

CITY OF FRESNO
PROJECTS CONSISTENT WITH A COMMUNITY PLAN, GENERAL PLAN, OR ZONING
EXEMPTION

AMENDED AND RESTATED ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT NO.
P20-01778

THE PROJECT DESCRIBED HEREIN IS DETERMINED TO BE EXEMPT FROM THE
PREPARATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTS PURSUANT TO ARTICLE 5 OF
THE STATE CEQA GUIDELINES.

APPLICANT(S): Department of Public Works
City of Fresno
2600 Fresno Street
Fresno, CA 93721

PROJECT LOCATION: City: City of Fresno County: Fresno
County
The Mid-Town Trail project is comprised of five segments
totaling 7.1 miles of multi-purpose trail in the public right-of-
way.

Segment 1 begins at the northeast corner of North Blackstone East Shields Avenues and runs east along the north side of Shields Avenue, crossing to the south side at the main entrance to the Manchester Mall. The trail continues east along the south side of Shields Avenue and terminates at the southwest corner of North Fresno Street and East Shields Avenue.

Segment 2 begins on the southeast corner of North Fresno Street and East Shields Avenue and continues east along the north side to the Herndon Canal and terminates on the southwest corner of North First Street and East Shields Avenue.

Segment 3 begins on the southeast corner of North First Street and East Shields Avenue and continues along the north and east bank of the Herndon Canal to East McKinley

Avenue.

Segment 4 begins on the southeast corner East McKinley and North Millbrook Avenues and continues along the north bank of the Herndon Canal, east to North Clovis Avenue.

Segment 5 begins at the northwest corner of East McKinley and North Clovis Avenues and continues along the west side of North Clovis Avenue to East Shields Avenue, where the trail will terminate.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: Amended and Restated Environmental Assessment No. P20-01778 was filed by Jason Miller of the City of Fresno Department of Public Works Engineering & Design Division and pertains to the proposed Mid-Town Trail. The Mid-Town Trail project is comprised of five segments totaling 7.1 miles of multi-purpose trail in the public right-of-way.

All Mid-Town Trail segments include the installation of a multi-purpose trail, shielded trail lighting, shade trees, irrigation, way finding amenities, signage, striping, minor road work, curb & gutter, sidewalk, traffic signal modifications, utilities, and grading. Key additional elements of Segment 1 include modifications to the SR41 on/off ramps on the south side of East Shields Avenue, removal of the westbound right turn lane from the southbound SR41 on-ramp on the north side of East Shields Avenue to North Blackstone Avenue. Segment 2 also includes right-of-way acquisition at the entrance to the south bank of the Herndon Canal at North Fresno Street to provide Fresno Irrigation District (FID), PG&E and AT&T access to their respective facilities within FID right-of-way. The project requires relocation of PG&E power poles and undergrounding/relocation of AT&T data lines along the southern bank of the Herndon Canal. An access driveway at the north end of North Angus Street will provide additional FID, PG&E, and AT&T access to their respective facilities on the southern bank of the canal. Key additional elements of Segment 3 include the installation of a 12'x60' prefabricated steel truss pedestrian bridge at the Herndon Canal and Mill Ditch crossing. Segment 4 key elements include the passing of the trail under SR168 (Caltrans ROW), railroad track panel installation to facilitate FID access at North Peach Avenue and North Clovis Avenue

(San Joaquin Valley Railroad), and an airport (FAA) runway protection zone near North Clovis Avenue. Finally, Segment 5 key elements include an airport (FAA) runway protection zone near North Clovis Avenue, a Memorandum of Understanding between the City and the Airport, and an impact to Valero Gas Station's Clovis Avenue frontage (lease from the airport).

An Environmental Assessment was previously adopted by the City of Fresno on November 19, 2020, this Amended and Restated Environmental Assessment is to provide a correction to indicate that the Mid-Town Trail will be a multi-purpose trail.

This project is exempt under Section 15183 (Projects Consistent with a Community Plan, General Plan, or Zoning) of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines as follows:

CEQA Guidelines Section 15183 allows a streamlined environmental review process for projects that are consistent with the densities established by existing zoning, community plan or general plan policies for which an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) was certified. The proposed project is consistent with the land use designation and densities established by the Fresno General Plan, for which an EIR was certified (State Clearinghouse (SCH) # 2012111015).

An Environmental Checklist has been prepared to show the project's consistency with CEQA Guidelines Section 15183 Statutory Exemption. The Environmental Checklist includes a discussion and analysis of any peculiar or site-specific environmental impacts associated with construction and operation of the proposed project. The Environmental Checklist identifies the applicable City of Fresno development standards and policies that would apply to the proposed project during both the construction and operational phases, and explains how the application of these uniformly applied standards and policies would ensure that no peculiar or site-specific environmental impacts would occur.

The proposed trail (project) is consistent with Figure MT-2 of the City of Fresno General Plan. Cumulative impacts associated with development and buildout of the project, as proposed, were fully addressed in the City of Fresno MEIR (SCH# 2012111015). Since the proposed project is consistent with the trail designation and intensity identified in the General Plan and analyzed in the MEIR, implementation of the proposed project would not result in any new or altered cumulative impacts beyond those addressed in the MEIR.

The analysis in the CEQA Environmental Checklist demonstrates that there are no site-specific or peculiar impacts associated with the project, and identifies uniformly applied standards and policies that would be applied to the project. The Project Requirements identified in the attached environmental analysis include requirements that must be implemented by the proposed project in order to ensure that any site-specific impacts or construction-related impacts are reduced to a less-than-significant level. All Project Requirements identified in the attached Environmental Checklist shall be made a condition of project approval and shall be implemented within the timeframes identified.

Additional supporting evidence for why the project qualifies for the exemption is included in the attached CEQA Guidelines Section 15183 Environmental Checklist (Appendix G). Furthermore, the proposed project is not expected to have a significant effect on the environment. Accordingly, a Section 15183 Exemption (Projects Consistent with a Community Plan, General Plan, or Zoning), as noted above, has been prepared for the project.

Date: December 10, 2020

Submitted by: Marisela Martínez

Marisela Martínez, Planner
Planning and Development Department
559-621-8038

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST IN SUPPORT OF CEQA GUIDELINES

SECTION 15183

Environmental Checklist Form for:

Amended and Restated Environmental Assessment No. P20-01778

1.	Project title: Amended and Restated Environmental Assessment No. P20-01778
2.	Lead agency name and address: City of Fresno 2600 Fresno Street Fresno, CA 93721
3.	Contact person and phone number: Marisela Martinez, Planner City of Fresno Planning and Development Department (559) 621-8038
4.	Project location: City: City of Fresno County: Fresno County The Mid-Town Trail project is comprised of five segments totaling 7.1 miles of multi-purpose trail in the public right-of-way. Segment 1 begins at the northeast corner of North Blackstone and East Shields Avenues and runs east along the north side of East Shields Avenue, crossing to the south side at the main entrance to the Manchester Mall. The trail continues east along the south side of Shields Avenue and terminates at the southwest corner of North Fresno Street and East Shields Avenue. Segment 2 begins on the southeast corner of North Fresno Street and East Shields Avenue and continues east along the north side to the Herndon Canal and terminates on the southwest corner of North First Street and East Shields Avenue. Segment 3 begins on the southeast corner of North First Street and East Shields Avenue and continues along the north and east bank of the Herndon Canal to East McKinley Avenue. Segment 4 begins on the southeast corner East McKinley and North Millbrook Avenues and continues along the north bank of the Herndon Canal, east to North Clovis Avenue.

	<p>Segment 5 begins at the northwest corner of East McKinley and North Clovis Avenues and continues along the west side of North Clovis Avenue to East Shields Avenue, where the trail will terminate.</p>
5.	<p>Project sponsor's name and address:</p> <p>City of Fresno – Department of Public Works 2600 Fresno Street Fresno, California 93721</p>
6.	<p>General & Community plan land use designation:</p> <p>All segments of the Mid-Town Trail are identified in Figure MT-2 of the City of Fresno General Plan and fall within the McLane Community Plan.</p>
7.	<p>Zoning:</p> <p>The Mid-Town Trail does not pertain to a sole zoning district.</p>
8.	<p>Description of project:</p> <p>Amended and Restated Environmental Assessment No. P20-01778 was filed by Jason Miller of the City of Fresno Department of Public Works Engineering & Design Division and pertains to the proposed Mid-Town Trail. The Mid-Town Trail project is comprised of five segments totaling 7.1 miles of multi-purpose trail in the public right-of-way.</p> <p>All Mid-Town Trail segments include the installation of a multi-purpose trail, shielded trail lighting, shade trees, irrigation, way finding amenities, signage, striping, minor road work, curb & gutter, sidewalk, traffic signal modifications, utilities, and grading. Key additional elements of Segment 1 include modifications to the SR41 on/off ramps on the south side of East Shields Avenue, removal of the westbound right turn lane from the southbound SR41 on-ramp on the north side of East Shields Avenue to North Blackstone Avenue. Segment 2 also includes right-of-way acquisition at the entrance to the south bank of the Herndon Canal at North Fresno Street to provide Fresno Irrigation District (FID), PG&E and AT&T access to their respective facilities within FID right-of-way. The project requires relocation of PG&E power poles and undergrounding/relocation of AT&T data lines along the southern bank of the Herndon Canal. An access driveway at the north end of North Angus Street will provide additional FID, PG&E, and AT&T access to their respective facilities on the southern bank of the canal. Key additional elements of Segment 3 include the installation of a 12'x60' prefabricated steel truss pedestrian bridge at the Herndon Canal and Mill Ditch crossing. Segment 4 key elements include the passing of the trail under SR168 (Caltrans ROW), railroad track panel installation to facilitate FID access at North Peach Avenue and North Clovis Avenue (San Joaquin Valley</p>

	<p>Railroad), and an airport (FAA) runway protection zone near North Clovis Avenue. Finally, Segment 5 key elements include an airport (FAA) runway protection zone near North Clovis Avenue, a Memorandum of Understanding between the Fresno Yosemite International Airport and the City of Fresno, City of Fresno, and an impact to Valero Gas Station’s Clovis Avenue frontage (lease from the airport).</p> <p>An Environmental Assessment was previously adopted by the City of Fresno on November 19, 2020, this Amended and Restated Environmental Assessment is to provide a correction to indicate that the Mid-Town Trail will be a multi-purpose trail.</p>
9.	<p>Surrounding land uses and setting:</p> <p>The Mid-Town Trail is surrounded by various planned land uses and is located in an urban setting.</p>
10.	<p>Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement):</p> <p>Planning and Development Department; Department of Public Works; Department of Public Utilities; Fresno Irrigation District; Westlands Water District; Fresno Yosemite International Airport; Department of Transportation (CalTrans); Fresno County; San Joaquin Valley Railroad (SJVRR); Federal Aviation Administration.</p>
11.	<p>Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 21080.3.1? If so, has consultation begun?</p> <p>The State requires lead agencies to consider the potential effects of proposed projects and consult with California Native American tribes during the local planning process for the purpose of protecting Traditional Tribal Cultural Resources through the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines. Pursuant to PRC Section 21080.3.1, the lead agency shall begin consultation with the California Native American tribe that is traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographical area of the proposed project. Such significant cultural resources are either sites, features, places, cultural landscapes, sacred places, and objects with cultural value to a tribe which is either on or eligible for inclusion in the California Historic Register or local historic register, or, the lead agency, at its discretion, and support by substantial evidence, choose to treat the resources as a Tribal Cultural Resources (PRC Section 21074(a)(1-2)). According to the most recent census data, California is home to 109 currently recognized Indian tribes. Tribes in California currently have nearly 100 separate reservations or</p>

<p>Rancherias. Fresno County has a number of Rancherias such as Table Mountain Rancheria, Millerton Rancheria, Big Sandy Rancheria, Cold Springs Rancheria, and Squaw Valley Rancheria. These Rancherias are not located within the city limits.</p> <p>As stated in PRC Section 21080.3.1, California Native American tribes are required to be contacted by the lead agency prior to the release of a negative declaration, mitigated negative declaration, or environmental impact report. The City of Fresno has determined the proposed project is exempt from CEQA pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15183 and the proposed project does not warrant a negative declaration, mitigated negative declaration, or environmental impact report. Thus, the lead agency is not required to conduct tribal consultation pursuant to PRC Section 21080.3.1.</p>
--

PREVIOUS ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSES OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT

One previous environmental analysis has been prepared and certified which is applicable to the proposed project. On December 18, 2014, the City adopted a new General Plan and certified the associated Master EIR (MEIR) (State Clearinghouse (SCH) # 2012111015). The proposed project is consistent with the Figure MT-2 of the Fresno General Plan. The MEIR assumed full development and buildout of the project site, consistent with the uses and development standards proposed by the project. The cumulative impacts associated with buildout of the City of Fresno General Plan, including the project site, were fully addressed in the MEIR.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15183

CEQA Guidelines Section 15183 allows a streamlined environmental review process for projects that are consistent with the densities established by existing zoning, community plan or general plan policies for which an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) was certified. As noted above, the proposed project is consistent with the Fresno General Plan, for which an EIR was certified. The provisions contained in Section 15183 of the CEQA Guidelines are presented below.

15183. Projects Consistent with a Community Plan or Zoning

- (a) CEQA mandates that projects which are consistent with the development density established by existing zoning, community plan, or general plan policies for which an EIR was certified shall not require additional environmental review, except as might be necessary to examine whether there are project-specific significant effects which are peculiar to the project or its site. This streamlines the review of such projects and reduces the need to prepare repetitive environmental studies.*

- (b) In approving a project meeting the requirements of this section, a public agency shall limit its examination of environmental effects to those which the agency*

determines, in an initial study or other analysis:

- (1) Are peculiar to the project or the parcel on which the project would be located,*
- (2) Were not analyzed as significant effects in a prior EIR on the zoning action, general plan, or community plan, with which the project is consistent,*
- (3) Are potentially significant off-site impacts and cumulative impacts which were not discussed in the prior EIR prepared for the general plan, community plan or zoning action, or*
- (4) Are previously identified significant effects which, as a result of substantial new information which was not known at the time the EIR was certified, are determined to have a more severe adverse impact than discussed in the prior EIR.*

(c) If an impact is not peculiar to the parcel or to the project, has been addressed as a significant effect in the prior EIR, or can be substantially mitigated by the imposition of uniformly applied development policies or standards, as contemplated by subdivision (e) below, then an additional EIR need not be prepared for the project solely on the basis of that impact.

(d) This section shall apply only to projects which meet the following conditions:

- (1) The project is consistent with:*
 - (A) A community plan adopted as part of a general plan,*
 - (B) A zoning action which zoned or designated the parcel on which the project would be located to accommodate a particular density of development, or*
 - (C) A general plan of a local agency, and*
- (2) An EIR was certified by the lead agency for the zoning action, the community plan, or the general plan.*

(e) This section shall limit the analysis of only those significant environmental effects for which:

- (1) Each public agency with authority to mitigate any of the significant effects on the environment identified in the planning or zoning action undertakes or requires others to undertake mitigation measures specified in the EIR which the lead agency found to be feasible, and*
- (2) The lead agency makes a finding at a public hearing as to whether the feasible mitigation measures will be undertaken.*

(f) An effect of a project on the environment shall not be considered peculiar to the project or the parcel for the purposes of this section if uniformly applied development policies or standards have been previously adopted by the City or county with a finding that the development policies or standards will substantially

mitigate that environmental effect when applied to future projects, unless substantial new information shows that the policies or standards will not substantially mitigate the environmental effect. The finding shall be based on substantial evidence which need not include an EIR. Such development policies or standards need not apply throughout the entire City or county, but can apply only within the zoning district in which the project is located, or within the area subject to the community plan on which the lead agency is relying. Moreover, such policies or standards need not be part of the general plan or any community plan, but can be found within another pertinent planning document such as a zoning ordinance. Where a City or county, in previously adopting uniformly applied development policies or standards for imposition on future projects, failed to make a finding as to whether such policies or standards would substantially mitigate the effects of future projects, the decision-making body of the City or county, prior to approving such a future project pursuant to this section, may hold a public hearing for the purpose of considering whether, as applied to the project, such standards or policies would substantially mitigate the effects of the project. Such a public hearing need only be held if the City or county decides to apply the standards or policies as permitted in this section.

- (g) Examples of uniformly applied development policies or standards include, but are not limited to:
 - (1) Parking ordinances.*
 - (2) Public access requirements.*
 - (3) Grading ordinances.*
 - (4) Hillside development ordinances.*
 - (5) Flood plain ordinances.*
 - (6) Habitat protection or conservation ordinances.*
 - (7) View protection ordinances.*
 - (8) Requirements for reducing greenhouse gas emissions, as set forth in adopted land use plans, policies, or regulations.**

- (h) An environmental effect shall not be considered peculiar to the project or parcel solely because no uniformly applied development policy or standard is applicable to it.*

- (i) Where the prior EIR relied upon by the lead agency was prepared for a general plan or community plan that meets the requirements of this section, any rezoning action consistent with the general plan or community plan shall be treated as a project subject to this section.
 - (1) "Community plan" is defined as a part of the general plan of a City or county which applies to a defined geographic portion of the total area included in the general plan, includes or references each of the mandatory elements specified in Section 65302 of the Government Code, and**

contains specific development policies and implementation measures which will apply those policies to each involved parcel.

(2) For purposes of this section, “consistent” means that the density of the proposed project is the same or less than the standard expressed for the involved parcel in the general plan, community plan or zoning action for which an EIR has been certified, and that the project complies with the density-related standards contained in that plan or zoning. Where the zoning ordinance refers to the general plan or community plan for its density standard, the project shall be consistent with the applicable plan.

(j) This section does not affect any requirement to analyze potentially significant offsite or cumulative impacts if those impacts were not adequately discussed in the prior EIR. If a significant offsite or cumulative impact was adequately discussed in the prior EIR, then this section may be used as a basis for excluding further analysis of that offsite or cumulative impact.

PROJECT-SPECIFIC ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

The Environmental Checklist includes a discussion and analysis of any peculiar or site- specific environmental impacts associated with construction and operation of the proposed project. The Environmental Checklist identifies the applicable City of Fresno development standards and policies that would apply to the proposed project during both the construction and operational phases, and explains how the application of these uniformly applied standards and policies would ensure that no peculiar or site-specific environmental impacts would occur. None of the environmental factors below would be affected by this project, as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

<input type="checkbox"/>	Aesthetics	<input type="checkbox"/>	Agriculture and Forestry Resources
<input type="checkbox"/>	Air Quality	<input type="checkbox"/>	Biological Resources
<input type="checkbox"/>	Cultural Resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	Energy
<input type="checkbox"/>	Geology/Soils	<input type="checkbox"/>	Greenhouse Gas Emissions
<input type="checkbox"/>	Hazards and Hazardous Materials	<input type="checkbox"/>	Hydrology/Water Quality
<input type="checkbox"/>	Land Use/Planning	<input type="checkbox"/>	Mineral Resources
<input type="checkbox"/>	Noise	<input type="checkbox"/>	Population/Housing

<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Services	<input type="checkbox"/>	Recreation
<input type="checkbox"/>	Transportation	<input type="checkbox"/>	Tribal Cultural Resources
<input type="checkbox"/>	Utilities/Service Systems	<input type="checkbox"/>	Wildfire
<input type="checkbox"/>	Mandatory Findings of Significance		

DETERMINATION

As described above, the Mid-Town Trail is consistent with Figure MT-2 of the City of Fresno General Plan. Cumulative impacts associated with development and buildout of the project site, as proposed, were fully addressed in the City of Fresno MEIR (SCH# 2012111015). Since the proposed project is consistent with the Fresno General Plan and analyzed in the MEIR, implementation of the proposed project would not result in any new or altered cumulative impacts beyond those addressed in the MEIR.

The analysis in the following CEQA Environmental Checklist demonstrates that there are no site-specific or peculiar impacts associated with the project, and identifies uniformly applied standards and policies that would be applied to the project. The Project Requirements identified in the attached environmental analysis include requirements that must be implemented by the proposed project in order to ensure that any site-specific impacts or construction-related impacts are reduced to a less-than- significant level. All Project Requirements identified in the attached Environmental Checklist shall be made a condition of project approval and shall be implemented within the timeframes identified.

Marisela Martínez

12-10-2020

Marisela Martinez, Planner

Date

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. AESTHETICS – Except as provided in PRC Section 21099, would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?				X
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcropping, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?				X
c) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?				X
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?			X	

DISCUSSION

I. AESTHETICS – Except as provided in PRC Section 21099, would the project:

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

The Fresno General Plan MEIR provides and recognizes that the City of Fresno has not identified or designated scenic vistas within its General Plan. Although no scenic vista has been designated, it is acknowledged that scenic vistas could provide distant views of natural landscape features such as the San Joaquin River and the foothills of the Sierra Nevada Mountain Range. These distant views of the Sierra Nevada foothills are impeded many days during the year by the poor air quality in the Fresno region. Distant views of man-made landscape features include the Downtown Fresno buildings that provide a unique skyline.

Although the aforementioned features may be considered to be scenic vistas, the trail is relatively flat and will not have a substantial adverse effect on any scenic vista.

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

As analyzed in MEIR SCH No. 2012111015, the County of Fresno does not have any officially designated State Scenic Highways, but has three eligible State Scenic Highways. The nearest eligible highways are east of the Planning Area along State Route 180 and along State Route 168 east of the City of Clovis. Therefore, given that the trail is in accordance with the Fresno General Plan and Fresno Municipal Code, the trail would not impact a designated state scenic highway. Additional scenic resources within the City of Fresno include landscaped open spaces such as parks, golf courses, bluff areas along the San Joaquin River due to the topographic variation in the relatively flat San Joaquin Valley, and historic structures in Downtown Fresno because they provide a unique skyline. At its nearest point, the trail is located approximately five air miles from the San Joaquin River and two and a half miles from Downtown Fresno. Given the trail's distance from the San Joaquin River and Downtown Fresno, the proposed project will not interfere with public views of the San Joaquin River environs or the Downtown Fresno skyline.

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

The trail is located in an urbanized area and does not conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality. The trail is consistent with the planned trail in Figure MT-2 of the Fresno General Plan.

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

The trail will not create a new source of substantial light or glare which would affect day or night time views in the project area given that the trail lighting will be shielded and developed in accordance with city standards. The City of Fresno Municipal Code includes various standards and requirements to minimize any impacts related to light and glare within the project area. Chapter 15-2015 Outdoor Lighting and Illumination of the City of Fresno Municipal Code provides standards to minimize any environmental impacts caused by outdoor artificial light. According to Table 15-2015-B-2 (incorporated by reference), the maximum height of outdoor lighting fixtures on-site shall not exceed 25 feet, and all light fixtures will be required to be shielded to not produce obtrusive glare onto the public right-of-way or adjoining properties. Further, no outdoor lighting is allowed to cause significant, direct glare beyond the boundaries of the property. The trail will also be subject to the applicable mitigation measures pertaining to light and glare included in MEIR SCH No. 2012111015, which would require trail lighting to

be shielded away from roadway surfaces and to install low intensity light fixtures to minimize light spillover. Therefore, the trail's impact will be less than significant.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, with MEIR mitigation measures incorporated, the project will not result in any aesthetic resource impacts beyond those analyzed in MEIR SCH No. 2012111015.

MEIR Mitigation

The proposed project shall implement and incorporate, as applicable, the aesthetics related mitigation measures as identified in the attached MEIR Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program dated October 21, 2020.

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES – In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:</p>				
<p>a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?</p>				X
<p>b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?</p>				X

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

DISCUSSION

II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES – In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state’s inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:

- a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?**
Pursuant to the 2016 Rural Land Mapping Edition: Fresno County Important Farmland Map of

the State of California Department of Conservation, segment one to four are designated as "Urban and Built-Up Land." Approximately fifty percent of property located to the east of segment five of the trail is designated as "Farmland of Local Importance." "Farmland of Local Importance" is defined as farmland within Fresno County that does not meet the definitions of Prime, Statewide, or Unique farmland and land of importance to the local agricultural economy as determined by each county's board of supervisors and a local advisory committee. This includes land that is or has been used for irrigated pasture, dryland farming, confined livestock and dairy, poultry facilities, aquaculture and grazing land. However, per the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency included in MEIR SCH No. 2012111015, the trail will not convert prime farmland, unique farmland, farmland of statewide importance or farmland of local importance to non-agricultural use.

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

The trail is not subject to a Williamson Act agricultural land conservation contract. Therefore, the trail will not affect existing agriculturally zoned or Williamson Act contract parcels.

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

The trail will not 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)) as there is no forest land or timberland in the project area.

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

The trail will not result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use. See Section II(c) above.

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

The trail will not involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use above. See Sections II(a), II(b), and II(c) above.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the proposed project would not result in any agriculture and forestry resource environmental impacts beyond those analyzed in the MEIR SCH No. 2012111015.

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
III. AIR QUALITY – Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan (e.g., by having potential emissions of regulated criterion pollutants which exceed the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control Districts (SJVAPCD) adopted thresholds for these pollutants)?			X	
b) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?			X	
c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?			X	
d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?				X

DISCUSSION

III. AIR QUALITY – Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:

- a) **Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan (e.g.,**

by having potential emissions of regulated criterion pollutants which exceed the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control Districts (SJVAPCD) adopted thresholds for these pollutants)?

The San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD) is the local regional jurisdictional entity charged with attainment planning, rulemaking, rule enforcement, and monitoring under Federal and State Clean Air Acts and Clean Air Act Amendments. To aid in evaluating potentially significant construction and/or operational impacts of a project, SJVAPCD has prepared an advisory document, the Guide for Assessing and Mitigating Air Quality Impacts (GAMAQI), which contains standard procedures for addressing air quality in CEQA documents. In particular, the District's GAMAQI states that the District's Air Quality Attainment Plans include measures to promote air quality elements in county and city general plans as one of the primary indirect source programs. Since air districts have no authority over land use decisions, it is up to cities and counties to ensure that their general plans help achieve air quality goals. Section 65302.1 of the California Government Code requires cities and counties in the San Joaquin Valley to amend appropriate elements of their general plans to include data, analysis, comprehensive goals, policies, and feasible implementation strategies to improve air quality in their next housing element revisions. The following Fresno General Plan policies are relevant to air quality and were analyzed in MEIR SCH No. 2012111015:

- **Policy UF-1-c: Legible City Structure.** Focus integrated and ongoing planning efforts to achieve an identifiable city structure, comprised of a concentration of buildings, people, and pedestrian-oriented activity in Downtown; along a small number of prominent east west and north-south transit-oriented, mixed-use corridors with distinctive and strategically located Activity Centers; and in existing and new neighborhoods augmented with parks and connected by multi-purpose trails and tree lined bike lanes and streets.
- **Policy UF-14-a: Design Guidelines for Walkability.** Develop and use design guidelines and standards for a walkable and pedestrian-scaled environment with a network of streets and connections for pedestrians and bicyclists, as well as transit and autos.
- **Policy UF-14-b: Local Street Connectivity.** Design local roadways to connect throughout neighborhoods and large private developments with adjacent major roadways and pathways of existing adjacent development. Create access for pedestrians and bicycles where a local street must dead end or be designed as a cul-de-sac to adjoining uses that provide services, shopping, and connecting pathways for access to the greater community area.

As stated in the MEIR, the Fresno General Plan supports the implementation of SJVAPCD's attainment plans. Furthermore, under the two tests conducted for the MEIR to analyze potential impacts to air quality based on population growth and project buildout, the effects were found to be less than significant. Given that the Mid-Town Trail is in accordance with Figure MT-2 of the Fresno General Plan and is in accordance with the policies, the impacts of the trail are

considered to be less than significant.

Additionally, as presented in Chapter 8 of the GAMAQI, the District has established thresholds of significance for criteria pollutant emissions, which are based on District New Source Review (NSR) offset requirements for stationary sources. Stationary sources in the District are subject to some of the toughest regulatory requirements in the nation. Emission reductions achieved through implementation of District offset requirements are a major component of the District's air quality plans. Thus, projects with emissions below the thresholds of significance for criteria pollutants would be determined to "Not conflict or obstruct implementation of the District's air quality plan". As depicted in Table 3-1 of the NSR, the significance thresholds are as follows:

POLLUTANT	THRESHOLD (POUNDS PER YEAR)
VOC	0
NO _x	0
PM _{2.5}	20,000 of direct PM _{2.5} emissions or 80,000 of sulfur dioxide emissions or 80,000 of nitrogen oxide emissions
PM ₁₀	30,000
SO _x	80,000

In addition to being subject to the above thresholds, the trail will also be subject to District Rule 9510 (ISR). The ISR is intended to reduce a project's impact on air quality through project design elements or mitigation by payments of applicable off-site mitigation fees. The Indirect Source Review rule requires developers to mitigate:

- 20 percent of construction equipment exhaust nitrogen oxides;
- 45 percent of construction equipment exhaust PM₁₀;
- 33 percent of operational nitrogen oxides over 10 years; and
- 50 percent of operational PM₁₀ over 10 years.

To comply with the ISR requirements, an applicant is encouraged to reduce as much air pollution as possible through on-site mitigation. The facilities offered by the trail are included as on-site mitigation measures (bicycle paths and sidewalks). If the SJVAPCD were to find that the trail does not achieve the required baseline emission reductions, the applicant will be required to mitigate the difference by paying off-site mitigation fees to the Air District. The Air District will use these fees to achieve off-site emission reductions by funding clean air projects. However, given that the trail offers alternatives forms of transportation that would help mitigate emissions from combustion of gasoline, oil, diesel fuel or wood, which produce much of the PM_{2.5} pollution found in outdoor air, as well as a significant proportion of PM₁₀, the trail would not conflict or obstruct implementation of the SJVAPCD air quality plans. Therefore, compliance with applicable SJVAPCD Rules, Fresno General Plan policies, and MEIR mitigation measures will result in a less than significant impact on air quality with respect to air quality plans and standards.

b) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?

The trail will not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant. The air quality thresholds of significance of the following criteria pollutants are outlined in the SJVAPCD's GAMAQI:

Pollutant / Precursor	Construction Emission
	<i>Emissions (tpy)</i>
CO	100
NOx	10
ROG	10
SOx	27
PM ₁₀	15
PM _{2.5}	15

Construction activity from the project will only cause temporary, short-term emissions of various air pollutants. Reactive Organic Gases and Nitrogen Oxides (ozone precursors), PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5} (particulate matters) are emitted by construction equipment during various activities, which include but are not limited to grading, excavation, construction, or demolition. The project will be required to meet all of the SJVAPCD's construction fleet and control requirements, which will reduce impacts from construction related activities to less than significant thresholds. Therefore, fugitive dust and emissions impacts from construction activities are considered less than significant.

**c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations; and
d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?**

There are several sensitive receptors within half-mile radius of the trail. Sensitive receptors include children, elderly, asthmatics and others who are at a heightened risk of negative health outcomes due to exposure to air pollution. The locations where these sensitive receptors congregate are considered sensitive receptor locations. Sensitive receptors locations include hospitals, schools, and day care centers, and such other locations as the air district board or California Air Resources Board may determine (California Health and Safety Code § 42705.5(a)(5)). Public parks including Manchester Park (± 0.12 miles), Radio Park (± 0.5 miles), Reedy Park (± 0.07 miles), Carroza Basin (± 0.38 miles), and Airways Municipal Golf Course (± 0.03 miles). Additionally, there are several schools within a half-mile radius of the trail. The schools within a half-mile radius are Manchester Gate Elementary School (± 0.5 miles), San Joaquin Memorial High School (± 0.02 miles), Crescent View West Public Charter (± 0.2 miles), Birney Elementary School (± 0.12 miles), Wishon Elementary School (± 0.2 miles), McLane High School (± 0.25 miles), Mayfair Elementary School (± 0.3 miles), Yosemite Middle School (± 0.25 miles), Norseman Elementary School (± 0.13 miles), Ericson Elementary

School (± 0.25 miles), Ewing Elementary School (± 0.4 miles), and Fresno Adventist Academy (± 0.35 miles). One hospital, the Veterans Affairs Medical Center, is also within a half-mile radius of the trail (± 0.4 miles). Although the trail is in close proximity to various sensitive receptors, the proposed use, if approved, will be allowed on the subject site and will not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations as the trail will be utilized by bicyclists and pedestrians only. Therefore, the impact of the trail exposing sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations is less than significant. Furthermore, the proposed project is not proposing a use which will create objectionable odors more obnoxious than prior uses of the site and/or current surrounding residential and non-residential uses; therefore there will be no impact with respect to odors.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the proposed project would not result in any air quality environmental impacts beyond those analyzed in the MEIR SCH No. 2012111015.

Mitigation Measures

The proposed project shall implement and incorporate, as applicable, the air quality related mitigation measures as identified in the attached MEIR Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program dated October 21, 2020.

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

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?				X
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?				X
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?				X
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?			X	
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?				X

DISCUSSION

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

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

The trail is located in an urbanized area which provides poor quality habitat for any special-status species. Although a small portion to the east of segment five of the trail is categorized as “irrigated row and field crops” vegetative community, irrigated row and field crops are significantly disturbed with altered substrates, and, therefore, do not provide suitable habitat for special-status plant species and limited habitat for special-status wildlife species. The trail would not directly affect any sensitive, special status, or candidate species, nor would it modify any habitat that supports them. Therefore, the impact of the trail will be less than significant.

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

The trail is not located in an area identified as a riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service. Therefore, there would be no impacts to any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities.

- c) **Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?**

No federally protected wetlands are located along the trail. Therefore, there would be no impacts to federally protected wetlands.

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

The trail will have no impact on the movement of migratory fish or wildlife species or on established wildlife corridors or wildlife nursery sites as there are no bodies of water or native wildlife nursery sites in the immediate vicinity of the trail.

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

Construction of the trail shall comply with Fresno Municipal Code (FMC) Section 13-305 – Tree Preservation. Development of the trail will specifically comply with the following regulations outlined in FMC Section 13-305-K:

- 1) Any tree growing upon public property which is to be removed for construction purposes shall be replaced, if it is possible to do so in accordance with the city's tree planting policy. If the Director determines that a tree can be replaced, the person causing its

removal shall, at his/her own expense, remove and replace such tree with a tree in a location and of a size and species to be determined by the Director. If the Director determines that a tree cannot be replaced, the person causing its removal shall, at his/her own expense, remove the tree and pay to the city the replacement value of the tree, as fixed by the Director.

- 2) Any tree growing upon public property near any excavation, construction or street work shall be sufficiently guarded and protected by those responsible for such work so as to prevent any injury to said tree. No person shall excavate any ditches, tunnels or trenches, or install pavement adjacent to any public tree without the written permission of the Director.

Development of the trail will require the removal of select trees to provide clearance for Fresno Irrigation District Clearance. However, additional trees and ground cover will be planted along the length of the trail. Therefore, by complying with the existing regulations listed above, the trail's impact will be less than significant.

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

No habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans in the region pertain to the natural resources that exist on the project site or in their immediate vicinity. Therefore, the trail will have no impact on any approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, with MEIR mitigation measures incorporated, the project will not result in any biological resource impacts beyond those analyzed in MEIR SCH No. 2012111015.

Mitigation Measures

The proposed project shall implement and incorporate, as applicable, the biological resources related mitigation measures as identified in the attached MEIR Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program dated October 21, 2020.

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

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?			X	
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?			X	

DISCUSSION

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5?

There are no structures that exist within the project area that are listed in the National Local Register of Historic Places and the trail is not within a designated historic district. Therefore, the trail will not cause an adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5.

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

There is no evidence that any archaeological resources exist on along the trail. Nevertheless, there is some possibility that a buried site may exist in the area and be obscured by vegetation, fill, or other historic activities, leaving no surface activity. Due to the ground disturbing activities that will occur as a result of the project, the measures within the Mitigation Monitoring Checklist of the MEIR SCH No. 2012111015 for the Fresno General Plan to address archaeological resources, paleontological resources, and human remains will be employed to guarantee that should archaeological and/or animal fossil material be encountered during project excavations, then work shall stop immediately; and, that qualified professionals in the respective field are contacted and consulted in order to ensure that the activities of the proposed project will not involve physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of historic, archaeological, or paleontological resources. Therefore, the trail's impact on cultural resources will be less than significant.

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

Previously unknown paleontological resources or undiscovered human remains could be disturbed during project construction. See Section V(b) above.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, with MEIR mitigation measures incorporated, the project will not result in any cultural resource impacts beyond those analyzed in MEIR SCH No. 2012111015.

Mitigation Measures

The proposed project shall implement and incorporate, as applicable, the cultural resource related mitigation measures as identified in the attached MEIR Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program dated October 21, 2020.

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

DISCUSSION

VI. ENERGY – Would the project:

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

Appendix F of the State CEQA Guidelines requires consideration of the potentially significant energy implications of a project. CEQA requires mitigation measures to reduce “wasteful, inefficient and unnecessary” energy usage (Public Resources Code Section 21100, subdivision [b][3]). According to Appendix F of the CEQA guidelines, the means to achieve the goal of conserving energy include decreasing overall energy consumption, decreasing reliance on natural gas and oil, and increasing reliance on renewable energy sources. In particular, the project would be considered “wasteful, inefficient, and unnecessary” if it were to violate state and federal energy standards and/or result in significant adverse impacts related to project energy requirements, energy inefficiencies, energy intensiveness of materials, cause

significant impacts on local and regional energy supplies or generate requirements for additional capacity, fail to comply with existing energy standards, otherwise result in significant adverse impacts on energy resources, or conflict or create an inconsistency with applicable plan, policy, or regulation. The trail would generate vehicle trips during the construction phase which would result in short-term impacts. During the operational phase, the trail will provide residents with an opportunity to reduce their use of wasteful, inefficient, and unnecessary non-renewable energy sources by an alternative mode of transportation that would not rely upon fossil fuels. While the trail will also use electricity to power trail lighting, existing streetlights will be retrofitted to be more energy-efficient. Therefore, the environmental impact of the trail due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation is considered to be less than significant.

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

The trail will not conflict with or obstruct any state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency. See Section VI(a).

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, with MEIR mitigation measures incorporated, the project will not result in any energy impacts beyond those analyzed in MEIR SCH No. 2012111015.

Mitigation Measures

The proposed project shall implement and incorporate, as applicable, the energy related mitigation measures as identified in the attached MEIR Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program dated October 21, 2020.

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

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

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

DISCUSSION

VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS – Would the project:

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

- 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.**
- ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?**
- iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?**
- iv) Landslides?**

The trail would neither directly nor indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving any of the events listed above. The City of Fresno has no known active earthquake faults and is not in any Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zones. The immediate vicinity has extremely low seismic activity levels, although shaking may be felt from earthquakes whose epicenters lie to the east, west, and south. Known major faults are over 50 miles distant and include the San Andreas Fault, Coalinga area blind thrust fault(s), and the Long Valley, Owens Valley, and White Wolf/Tehachapi fault systems. The most serious threat to Fresno from a major earthquake in the Eastern Sierra would be flooding that could be caused by damage to dams on the upper reaches of the San Joaquin River.

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

Development of the trail requires compliance with grading and drainage standards of the City of Fresno. A civil engineer or soils engineer registered in this state shall complete a Soils Investigation and Evaluation Report. The investigation will address the detail of the configuration, location, type of loading of the proposed structures and drainage plan. The report shall provide detailed recommendation for foundations, drainage, and other items. The preparation of the Soils Investigation and Evaluation Report is an existing standard and shall be prepared prior to issuance of grading permits.

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

spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?

There are no geologic hazards or unstable soil conditions known to exist along the trail. The existing topography is relatively flat with no apparent unique or significant land forms such as vernal pools.

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

There are no geologic hazards or unstable soil conditions known to exist along the trail. Therefore, there will be no impact.

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

No use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems are proposed. Therefore, there will be no impact.

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

There are no apparent unique or significant land forms such as vernal pools. See Section V(b).

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the proposed project would not result in any geology and soil environmental impacts beyond those analyzed in MEIR SCH No. 2012111015.

Mitigation Measures

The proposed project shall implement and incorporate, as applicable, the geology and soils related mitigation measures as identified in the attached MEIR Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program dated October 21, 2020.

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS – Would the project:				
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?			X	

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

DISCUSSION

VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS – Would the project:

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

The trail will not contribute substantially or cumulatively to the generation of greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly. The trail creates an opportunity for the reduction of emissions by providing residents with a safe, aesthetically inviting pedestrian and bicycle trail facilitating an alternative transportation choice. Therefore, the trail’s impact on greenhouse gas emissions will be less than significant.

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

The General Plan and MEIR rely upon a Greenhouse Gas Reduction Plan that provides a comprehensive assessment of the benefits of city policies and proposed code changes, existing plans, programs, and initiatives that reduce greenhouse gas emissions. The plan demonstrates that even though there is increased growth, the City would still be reducing greenhouse gas emissions through 2020 and per capita emission rates drop substantially. The benefits of adopted regulations become flat in later years and growth starts to exceed the reductions from all regulations and measures. Although it is highly likely that regulations will be updated to provide additional reductions, none are reflected in the analysis since only the effect of adopted regulations is included. As stated in Section VIII(a), the trail will provide an alternative transportation choice and will therefore provide an opportunity to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and will have an impact that is less than significant.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the trail would not result in any greenhouse gas emission environmental impacts beyond those analyzed in MEIR SCH No. 2012111015 for the Fresno General Plan.

Mitigation Measures

The proposed project shall implement and incorporate, as applicable, the greenhouse gases related mitigation measures as identified in the attached MEIR Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program dated October 21, 2020.

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

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

DISCUSSION

IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIAL – Would the project:

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

Pursuant to Policy 1-6-a of the Fresno General Plan, hazardous materials will be defined as those that, because of their quantity, concentration, physical or chemical characteristics, pose significant potential hazards to human health, safety, or the environment. Specific federal, state and local definitions and listings of hazardous materials will be used by the City of Fresno. The trail will not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials as it will not transport, use, or dispose of any hazardous materials. Therefore, there will be no impact.

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

There is no use of hazardous materials in the trail. Therefore, the trail will not 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 and will have no impact.

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

The trail will not emit hazardous emissions or handle any hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste. Therefore, there will be no impact.

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

Segment four of the trail is located along the Fresno Air Terminal/Old Hammer Field site, which is listed on the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) EnviroStor database. According to the DTSC EnviroStor database, the Fresno Air Terminal/Old Hammer Field is a hazardous cleanup site (i.e., Fresno Air Terminal/Old Hammer Field) with an active cleanup status as of 1/1/1990. The Fresno Air Terminal/Old Hammer Field site (Envirostor ID 10450005) encompasses 1,598 acres northeast of downtown Fresno, consisting of the Fresno Yosemite International Airport, Air National Guard facility, Army National Guard Facility, and other governmental facilities and industrial warehouses/vacant industrial land. In 1989, the City of Fresno discovered volatile organic compound (VOC) contamination, including trichloroethylene and perchloroethylene, and entered into a Cooperative Agreement with the State of California for site remediation in 1994.

The Fresno Air Terminal/Old Hammer Field site was initially separated into 14 separate areas targeted for investigation. Area 1 was identified as the highest priority for investigation due to the past and present operations in Area 1 involving the use, storage, treatment, and potential spillage and disposal of materials and wastes categorized as hazardous. The primary environmental concern associated with Area 1 was chlorinated VOC in the soil and groundwater and a chlorinated VOC plume that extended southwest beyond the original boundaries of Fresno Air Terminal/Old Hammer Field site. The appropriate regulatory agencies investigated the remaining areas of the Fresno Air Terminal/Old Hammer Field site separately from Area 1, and no further concerns were identified.

Given that the Fresno Air Terminal/Old Hammer Field site has been under remediation for decades, the site's status on the DTSC EnviroStor database was taken into account during the preparation of the most recent Fresno General Plan and included in the analysis of impacts contained within the MEIR SCH No. 2012111015. Additionally, the impact discussion within the MEIR SCH No. 2012111015 acknowledges development, in accordance with the Fresno General Plan, could occur on a site that is on a list of hazardous material sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. The proposed trail is to be developed in accordance with Figure MT-2 of the Fresno General Plan.

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

The Mid-Town Trail is subject to the Fresno County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP) given its proximity to the Fresno Yosemite International Airport (FYI). The FYI is a joint use civilian and military facility used by commercial air carriers, air cargo operators, charter operators, the State of California, general aviation, and the United States military. The California National Guard uses a 58-acre portion of the southeastern part of the Airport. The Army National Guard, the California Division of Forestry, corporate aviation businesses, and

two fixed base operators also lease facilities from FYI. The ALUCP contains criteria for development projects within the vicinity of an airport that are based upon 14 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 77. The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) is charged with the review of construction activities that occur in the vicinity of airports. Its role in reviewing these activities is to ensure that new structures do not result in a hazard to navigation. The regulations in the Federal Air Regulations (14 CFR, Part 77) are designed to ensure that no obstructions in navigable air space are allowed to exist that would endanger the public. Proposed structures are also evaluated against Terminal En Route Procedures, which ensure that a structure does not adversely impact flight procedures. Tall structures, including buildings, construction cranes, and cell towers in the vicinity of an airport can be hazardous to the navigation of airplanes. Federal Air Regulations Part 77 identifies the maximum height at which a structure would be considered an obstacle at any given point around an airport. The extent of the off-airport coverage that needs to be evaluated for tall structure impacts can extend miles from an airport facility. In addition, Federal Air Regulations Part 77 establishes standards for determining whether objects constructed near airports will be considered obstructions in navigable airspace, sets forth notice requirements of certain types of proposed construction or alterations, and provides for aeronautical studies to determine the potential impacts of a structure on the flight of aircraft through navigable airspace. Furthermore, the ALUCP contains the following obstruction standards to minimize safety hazards:

- a) An existing object, including a mobile object, is, and a future object would be an obstruction to air navigation if it is of greater height than any of the following heights or surfaces:
 1. A height of 499 feet above ground level (AGL) at the site of the object.
 2. A height that is 200 feet AGL, or above the established airport elevation, whichever is higher, within 3 nautical miles of the established reference point of an airport, excluding heliports, with its longest runway more than 3,200 feet in actual length, and that height increases in the proportion of 100 feet for each additional nautical mile from the airport up to a maximum of 499 feet.
 3. A height within a terminal obstacle clearance area, including an initial approach segment, a departure area, and a circling approach area, which would result in the vertical distance between any M-56 point on the object and an established minimum instrument flight altitude within that area or segment to be less than the required obstacle clearance.
 4. A height within an en route obstacle clearance area, including turn and termination areas, of a Federal Airway or approved off-airway route, that would increase the minimum obstacle clearance altitude. (5) The surface of a takeoff and landing area of an airport or any imaginary surface established under Sec. 77.19, 77.21, or 77.23. However, no part of the takeoff or landing area itself will be considered an obstruction.

- b) Except for traverse ways on or near an airport with an operative ground traffic control service furnished by an airport traffic control tower or by the airport management and coordinated with the air traffic control service, the standards of paragraph (a) of this section apply to traverse ways used or to be used for the passage of mobile objects only after the heights of these traverse ways are increased by:
1. 17 feet for an Interstate Highway that is part of the National System of Military and Interstate Highways where overcrossings are designed for a minimum of 17 feet vertical distance.
 2. 15 feet for any other public roadway.
 3. 10 feet or the height of the highest mobile object that would normally traverse the road, whichever is greater, for a private road.
 4. 23 feet for a railroad.
 5. For a waterway or any other traverse way not previously mentioned, an amount equal to the height of the highest mobile object that would normally traverse it.

Segment four and five of the trail are located within 100 feet of the FYI and are within the FAA runway protection zone. Segment five will require a Memorandum of Understanding between the FYI and the City of Fresno. Given that the trail is relatively flat and does not conflict with the ALUCP, the trail will not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the surrounding area and its impact will be less than significant.

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

The City of Fresno has an Emergency Operations Plan that describes what the City's actions will be during a response to an emergency. The plan also describes the role of the Emergency Operations Center (EOC) and the coordination that occurs between the EOC, City Departments, and other response agencies. The plan establishes a requirement for the emergency management organization to mitigate any significant emergency disaster affecting the City of Fresno. The trail will not impair the implementation of or physically interfere with the Emergency Operations Plan in the City of Fresno as it does not change the role of the EOC or the coordination between the agencies mentioned above. Furthermore, the trail will not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency evacuation plan given that the city does not maintain formal evacuation routes, as the most appropriate routes away from an area that may have been affected by a major disaster would be determined by the location and type of incident. Plans for such incidents would also be heavily subject to change.

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

The trail is not located within any wildland fire hazard zones. Therefore, there will be no impact.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the project will not result in any hazards and hazardous material impacts beyond those analyzed in MEIR SCH No. 2012111015.

Mitigation Measures

The proposed project shall implement and incorporate, as applicable, the hazards and hazardous materials related mitigation measures as identified in the attached MEIR Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program dated October 21, 2020.

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY – Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?			X	
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?			X	
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:				
i) Result in a substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;			X	
ii) Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site:			X	
iii) create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or			X	

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
iv) impede or redirect flood flows?			X	
d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?				X
e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?			X	

The MEIR SCH No. 2012111015 prepared for the Fresno General Plan (collectively, the “MEIR”) contains measures to mitigate projects’ individual and cumulative impacts to groundwater resources and to reverse the groundwater basin’s overdraft conditions, which would be uniformly applied to the project consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15183 Exemption.

DISCUSSION

X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY – Would the project:

- a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality; and**
- b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?**

Fresno has attempted to address water supply issues through metering and revisions to the City’s Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP). The purpose of the management plan is to provide safe, adequate, and dependable water supplies in order to meet the future needs of the metropolitan area in an economical manner; protect groundwater quality from further degradation and overdraft; and, provide a plan of reasonably implementable measures and facilities. City water wells, pump stations, recharge facilities, water treatment and distribution systems have been expanded incrementally to mitigate increased water demands and respond to groundwater quality challenges.

The adverse groundwater conditions of limited supply and compromised quality have been well-documented by planning, environmental impact report and technical studies over the past 20 years including the MEIR SCH No. 2012111015 for the Fresno General Plan, the MEIR 10130 for the 2025 Fresno General Plan, Final EIR No.10100, Final EIR No.10117 and Final

EIR No. SCH 95022029 (Fresno Metropolitan Water Resource Management Plan), et al. These conditions include water quality degradation due to DBCP, arsenic, iron, and manganese concentrations; low water well yields; limited aquifer 36 storage capacity and recharge capacity; and, intensive urban or semi-urban development occurring upgradient from the Fresno Metropolitan Area.

In response to the need for a comprehensive long-range water supply and distribution strategy, the Fresno General Plan recognizes the Kings Basin's Integrated Regional Water Management Plan, Fresno-Area Regional Groundwater Management Plan, and City of Fresno Metropolitan Water Resource Management Plan and cites the findings of the City of Fresno Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP). The purpose of these management plans is to provide safe, adequate, and dependable water supplies to meet the future needs of the Kings Basin regions and the Fresno-Clovis metropolitan area in an economical manner; protect groundwater quality from further degradation and overdraft; and, provide a plan of reasonably implementable measures and facilities.

The 2010 Urban Water Management Plan, Figure 4-3 (incorporated by reference) illustrates the City of Fresno's goals to achieve a 'water balance' between supply and demand while decreasing reliance upon and use of groundwater. To achieve these goals the City is implementing a host of strategies, including:

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

The City has indicated that groundwater wells, pump stations, recharge facilities, water treatment and distribution systems shall be expanded incrementally to mitigate increased water demands. One of the primary objectives of Fresno's future water supply plans detailed in Fresno's current UWMP is to balance groundwater operations through a host of strategies. Through careful planning, Fresno has designed a comprehensive plan to accomplish this objective by increasing surface water supplies and surface water treatment facilities, intentional recharge, and conservation, thereby reducing groundwater pumping. The City continually monitors impacts of land use changes and development project proposals on water

supply facilities by assigning fixed demand allocations to each parcel by land use as currently zoned or proposed to be rezoned.

Until 2004, groundwater was the sole source of water for the City. In June 2004, a \$32 million Surface Water Treatment Facility (“SWTF”) began providing Fresno with water treated to drinking water standards. A second surface water treatment facility is operational in southeast Fresno to meet demands anticipated by the growth implicit in the 2025 Fresno General Plan. Surface water is used to replace lost groundwater through Fresno’s artificial recharge program at the City-owned Leaky Acres and smaller facilities in Southeast Fresno. Fresno holds entitlements to surface water from Millerton Lake and Pine Flat Reservoir. In 2006, Fresno renewed its contract with the United States Bureau of Reclamation, through the year 2045, which entitles the City to 60,000 acre-feet per year of Class 1 water. This water supply has further increased the reliability of Fresno’s water supply.

Also, in 2006, Fresno updated its Metropolitan Water Resources Management Plan designed to ensure the Fresno metro area has a reliable water supply through 2050. The plan implements a conjunctive use program, combining groundwater, treated surface water, artificial recharge and an enhanced water conservation program.

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

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

Implementation of the Fresno General Plan policies, the Kings Basin Integrated Regional Water Management Plan, City of Fresno UWMP, Fresno-Area Regional Groundwater Management Plan, and City of Fresno Metropolitan Water Resource Management Plan and the applicable mitigation measures of approved environmental review documents will address the issues of providing an adequate, reliable, and sustainable water supply for the project.

Furthermore, the trail’s irrigation system will be subject to review prior to issuance of building permits. Pursuant to FMC Section 15-2309, all new landscaping shall have an automatic irrigation system designed to provide adequate and efficient coverage of all plant material and said irrigation systems shall comply with the requirements of the California Green Building Standards Code and/or the California Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance and/or the California Plumbing Code as may be amended. Therefore, the trail will not violate

any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements, substantially degrade surface of ground water quality, substantially decrease groundwater supplies, or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge.

c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:

i) Result in a substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;

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

iii) create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or

iv) impede or redirect flood flows?

Short-Term Hydrology & Water Quality Impacts

Construction activities will result in ground-disturbing activities. Such earthmoving activities would increase the potential for erosion and sedimentation, particularly during storm events. Additionally, construction equipment and vehicles could deposit constituents such as diesel fuel, hydraulic fluid, oil, and exhaust into the environment that could be conveyed within stormwater runoff to surface waters or groundwater. Construction activities use concrete, solvents, glues, oils, paints, and generate trash, all of which, if they come into contact with rainfall or stormwater runoff can cause pollution in stormwater. While temporary, all of these construction activities and products, including ground-disturbing construction activities could still result in the pollution of stormwater runoff that leaves the construction site that could contribute to downstream surface waters or groundwater degradation. There are regulatory mechanisms in place that would reduce the effects of construction activities on water quality, including the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Construction General Permit. Development would be required to comply with the requirements of the NPDES Construction General Permit. The NPDES Permit Program, which is administered in the City of Fresno by the Central Valley RWQCB, helps control pollution in stormwater by regulating sources of pollution at construction sites that would result in the discharge of pollutants into the stormwater and subsequent receiving waters during both construction and operations activities. Any development project disturbing one or more acres of soil must obtain coverage under the General Permit for Discharges of Storm Water Associated with Construction Activity (Construction General Permit Order 2009-0009-DWQ). Construction activities subject to the Construction General Permit includes clearing, grading, and other ground-disturbing activities such as stockpiling or excavation. The Construction General Permit requires development and implementation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). Among other mandated items that are included in a SWPPP, are features designed to eliminate contact of rainfall and stormwater runoff with sources of pollution that occur on construction sites, of which a primary source is soil erosion as a result of unstabilized soils coming in contact with water and wind. These features are known as Best Management Practices (BMPs). Common BMPs to limit pollution in stormwater runoff from construction sites include maintaining or creating drainages

to convey and direct surface runoff away from bare areas and installing physical barriers such as berms, silt fencing, waddles, straw bales, and gabions. The required preparation, implementation, and participation with the Construction General Permit, including the SWPPP and BMPs, would reduce project construction impacts on water quality to less than significant levels. Therefore, short-term construction impacts associated with water quality standards and waste discharge requirements would be less than significant.

Long-Term Hydrology & Water Quality Impacts

Long-term impacts of the trail would include an increase in impervious surfaces which would increase stormwater runoff rates and volumes over the rates and volumes from undeveloped land. The Fresno Metropolitan Flood Control District (FMFCD) is responsible for developing and implementing the Storm Drainage Master Plan for the City of Fresno. In general, as land is developed, the FMFCD works with developers and the City to implement the storm drainage system to collect and dispose of the increased runoff rates and volumes and prevent them from entering local surface waters, including the San Joaquin River, local creeks, and numerous irrigation canals that cross through the Planning Area. Here, the City of Fresno is the project applicant and will be responsible to implement the storm drainage system. The storm drainage systems that are implemented for the Planning Area consist of streets, curbs and gutters that direct runoff to storm drain inlets, which direct runoff to underground pipelines. The underground pipelines convey stormwater to retention and urban detention (water quality) basins located at strategic locations within the Planning Area. The stormwater retention basins dispose of runoff through percolation into the groundwater and, in emergencies, through pumping to designated irrigation canals. The urban detention (water quality) basins discharge to the San Joaquin River. Discharges from the retention basins and the urban detention (water quality) basins could affect water quality in the receiving waters by potentially increasing the concentration of sediment and pollution found in stormwater. However, the FMFCD works with the developers within their jurisdiction to implement a storm drainage system to collect and dispose of the increased runoff rates and volumes and prevent them from entering local surface waters, including the San Joaquin River, local creeks, and numerous irrigation canals. Therefore, the short-term and long-term impacts are considered to be less than significant.

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

No segment of the trail is located in a flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zone. Therefore, the trail does not risk release of pollutants due to project inundation.

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

The trail will not conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan. See Section X(a) and X(b).

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, with MEIR mitigation measures incorporated, the project will not result in any hydrology or water quality impacts beyond those analyzed in MEIR SCH No. 2012111015.

Mitigation Measures

The proposed project shall implement and incorporate, as applicable, the hydrology and water quality related mitigation measures as identified in the attached MEIR Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program dated October 21, 2020.

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING – Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?				X
b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?				X

DISCUSSION

XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING – Would the project:

a) Physically divide an established community?

The trail will not divide an established community as the trail is primarily located along the Herndon Canal and in the public right-of-way. The enhanced pedestrian and bicycle facilities will provide enhanced neighborhood connectivity for residents without or choosing not to rely upon motor vehicle transportation.

b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

The trail is surrounded by various planned land use designations and is consistent with Figure MT-2 of the City of Fresno General Plan. Furthermore, as stated in the MEIR, the City of Fresno Planning Area does not occur within the boundaries of any approved or draft Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP), Natural Community Conservation Plan (NCCP) or other adopted local, regional or state HCP. Therefore, development of the trail will not 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.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, with MEIR mitigation measures incorporated, the project will not result in any land use and planning environmental impacts beyond those analyzed in MEIR SCH No. 2012111015.

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

DISCUSSION

XII. MINERAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

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

The trail is not located in an area designated for mineral resource preservation or recovery, therefore, will not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state.

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

The trail is not delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan as a locally-important mineral resource recovery site; therefore it will not result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral source.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the proposed project would not result in any mineral resource environmental impacts beyond those analyzed in MEIR SCH No. 2012111015.

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIII. NOISE – Would the project result in:				
a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?			X	
b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?			X	
c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?			X	

DISCUSSION

XIII. NOISE – Would the project result in:

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

Short-Term Noise Impacts

Construction of the trail involves both short-term, construction related noise, and long-term noise potentially generated by increases in foot traffic, nearby stationary sources, or other transportation sources. The Fresno Municipal Code (FMC) allows for construction noise in excess of standards if it complies with the section below (Chapter 10, Article 1, Section 10-109

– Exemptions). It states that the provisions of Article 1 – Noise Regulations of the FMC shall not apply to:

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

Thus, construction activity would be exempt from City of Fresno noise regulations, as long as such activity is conducted pursuant to an applicable construction permit and occurs between 7:00 a.m. and 10:00 p.m., excluding Sunday. Therefore, short-term construction impacts associated with the exposure of persons to or the generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the general plan or noise ordinance or applicable standards of other agencies would be less than significant.

Long-Term Noise Impacts

The project is a pedestrian and bicycle trail that prohibits motorized vehicle. The trail creates the potential to reduce the long-term noise impacts by reducing motorized vehicle use while facilitating modes of travel that generate less noise impacts than motor vehicles do.

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

Long-term project activities associated with buildout of the trail would not involve the use of any equipment or processes that would result in potentially significant levels of ground vibration. Increases in ground-borne vibration levels attributable to the project would be primarily associated with short-term construction activities.

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

The proposed project is located within the Airport Influence Area under the Fresno County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan and within the FYI 60 dB airport noise contour. To reduce potential project-specific and cumulative impacts of public and private airports on future development, the General Plan incorporates objectives and policies, which include but are not limited to the following:

- NS-1-Policy. Airport Noise Compatibility. Implement the land use and noise exposure compatibility provisions of the adopted Fresno Yosemite International Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, the Fresno-Chandler Downtown Airport Master and Environs Specific Plan and the Sierra Skypark Land Use Policy Plan to assess noise compatibility of proposed uses and improvements within airport influence and environs areas.

Policy NS-1 would require the City approve only noise compatible land uses and limit noise-sensitive land uses, including residential uses, as defined by the Fresno Yosemite International Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan. The “Airport Land Use Noise Compatibility Criteria” table found in the Fresno Yosemite International ALUCP notes land uses that are compatible,

conditional, and incompatible depending on the exterior noise exposure from the airport. Outdoor recreation uses are considered compatible, which means the activities associated with the project may be carried out on-site with essentially no interference from aircraft noise. Therefore, the proposed project would not expose people working or residing in the project area to excessive noise levels from public or private airports, resulting in a less-than-significant impact.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the proposed project would not result in any noise environmental impacts beyond those analyzed in MEIR SCH No. 2012111015.

Mitigation Measures

The proposed project shall implement and incorporate, as applicable, the noise related mitigation measures as identified in the attached MEIR Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program dated October 21, 2020.

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

DISCUSSION

XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING – Would the project:

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

The trail does not propose the development of any new homes or businesses. The trail will improve pedestrian and bicycle facilities, but will not occur at an intensity or scale that would induce substantial unplanned population growth. Therefore, the impact of the trail on population and housing will be less than significant.

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

There are no existing or planned residences on any segment of the trail; therefore the trail does not have the potential to displace existing housing or residents and will not directly or indirectly induce substantial population growth in the area.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the proposed project would not result in any population and housing environmental impacts beyond those analyzed in MEIR SCH No. 2012111015.

Mitigation Measures

The proposed project shall implement and incorporate, as applicable, the population and housing related mitigation measures as identified in the attached MEIR Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program dated October 21, 2020.

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

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

DISCUSSION

XV. PUBLIC SERVICES – Would the project:

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

- **Fire protection?**

The trail will not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered fire stations. City Fire Station No. 5 is located at the southwest corner of East Shields Avenue and North Fresno Street. City Fire Station 1 is located approximately 0.4 miles south of Segment 4 of the trail. City Fire Station No. 10 is located approximately 0.2 miles west of Segment 5 of the trail. The existing fire stations will serve the trail location.

- **Police protection?**

The trail is located within the existing Central Policing District and will not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered police stations.

- **School?**

Any future development occurring as a result of the trail may have an effect on the school district's student housing capacity. The school district, through local funding, is in a position to mitigate its shortage of classrooms to accommodate planned population growth for the foreseeable future. Any future developers will pay the appropriate impact fees at the time of building permits.

- **Parks?**

The trail has the potential to offset the need for parks by providing an alternative recreational site for pedestrians and bicyclists.

- **Other public facilities?**

The trail is within the boundaries of the Fresno Metropolitan Flood Control District (FMFCD). Prior to permit submittal, the applicant shall meet with the FMFCD staff to discuss drainage options. Currently, water mains exist to serve the proposed project with irrigation water for limited landscaping. Water facilities are available to provide service to the site. If the development creates additional water demands beyond the levels allocated in the current

version of the City’s Urban Water Management Plan, it shall be offset in a manner approved by the Department of Public Utilities. The use of the trail will not generate wastewater containing human waste, which is required to be conveyed and treated by the Fresno-Clovis Regional Wastewater Treatment and Reclamation Facility. There will not be any onsite wastewater treatment system.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the proposed project would not result in any public services environmental impacts beyond those analyzed in MEIR SCH No. 2012111015.

Mitigation Measures

The proposed project shall implement and incorporate, as applicable, the public services related mitigation measures as identified in the attached MEIR Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program dated October 21, 2020.

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

DISCUSSION

XVI. RECREATION - Would the project:

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

Segments of the trail are within a quarter mile of the Discovery Center, Manchester Park, and Airways Municipal Golf Course. The trail has the potential to both increase and decrease the use of the surrounding parks. While the trail has the potential to increase pedestrian and bicycle traffic along the trail route and draw residents to the aforementioned facilities, the trail also has the potential to decrease the use of surrounding recreational facilities by attracting residents away from the facilities and to the trail. Therefore, the impacts of the trail will be less than significant and will not be at a scale beyond what was analyzed in MEIR SCH No. 2012111015.

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?

The trail will provide pedestrian and bicycle facilities for public use. The trail will not require the construction or expansion of other recreational facilities and will, therefore, have no impact.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the proposed project would not result in any recreation environmental impacts beyond those analyzed in MEIR SCH No. 2012111015.

Mitigation Measures

The proposed project shall implement and incorporate, as applicable, the recreation related mitigation measures as identified in the attached MEIR Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program dated October 21, 2020.

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVII. TRANSPORTATION – Would the project:				
a) Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?				X
b) Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines § 15064.3, subdivision (b)?			X	

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?			X	
d) Result in inadequate emergency access?			X	

DISCUSSION

XVII. TRANSPORTATION – Would the project:

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

The trail does not conflict with any programs, plans, ordinances, or policies addressing the circulation system given that the proposed project is specifically identified in Figure MT-2 of the City of Fresno General Plan. Furthermore, the trail is located along the Herndon Canal, East Shields, East McKinley, and North Clovis Avenues. In the Fresno General Plan Circulation Element, East Shields, East McKinley, and North Clovis Avenues are identified as arterials. A designated arterial is a four- to six-lane divided roadway, where called for by the General Plan, a trail may be required instead of a sidewalk. Therefore, the trail does not conflict with any program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities.

b) Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines § 15064.3, subdivision (b)?

Senate Bill (SB) 743, signed in 2013, and codified in the CEQA Guidelines in January 2019, changes the way transportation impacts are analyzed in the CEQA process. Vehicle miles traveled (VMT) replaces auto delay and level of service (LOS) as the metric for transportation impact determination. SB 743 took effect statewide on July 1, 2020. In order to assist the member agencies in their shift from delay based LOS approach to VMT analysis, Fresno Council of Governments (COG) prepared the Fresno County SB 743 Implementation Regional Guidelines guide. The document discusses the context for VMT analysis, project screening, VMT significance thresholds, VMT analysis for land use development projects, transportation projects, and land use plans, and feasible mitigation strategies applicable for the Fresno region. In the document, the technical advisory provided by the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research lists a series of projects that would not likely lead to a substantial or measurable increase in vehicle travel and which would, therefore, not require an induced travel analysis. These include the addition of Class I bike paths, trails, multi-use paths, or other off-road

facilities that serve nonmotorized travel. Therefore, the project does not conflict with CEQA Guidelines § 15064.3, subdivision (b) and should be considered to have a less than significant transportation impact.

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

The trail will not substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature or incompatible uses. The trail will be located within the existing public right-of-way.

d) Result in inadequate emergency access?

See Section IX(f).

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the project would not result in any transportation/traffic environmental impacts beyond those analyzed in MEIR SCH No. 2012111015.

Mitigation Measures

The proposed project shall implement and incorporate, as applicable, the transportation related mitigation measures as identified in the attached MEIR Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program dated October 21, 2020.

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES – Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in PRC section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:				

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
i) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in PRC section 5020.1(k), or,			X	
ii) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of PRC section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of PRC section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.			X	

DISCUSSION

XVII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

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

- i) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in PRC section 5020.1(k), or,**
- ii) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of PRC section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of PRC section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.**

The trail will not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource defined in PRC section 21074. The trail is not listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as

defined in PRC section 5020.1(k) or a resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of PRC section 5024.1. Segments 2 and 3 of the trail are adjacent to a canal built more than 120 years ago in what is currently an urbanized area and is surrounded by urban uses of medium to medium high density residential. If any artifacts are inadvertently discovered during ground-disturbing activities, existing federal, State, and local laws and regulations as well as the mitigation measures of the Fresno General Plan MEIR will require construction activities to cease until such artifacts are properly examined and determined not to be of significance by a qualified cultural resources professional.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, with implementation of the MEIR Cultural Resource Mitigation measures, impacts related to tribal cultural resources would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

The proposed project shall implement and incorporate, as applicable, the tribal resources related mitigation measures as identified in the attached MEIR Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program dated October 21, 2020.

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS – Would the project:				
a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effect?			X	
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?			X	

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Result in a determination by the waste water treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?				X
d) Generate solid waste in excess of state or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?				X
e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				X

DISCUSSION

XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS – Would the project:

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

The trail will primarily be served by existing utilities which will be protected in place during construction. The trail will, however, require minor additions and relocations of existing utilities such as the installation of two Caltrans storm drain inlets and a storm drain line on East Shields Avenue at the Highway 41 SB onramp, the relocation of select utility boxes, and the relocation of select utility poles along the trail. Given that the trail will not require major upsizing of water, wastewater, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunication facilities the impact of the trail will be less than significant.

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

As discussed under the Hydrology and Water Quality section of this environmental checklist, the City has adequate water supply and the applicant will be required to comply with all requirements of the City of Fresno Department of Public Utilities to reduce the project's water impacts to less than significant. In addition to being subject to water management plans, the trail will be subject to the regulations set forth in the Fresno Municipal Code including, but not limited to, Chapter Six and Section 15-2309. Furthermore, the trail's irrigation system will be subject to review prior to issuance of building permits. Pursuant to FMC Section 15-2309, all new landscaping shall have an automatic irrigation system designed to provide adequate and efficient coverage of all plant material and said irrigation systems shall comply with the requirements of the California Green Building Standards Code and/or the California Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance and/or the California Plumbing Code as may be amended.

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

The proposed trail is within the City of Fresno limits. The Department of Public Utilities Wastewater Management Division has made the preliminary determination that the waste water generated by the drinking fountains located at the rest areas along the trail would have no impact to capacity. This form of waste water generation is commonly discharged into landscaping or drywells. Therefore, the trail will have adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments and will result in no impact.

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

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

As stated in the Hydrology and Water Quality section of this environmental checklist, the trail will not 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.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, with MEIR mitigation measures incorporated, the project will not result in any utilities and service system impacts beyond those analyzed in MEIR SCH No. 2012111015.

Mitigation Measures

The proposed project shall implement and incorporate, as applicable, the utilities and service systems related mitigation measures as identified in the attached MEIR Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program dated October 21, 2020.

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XX. WILDFIRE – If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:				
a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				X
b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?				X
c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?				X
d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?				X

DISCUSSION

XX. WILDFIRE – If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones would the project:

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

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

The trail is not located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones. Therefore, Section XX. Wildfire does not apply.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the proposed project would not result in any wildfire environmental impacts.

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIX. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE				
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?			X	

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?			X	
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?			X	

DISCUSSION

XIX. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

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

As discussed in the Biological Resources section of the environmental checklist, the trail is located in an urbanized area which provides poor quality habitat for any special-status species, is not located on a sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service, and will have no impact on the movement of migratory fish or wildlife species or on established wildlife corridors or wildlife nursery sites as there are no bodies of water or native wildlife nursery sites in the immediate vicinity of the trail.

b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a

project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?

The trail does not have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable. The trail is specifically identified in the Fresno General Plan and its impacts have been previously considered in the City of Fresno MEIR (SCH# 2012111015).

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

The trail is considered to be of a size and scope that is not a direct or indirect detriment to the quality of the environment through reductions in habitat, populations, or examples of local history (through either individual or cumulative impacts) and does not have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment or reduce the habitat of wildlife species and will not threaten plant communities or endanger any floral or faunal species. Furthermore the trail has no potential to eliminate important examples of major periods in history. Therefore, as noted in preceding sections of this Initial Study, there is no evidence in the record to indicate that incremental environmental impacts facilitated by this project would be cumulatively significant. There is also no evidence in the record that the trail would have any adverse impacts directly, or indirectly, on human beings.

In summary, given the mitigation measures required of the proposed project and the analysis detailed in the preceding Initial Study, the proposed project:

- Does not have environmental impacts which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly nor indirectly;
- Does not have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish/wildlife or native plant species (or cause their population to drop below self-sustaining levels), does not threaten to eliminate a native plant or animal community, and does not threaten or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal;
- Does not eliminate important examples of elements of California history or prehistory;
- Does not have impacts which would be cumulatively considerable even though individually limited; and
- Does not have environmental impacts which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.

Therefore, there are no mandatory findings of significance and preparation of a Negative Declaration, Mitigated Negative Declaration, or Environmental Impact Report is not warranted for this project.