - Eastbound – one (1) right turn lane
  - Northbound – one (1) left-turn lane, one (1) through lane
  - Southbound – one (1) through lane and one (1) right-turn lane
  - Bike lanes shall be provided along the west side of Willow in the southbound direction
12. Each entitlement of the proposed project shall be responsible for providing a trip generation study as part of its application. The trip generation study shall include the trip generation of the proposed project as well as the trip generation of all components approved at that time.
13. For additional building permit issuance, each entitlement shall provide a signed acknowledgement from the homebuyer (Residential units) or developer/tenant (Commercial units) that occupancy will not be permitted until traffic signal improvements listed on conditions #5 through #10 (Whichever are applicable) are completed. The developer of each entitlement shall have a sign installed at the entrance into each development stating, "Traffic signal improvements

coming soon to the intersection of “street” and “street” (each applicable intersection/improvement shall be listed). No occupancies or move-in(s) will be allowed until the required traffic signal improvements are completed.

14. If the above listed traffic signals are not operational by August 1, 2024, the project shall enter into a Deferral Agreement with cash deposit(s) for the remaining work and schedule for completion of work. The Deferral Agreement will allow for 100 occupancies.
15. The proposed project shall make necessary improvements and right-of-way and public easement dedications along adjacent public street(s) and within the site boundaries per City of Fresno standards/requirements.
16. The proposed site plan shall be reviewed and approved by the City of Fresno Traffic & Engineering Services Division, Land Planning & Subdivision Inspection Section.

There are no changes to the Project that would cause an increase in impacts beyond what was previously analyzed. Therefore, the impact remains less than significant.

## FINAL EIR MITIGATION MEASURES

TRA – 1, TRA – 2, TRA - 3

## CONCLUSION

The conclusions from the EIR remain unchanged.

## XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

Environmental Issue Area	Certified EIR Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Certified EIR Mitigation Measures
<i>Would the project:</i>					
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:	Less Than Significant.	<b>No.</b> There are no identified Tribal Cultural Resources in the area.	<b>No.</b> There are no identified Tribal Cultural Resources in the area.	<b>No.</b> There are no identified Tribal Cultural Resources in the area.	None.
i. Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or	Less Than Significant.	<b>No.</b> There are no structures or historical resources on the project site.	<b>No.</b> There are no structures or historical resources on the project site.	<b>No.</b> There are no structures or historical resources on the project site.	None.
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)	Less Than Significant.	<b>No.</b> There are no identified Tribal Cultural Resources in the area.	<b>No.</b> There are no identified Tribal Cultural Resources in the area.	<b>No.</b> There are no identified Tribal Cultural Resources in the area.	None.

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

## DISCUSSION

The previously certified EIR determined that the proposed Project would have a less than significant impact on tribal cultural resources. No additional construction or operational activities will occur other than as stated in the certified EIR. There are no changes to the Project that would cause an increase in impacts beyond what was previously analyzed. Therefore, the impact remains less than significant.

## FINAL EIR MITIGATION MEASURES

None.

## CONCLUSION

The conclusions from the EIR remain unchanged.

## XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Environmental Issue Area	Certified EIR Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Certified EIR Mitigation Measures
<i>Would the project:</i>					
<p>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?</p>	Less Than Significant.	<p><b>No.</b> The project would not require the relocation or construction of new or expanded utilities.</p>	<p><b>No.</b> The project would not require the relocation or construction of new or expanded utilities.</p>	<p><b>No.</b> The project would not require the relocation or construction of new or expanded utilities.</p>	<p>The mitigation measures throughout this document are also applicable to the on-site improvements associated with installation of adequate utilities.</p>
<p>b. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?</p>	Less Than Significant with Mitigation.	<p><b>No.</b> Impacts resulting from the sewer and water system extensions have been adequately analyzed.</p>	<p><b>No.</b> Impacts resulting from the sewer and water system extensions have been adequately analyzed.</p>	<p><b>No.</b> Impacts resulting from the sewer and water system extensions have been adequately analyzed.</p>	<p>HYD – 2A HYD – 2B 2.8.2-a 2.9.1-a 2.9.1-c 2.9.1-d 2.9.1-e 2.9.2-a 2.9.2-b 2.9.2-c 2.9.3-a 2.9.3-b 2.9.3-c 2.9.4-a 2.9.6-a</p>
<p>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</p>	Less Than Significant with Mitigation.	<p><b>No.</b> The project would not require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage</p>	<p><b>No.</b> The project would not require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or</p>	<p><b>No.</b> The project would not require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of</p>	<p>2.8.1-a 2.8.1-b 2.8.1-d 2.8.2-b 2.8.2-c 2.8.3-a 2.8.3-b 2.8.4-d</p>



Environmental Issue Area	Certified EIR Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Certified EIR Mitigation Measures
the provider’s existing commitments?		facilities or expansion of existing facilities.	expansion of existing facilities.	existing facilities.	2.8.5-a
d. Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?	Less Than Significant.	<b>No.</b> The project would not generate excess solid waste.	<b>No.</b> The project would not generate excess solid waste.	<b>No.</b> The project would not generate excess solid waste.	None.
e. Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statues and regulations related to solid waste?	Less Than Significant.	<b>No.</b> The project would comply with applicable statues and regulations related to solid waste.	<b>No.</b> The project would comply with applicable statues and regulations related to solid waste.	<b>No.</b> The project would comply with applicable statues and regulations related to solid waste.	None.

## DISCUSSION

The previously certified EIR determined that the proposed Project would have a less than significant impact with mitigation on utilities and service systems. No additional construction or operational activities will occur other than as stated in the certified EIR. There are no changes to the Project that would cause an increase in impacts beyond what was previously analyzed. Therefore, the impact remains less than significant.

## FINAL EIR MITIGATION MEASURES

HYD – 2A, HYD – 2B, 2.8.2-a, 2.9.1-a, 2.9.1-c, 2.9.1-d, 2.9.1-e, 2.9.2-a, 2.9.2-b, 2.9.2-c, 2.9.3-a, 2.9.3-b, 2.9.3-c, 2.9.4-a, 2.9.6-a, 2.8.1-a, 2.8.1-b, 2.8.1-d, 2.8.2-b, 2.8.2-c, 2.8.3-a, 2.8.3-b, 2.8.4-d, 2.8.5-a

## CONCLUSION

The conclusions from the EIR remain unchanged.

## XX. WILDFIRE

Environmental Issue Area	Certified EIR Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Certified EIR Mitigation Measures
<i>If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project: :</i>					
a. Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	Less Than Significant Impact.	<b>No.</b> The City has reviewed the site plan and has determined that there will be no impairment of emergency plans.	<b>No.</b> The City has reviewed the site plan and has determined that there will be no impairment of emergency plans.	<b>No.</b> The City has reviewed the site plan and has determined that there will be no impairment of emergency plans.	None.
b. Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?	Less Than Significant Impact.	<b>No.</b> The project would not exacerbate wildfire risks.	<b>No.</b> The project would not exacerbate wildfire risks.	<b>No.</b> The project would not exacerbate wildfire risks.	None.
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?	Less Than Significant Impact.	<b>No.</b> The project does not require installation of infrastructure that exacerbates wildfire risks.	<b>No.</b> The project does not require installation of infrastructure that exacerbates wildfire risks.	<b>No.</b> The project does not require installation of infrastructure that exacerbates wildfire risks.	None.
d. Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding	Less Than Significant Impact.	<b>No.</b> There are no substantial slopes or flooding risk	<b>No.</b> There are no substantial slopes or flooding risk in the area and	<b>No.</b> There are no substantial slopes or flooding risk in the area and	None.

<p>or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?</p>		<p>in the area and therefore there is no increased risk due to post-fire impacts.</p>	<p>therefore there is no increased risk due to post-fire impacts.</p>	<p>therefore there is no increased risk due to post-fire impacts.</p>	
--	--	---	---	---	--

## DISCUSSION

The previously certified EIR determined that the proposed Project would have a less than significant impact on wildfire. No additional construction or operational activities will occur other than as stated in the certified EIR. There are no changes to the Project that would cause an increase in impacts beyond what was previously analyzed. Therefore, the impact remains less than significant.

## FINAL EIR MITIGATION MEASURES

None.

## CONCLUSION

The conclusions from the EIR remain unchanged.

Attachment A

---

Traffic Memorandum

City Hall  
2600 Fresno Street, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Fresno, California 93721  
Ph. (559) 621-8800  
www.fresno.gov

Scott L. Mozier, P.E.  
Public Works Director

January 17, 2024

Israel Trejo, Supervising Planner  
Planning and Development Department  
2600 Fresno Street, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor  
Fresno, CA 93721

**SUBJECT: REVIEW OF THE UPADTED TRAFFIC IMPACT ANALYSIS REPORT DATED AUGUST 22, 2023 FOR THE COPPER RIVER RANCH DEVELOPMENT LOCATED ON THE NORTHWEST QUADRANT OF WILLOW AVENUE AND COPPER AVENUE  
TIS 23-016, P23-02992**

## **PROJECT OVERVIEW**

Traffic & Engineering Services staff has reviewed the Updated Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) Report prepared by JLB Traffic Engineering, Inc. for the proposed Copper River Ranch Development, "project". At build out, the project has proposed to have constructed the following:

- 3,278 residential units (2,429 single family & 849 multi-family)
- 254,423 square feet of mixed-use commercial uses
- Park-N-Ride lot with 27 parking spaces
- 28.80 acres of park space
- 3.30 acres of wastewater treatment plant

The Updated TIA evaluated the vehicular traffic operational analysis of five (5) intersections which the City of Fresno conditioned the project to construct traffic signals at varying levels of development. Vehicle trips projected to be generated by the project were calculated using the ITE Trip Generation Manual, 10<sup>th</sup> Edition. The following table below includes a comparison of the daily (ADT), AM and PM peak hour trips projected to be generated by proposed project as remaining to be Built (2020), Built (2020-2023), and Build Projections (2023-2025).

Land Use	Size	ADT	Weekday					
			AM Peak Hour			PM Peak Hour		
			In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total
Remaining to be Built (2020) – Included in EIR project description								
Single Family Detached Housing	1,270 DU	11,987	233	705	938	792	466	1,258
Apartments	849 DU	6,215	89	301	390	299	176	475
City Park	25.30 acres	20	1	0	1	2	1	3
Commercial	192,273 SF	14,230	464	380	844	539	583	1,122
Total		32,452	787	1,386	2,176	1,632	1,226	2,858
Built (2020-2023) – Since adoption of EIR								
Single Family Detached Housing	254 DU	2,397	48	138	186	155	96	251
Apartments	216 DU	1,581	23	76	99	76	45	121
City Park	0 acres	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Commercial	22,500 SF	1,921	68	52	120	67	76	143
Total		5,899	139	266	405	298	217	515
Build Projections (2023-2025)								
Single Family Detached Housing	240 DU	2,265	41	135	176	152	87	239
Apartments	276 DU	2,020	29	98	127	98	57	155
Commercial	38,400 SF	4,241	132	119	251	165	164	329
Total		8,526	202	352	554	415	308	723

DU = dwelling units                      SF = square feet

**GENERAL COMMENTS and CONDITIONS**

1. This project shall pay its Traffic Signal Mitigation Impact (TSMI) Fee per the Master Fee Schedule at the time of building permit.

The TSMI fee facilitates project impact mitigation to the City of Fresno Traffic Signal infrastructure so that costs are applied to each new project/building based on the generated ADT. The TSMI fee is credited against traffic signal installation/modifications and/or Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) improvements (constructed at their ultimate location) that plan to build out the General Plan Circulation Element and are included in the Nexus Study for the TSMI fee. If the project is conditioned with traffic signal improvements in excess of their TSMI fee amount, the applicant may apply for fee credits (security/bonding and/or developer agreement required) and/or reimbursement for work in excess of their fee as long as the infrastructure is in place at the ultimate location. The applicant should work with the Public Works Department and identify, with a Professional Engineers estimate, the costs associated with the improvements prior to paying the TSMI fee to determine any applicable fee credits and/or reimbursements.

For project specific impacts that are not consistent with the General Plan, Public Works Standards, and/or are not incorporated into the TSMI fees, the infrastructure costs will not be eligible. Failure to pay this fee or construct improvements that are credited/reimbursable with this fee will result in a significant unmitigated impact as this fee is applied to all projects within the City Sphere of Influence.

Improvements at the following study intersections are included in the TSMI fee program:

- Willow Avenue at Alicante Drive
  - Millbrook Avenue at Olympic Avenue
  - Cedar Avenue at Olympic Avenue
  - Chestnut Avenue at Behymer Avenue
  - Sommersville Avenue at Chestnut Avenue
2. This project shall pay its Fresno Major Street Impact (FMSI) Fee, which will be determined at time of building permit. This FMSI fee is creditable towards major street roadway improvements included in the nexus study for the FMSI fee.
  3. The project shall pay the Regional Transportation Mitigation Fee (RTMF). Pay the RTMF fee to the Joint Powers Agency located at 2035 Tulare Street, Suite 201, Fresno, CA 93721; (559) 233-4148, ext. 200; [www.fresnocog.org](http://www.fresnocog.org). Provide proof of payment or exemption, based on vesting rights, prior to issuance of building permits.
  4. The proposed project shall pay the \$525 Traffic Study review fee for review of the document. Proof of payment shall be provided to the Traffic Operations and Planning Division.
  5. The proposed project shall install a traffic signal with protected left-turn phasing per City of Fresno standards at the intersection of Chestnut Avenue and Behymer Avenue prior to the occupancy of building permits for development of the proposed project generating up to 950 average daily trips (ADT) of the 32,452 ADT projected to be generated by the remaining build out of the project (See Remaining to be Built 2020 in Table above). This improvement will improve the crossing conditions for students. The traffic signal poles shall be installed in the ultimate location and may require the acquisition of right-of-way. The intersection shall be constructed to include the following configuration:
    - Eastbound – one (1) left-turn lane, two (2) through lanes and one (1) right-turn lane
    - Westbound – one (1) left-turn lane, two (2) through lanes and one (1) right-turn lane
    - Northbound – one (1) left-turn lane, one (1) through lane and one (1) right-turn lane
    - Southbound – one (1) left-turn lane, one (1) through lane and one (1) right-turn lane
    - Bike lanes shall be provided in all directions



6. The proposed project shall install a traffic signal with protected left-turn phasing per City of Fresno standards at the intersection of Cedar Avenue and Olympic Avenue prior to the occupancy of building permits for development of the proposed project generating up to 2,400 average daily trips (ADT) of the 32,452 ADT projected to be generated by the remaining build out of the project (See Remaining to be Built 2020 in Table above). This improvement will improve the crossing conditions for students. The traffic signal poles shall be installed in the ultimate location and may require the acquisition of right-of-way. The intersection shall be constructed to include the following configuration:
  - Eastbound – one (1) left-turn lane and one (1) right-turn lane
  - Northbound – one (1) left-turn lane and two (2) through lanes
  - Southbound –two (2) through lanes and one (1) right turn lane
  - Bike lanes shall be provided in all directions
7. The proposed project shall install a traffic signal with protected left-turn phasing per City of Fresno standards at the intersection of Millbrook Avenue and Olympic Avenue prior to the occupancy of building permits for development of the proposed project generating up to 2,400 average daily trips (ADT) of the 32,452 ADT projected to be generated by the remaining build out of the project (See Remaining to be Built 2020 in Table above). This improvement will improve the crossing conditions for students. The traffic signal poles shall be installed in the ultimate location and may require the acquisition of right-of-way. The intersection shall be constructed to include the following configuration:
  - Westbound – one (1) left-turn lane and one (1) right-turn lane
  - Northbound –two (2) through lanes and one (1) right turn lane
  - Southbound – one (1) left-turn lane and two (2) through lanes
  - Bike lanes shall be provided in all directions
8. The project has proposed a full access intersection on Willow Avenue at Alicante Drive. Willow Avenue is a super arterial which allows for limited access points. All full access intersections along a super arterial shall be signalized. This intersection shall be modified to restrict eastbound left-turn movements. Prior to the project utilizing eastbound left-turn movements, the traffic signal at the intersection shall be operational. The traffic signal poles shall be installed in the ultimate location and may require the acquisition of right-of-way. The signalized intersection shall be constructed to include the following configuration:
  - Eastbound – one (1) left-turn lane and one (1) right turn lane
  - Northbound – one (1) left-turn lane and one (1) through lane
  - Southbound – one (1) left-turn lane, two (2) through lanes and one (1) right-turn lane
  - Bike lanes shall be provided along the west side of Willow in the southbound direction
9. The proposed project shall widen/construct Willow Avenue between Copper Avenue and Alicante Drive prior to the occupancy of building permits for development of the proposed project generating up to 20,000 average daily trips (ADT) of the 32,452 ADT projected to be generated by the remaining build out of the project (See Remaining to be Built 2020 in Table above). The segment shall be widened/constructed to include two (2) 12' travel lanes in each direction, shoulder, and a raised median island. The northbound portion of the segment should reduce to one northbound through lane prior to the intersection of

Alicante Drive, utilizing a 55 mph design speed and 55:1 taper, following a series of three Type VI lane drop arrows north of Copper Avenue. The roadway segment shall be constructed per City of Fresno standards and may require the acquisition of right-of-way. Note, the intersection of Alicante Drive and Willow Avenue shall conform to the configuration in condition #8 above.

10. The proposed project shall install a traffic signal with protected left-turn phasing per City of Fresno standards at the intersection of Chestnut Avenue and Sommerville Drive prior to the occupancy of building permits for development of the proposed project generating up to 4,800 average daily trips (ADT) of the 32,452 ADT projected to be generated by the remaining build out of the project (See Remaining to be Built 2020 in Table above). This improvement will improve the crossing conditions for students. The traffic signal poles shall be installed in the ultimate location and may require the acquisition of right-of-way. The intersection shall be constructed to include the following configuration:
  - Westbound – one (1) left-turn lane and one (1) right-turn lane
  - Northbound – one (1) left-turn lane, one (1) through lane, and one (1) shared through-right-turn lane
  - Southbound – one (1) left-turn lane and two (2) through lanes
  - Bike lanes shall be provided in all directions
11. The project has proposed a full access intersection on Willow Avenue north of Alicante. Willow Avenue is a super arterial which allows for limited access points. All full access intersections along a super arterial shall be signalized. The City is not supportive of a traffic signal or a full access intersection at this location. The intersection shall be designed and constructed to include the following configuration:
  - Eastbound – one (1) right turn lane
  - Northbound – one (1) left-turn lane, one (1) through lane
  - Southbound – one (1) through lane and one (1) right-turn lane
  - Bike lanes shall be provided along the west side of Willow in the southbound direction
12. Each entitlement of the proposed project shall be responsible for providing a trip generation study as part of its application. The trip generation study shall include the trip generation of the proposed project as well as the trip generation of all components approved at that time.
13. For additional building permit issuance, each entitlement shall provide a signed acknowledgement from the homebuyer (Residential units) or developer/tenant (Commercial units) that occupancy will not be permitted until traffic signal improvements listed on conditions #5 through #10 (Whichever are applicable) are completed. The developer of each entitlement shall have a sign installed at the entrance into each development stating, "Traffic signal improvements coming soon to the intersection of "street" and "street" (each applicable intersection/improvement shall be listed). No occupancies or move-in(s) will be allowed until the required traffic signal improvements are completed.

14. If the above listed traffic signals are not operational by August 1, 2024, the project shall enter into a Deferral Agreement with cash deposit(s) for the remaining work and schedule for completion of work. The Deferral Agreement will allow for 100 occupancies.
15. The proposed project shall make necessary improvements and right-of-way and public easement dedications along adjacent public street(s) and within the site boundaries per City of Fresno standards/requirements.
16. The proposed site plan shall be reviewed and approved by the City of Fresno Traffic & Engineering Services Division, Land Planning & Subdivision Inspection Section.

If you have any further questions regarding this matter, please contact me at (559) 621-8694 or [Harmanjit.Dhaliwal@fresno.gov](mailto:Harmanjit.Dhaliwal@fresno.gov) .

Sincerely,



Harmanjit Dhaliwal, PE  
Licensed Engineer Manager, Land Planning & Subdivision Inspection Section  
Public Works Department, Traffic & Engineering Services Division

C: Copy filed with Traffic Impact Study  
Nicholas D. Mascia, PE, TE, PTOE, Assistant City Manager  
Scott Mozier, PE Public Works Director  
Jill Gormley, TE Assistant Director  
Scott Tyler, PE City Traffic Engineer/Licensed Engineer Manager  
Jason Camit, Chief Surveyor