

Exhibit K

CITY OF FRESNO

MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

Notice of Intent was filed with:

FRESNO COUNTY
CLERK
2221 Kern Street
Fresno, California 93721

on

May 11, 2018

The full Initial Study and the Fresno General Plan Master Environmental Impact Report are on file in the Development and Resource Management Department, Fresno City Hall, 3rd Floor 2600 Fresno Street Fresno, California 93721 (559) 621-8277

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT NUMBER:
**ANX-18-002/A-18-001/
R-18-002/T-6198**

APPLICANT:

Lennar Homes
8080 North Palm Avenue #101
Fresno, CA 93711

PROJECT LOCATION:

Northwest corner of West Shaw and North Grantland Avenues, in the County of Fresno, Fresno, California
Site Latitude: 36°48'31.22" N
Site Longitude: 119°55'3.20" W
Assessor's Parcel Number(s): 505-050-12 & -13

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

Yamabe and Horn Engineering, on behalf of Lennar Homes, has filed Annexation Application No. ANX-18-002, Plan Amendment Application No. A-18-001, Pre-zone Application No. R-18-002 and Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 6198/UGM pertaining to ±26.92 acres of property located on the northwest corner of West Shaw and North Grantland Avenues.

Annexation Application No. ANX-18-002 is a request for annexation to the City of Fresno and detachment from the North Central Fire Protection District and the Kings River Conservation District. Plan Amendment Application No. A-18-001 proposes to amend the Fresno General Plan and West Area Community Plan land use designations from Community Commercial (±12.66 acres) and Urban Neighborhood (±14.26 acres) to Medium Density Residential (±26.92 acres). Pre-zone Application No. R-18-002 proposes to amend the Official Zone Map to reclassify the subject property from the RR (Rural Residential) zone district to the RS-5 (Residential Single Family) zone district. Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 6198/UGM is a request to subdivide ±26.05 acres of the subject into a 163-lot single-family residential development.

The project will also require dedications for public street rights-of-way and utility easements as well as the construction of public facilities and infrastructure in accordance with the standards, specifications and policies of the City of Fresno in order to facilitate the future proposed development of the subject property.

The subject property is located within the boundaries of the Fresno General Plan and West Area Community Plan.

The City of Fresno has conducted an initial study and proposes to adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration for the above-described project. The environmental analysis contained in the Initial Study and this Mitigated Negative Declaration is tiered from the Master Environmental Impact Report (SCH # 2012111015) prepared for the Fresno General Plan ("MEIR"). A copy of the MEIR may be reviewed in the City of Fresno Development and Resource Management Department as noted above. The proposed project has been determined to be a subsequent project that is not fully within the scope of the Master Environmental Impact Report ("MEIR") prepared for the Fresno General Plan. Pursuant to Public Resources Code § 21157.1 and California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines § 15177, this project has been evaluated with respect to each item on the attached environmental checklist to determine whether this project may cause any additional significant effect on the environment which was not previously examined in the MEIR. After conducting a review of the adequacy of the MEIR pursuant to Public Resources Code, Section 21157.6(b)(1), the Development and Resource Management Department, as lead agency, finds that no substantial changes have occurred with respect to the circumstances under which the MEIR was certified and that no new information, which was not known and could not have been known at the time that the MEIR was certified as complete, has become available.

This completed environmental impact checklist form, its associated narrative, and proposed mitigation measures reflect applicable comments of responsible and trustee agencies and research and analyses conducted to examine the interrelationship between the proposed project and the physical environment. The information contained in the project application and its related environmental assessment application, responses to requests for comment, checklist, initial study narrative, and any attachments thereto, combine to form a record indicating that an initial study has been completed in compliance with the State CEQA Guidelines and the CEQA.

All new development activity and many non-physical projects contribute directly or indirectly toward cumulative impacts on the physical environment. It has been determined that the incremental effect contributed by this project toward cumulative impacts is not considered substantial or significant in itself, and/or that cumulative impacts accruing from this project may be mitigated to less than significant with application of feasible mitigation measures.

Based upon the evaluation guided by the environmental checklist form, it was determined that there are foreseeable impacts from the Project that are additional to those identified in the MEIR, and/or impacts which require mitigation measures not included in the MEIR Mitigation Measure Checklist.

The completed environmental checklist form indicates whether an impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant.

For some categories of potential impacts, the checklist may indicate that a specific adverse environmental effect has been identified which is of sufficient magnitude to be of concern. Such an effect may be inherent in the nature and magnitude of the project, or may be related to the design and characteristics of the individual project. Effects so rated are not sufficient in themselves to require the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report, and have been mitigated to the extent feasible. With the project specific mitigation imposed, there is no substantial evidence in the record that this project may have additional significant, direct, indirect or cumulative effects on the environment that are significant and that were not identified and analyzed in the MEIR. Both the MEIR mitigation checklist measures and the project-specific mitigation checklist measures will be imposed on this project.

The initial study has concluded that the proposed project will not result in any adverse effects which fall within the "Mandatory Findings of Significance" contained in Section 15065 of the State CEQA Guidelines.

The finding is, therefore, made that the proposed project will not have a significant adverse effect on the environment.

| | |
|--|---|
| PREPARED BY: Israel Trejo, Planner | SUBMITTED BY:  Will Tackett, Supervising Planner DEVELOPMENT & RESOURCE MANAGEMENT DEPARTMENT |
| DATE: May 11, 2018 | |
| Attachments: | <ul style="list-style-type: none">-Notice of Intent-Initial Study Impact Checklist and Initial Study (Appendix G)-MEIR Mitigation Monitoring Checklist Mitigation and Monitoring Reporting Program dated May 11, 2018- Project Specific Mitigation Monitoring Checklist dated May 11, 2018 |

CITY OF FRESNO

NOTICE OF INTENT TO ADOPT A
MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATIONEA No. ANX-18-002/A-18-001/R-18-002/T-6198

Annexation Application No. ANX-18-002
 Plan Amendment Application No. A-18-001
 Pre-zone Application No. R-18-002
 Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 6198/UGM

APPLICANT:

Lennar Homes
 8080 North Palm Avenue #101
 Fresno, CA 93711

PROJECT LOCATION:

Northwest corner of West Shaw and North Grantland
 Avenues, in the County of Fresno, Fresno, California

Site Latitude: 36°48'31.22" N
 Site Longitude: 119°55'3.20" W

Assessor's Parcel Number(s): 505-050-12 & -13

Filed with:

F I L E D
 MAY 11 2018
 TIME 4:05
 FRESNO COUNTY CLERK
 By Engel S. DEPUTY

FRESNO COUNTY CLERK
 2221 Kern Street, Fresno, CA
 93721

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

Yamabe and Horn Engineering, on behalf of Lennar Homes, has filed Annexation Application No. ANX-18-002, Plan Amendment Application No. A-18-001, Pre-zone Application No. R-18-002 and Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 6198/UGM pertaining to ±26.92 acres of property located on the northwest corner of West Shaw and North Grantland Avenues.

Annexation Application No. ANX-18-002 is a request for annexation to the City of Fresno and detachment from the North Central Fire Protection District and the Kings River Conservation District. Plan Amendment Application No. A-18-001 proposes to amend the Fresno General Plan and West Area Community Plan land use designations from Community Commercial (±12.66 acres) and Urban Neighborhood (±14.26 acres) to Medium Density Residential (±26.92 acres). Pre-zone Application No. R-18-002 proposes to amend the Official Zone Map to reclassify the subject property from the RR (Rural Residential) zone district to the RS-5 (Residential Single Family) zone district. Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 6198/UGM is a request to subdivide ±26.05 acres of the subject into a 163-lot single-family residential development.

The project will also require dedications for public street rights-of-way and utility easements as well as the construction of public facilities and infrastructure in accordance with the standards, specifications and policies of the City of Fresno in order to facilitate the future proposed development of the subject property.

The City of Fresno has conducted an initial study of the above-described project and it has been determined to be a subsequent project that is not fully within the scope of the Master Environmental Impact Report (MEIR) prepared for the Fresno General Plan (SCH # 2012111015). Therefore, the Development and Resource Management Department proposes to adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration for this project.

With the project specific mitigation imposed, there is no substantial evidence in the record that this project may have additional significant, direct, indirect or cumulative effects on the environment that are significant and that were not identified and analyzed in the MEIR. After conducting a review of the adequacy of the MEIR pursuant to Public Resources Code, Section 21157.6(b)(1), the Development and Resource Management Department, as lead agency, finds that no substantial changes have occurred with respect to the circumstances under which the MEIR was certified and that no new information, which was not known and could not have been known at the time that the MEIR was certified as complete has become available. The project is not located on a site which is included on any of the lists enumerated under Section 65962.5 of the Government Code including, but not limited to, lists of hazardous waste facilities, land designated as hazardous waste property, hazardous waste disposal sites and others, and the information in the Hazardous Waste and Substances Statement required under subdivision (f) of that Section.

Additional information on the proposed project, including the MEIR, the proposed environmental finding of a mitigated negative declaration and the initial study may be obtained from the Development and Resource Management Department, Fresno City Hall, 2600 Fresno Street, 3rd Floor Fresno, California 93721-3604. Please contact Israel Trejo at (559) 621-8044 or via e-mail at Israel.Trejo@fresno.gov for more information.

ANY INTERESTED PERSON may comment on the proposed environmental finding. Comments must be in writing and must state (1) the commentor's name and address; (2) the commentor's interest in, or relationship to, the project; (3) the environmental determination being commented upon; and (4) the specific reason(s) why the proposed environmental determination should or should not be made. Any comments may be submitted at any time between the publication date of this notice and close of business on June 4, 2018. Please direct comments to Israel Trejo, City of Fresno Development and Resource Management Department, City Hall, 2600 Fresno Street, Room 3043, Fresno, California, 93721-3604; or by email to Israel.Trejo@fresno.gov.

| | |
|---|---|
| INITIAL STUDY PREPARED BY: Israel Trejo, Planner | SUBMITTED BY:  Will Tackett, Supervising Planner CITY OF FRESNO DEVELOPMENT AND RESOURCE MANAGEMENT DEPARTMENT |
| DATE: May 11, 2018 | |

**MODIFIED APPENDIX G / INITIAL STUDY TO ANALYZE
SUBSEQUENT PROJECT IDENTIFIED IN CERTIFIED MASTER ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT REPORT (MEIR) SCH NO. 2012111015**

**Environmental Checklist Form
For EA No. ANX-18-002/A-18-001/R-18-002/T-6198**

1. Project title:

Annexation Application No. ANX-18-002, Plan Amendment Application No. A-18-001, Pre-zone Application No. R-18-002, Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 6198/UGM

2. Lead agency name and address:

City of Fresno
Development and Resource Management Department
2600 Fresno Street
Fresno, CA 93721

3. Contact person and phone number:

Israel Trejo, Planner
City of Fresno
Development & Resource Management Department
(559) 621-8044

4. Project location:

Northwest corner of West Shaw and North Grantland Avenues, in the County of Fresno, Fresno, California

Site Latitude: 36°48'31.22" N
Site Longitude: 119°55'3.20" W

Assessor's Parcel Number: 505-050-12 & -13

5. Project sponsor's name and address:

Lennar Homes
8080 North Palm Avenue #101
Fresno, CA 93711

6. General plan designation:

Community Commercial (\pm 12.66 acres) and Urban Neighborhood (\pm 14.26 acres)

7. Zoning:

RR (Rural Residential) zone district

8. Description of project:

Annexation Application No. ANX-18-002 is a request for annexation to the City of Fresno and detachment from the North Central Fire Protection District and the Kings River Conservation District. Plan Amendment Application No. A-18-001 proposes to amend the Fresno General Plan and West Area Community Plan land use designations from Community Commercial (± 12.66 acres) and Urban Neighborhood (± 14.26 acres) to Medium Density Residential (± 26.92 acres). Pre-zone Application No. R-18-002 proposes to amend the Official Zone Map to reclassify the subject property from the RR (Rural Residential) zone district to the RS-5 (Residential Single Family) zone district. Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 6198/UGM is a request to subdivide ± 26.05 acres of the subject into a 163-lot single-family residential development.

9. Surrounding land uses and setting:

| | Planned Land Use | Existing Zoning | Existing Land Use |
|--------------|----------------------------|---|------------------------------------|
| North | Medium Density Residential | RS-5 (<i>Residential Single-Family</i>) | Single-Family Residential |
| East | Regional Mixed Use | RMX (<i>Regional Mixed Use</i>) | Rural Residential and Agricultural |
| South | Low Density Residential | RR (<i>Rural Residential</i>) | Rural Residential |
| West | Medium Density Residential | RR (<i>Rural Residential</i>) | Church and Vacant Land |

10. Other public agencies whose approval is required:

Central Unified School District, City of Fresno (COF) Development and Resource Management Department, COF Department of Public Works; COF Department of Public Utilities; COF Fire Department; County of Fresno Department of Public Health; COF Department of Transportation; Fresno Irrigation District; Fresno Metropolitan Flood Control District, San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District.

11. Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 21080.3.1? If so, has consultation begun?

Note: Conducting consultation early in the CEQA process allows tribal governments, lead agencies, and project proponents to discuss the level of environmental review, identify and address potential adverse impacts to tribal cultural resources, and reduce the potential for delay and conflict in the environmental review process. (See PRC section 21083.3.2.) Information may also be available from the California Native American Heritage Commission's Sacred Lands File per PRC Section 5097.96 and the California Historical Resources Information System administered by the California Office of Historic Preservation. Please also note that PRC Section 21082.3(c) contains provisions specific to confidentiality.

The Development and Resource Management Department provided the Table Mountain Rancheria with notification of this project and an invitation to consult on the CEQA review of the proposed project. Table Mountain Rancheria declined participation but asked to be notified in the unlikely event that cultural resources are identified. Various other tribes have also been provided notification of the project, including the Big Sandy Rancheria, Cold Springs Rancheria, Dumna Wo Wah, Dunlap Bandon Mono Indians, Kings River Choinumni Farm, North Fork Mono, Santa Rosa Rancheria, Traditional Choinumni and the Wuksache Indian/Eshom Valley Band. The deadline to request for consultation is June 18, 2018.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

Pursuant to PRC Section 21157.1(b) and CEQA Guidelines 15177(b)(2), the purpose of this initial study is to analyze whether the subsequent project was described in the Master Environmental Impact Report (MEIR) State Clearing House (SCH) No. 2012111015 as prepared and adopted for the Fresno General Plan and whether the subsequent project may cause any additional significant effect on the environment, which was not previously examined in MEIR SCH No. 2012111015.

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

| | | |
|----------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------|
| Aesthetics | Agriculture and Forestry Resources | Air Quality |
| Biological Resources | Cultural Resources | Geology /Soils |
| Greenhouse Gas | Hazards & Hazardous | Hydrology / Water |

| Emissions | Materials | Quality |
|------------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------|
| Land Use / Planning | Mineral Resources | Noise |
| Population / Housing | Public Services | Recreation |
| Transportation/Traffic | Tribal Cultural Resources | Utilities / Service |
| Mandatory Findings of Significance | | |

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project is a subsequent project identified in the MEIR and that it is fully within the scope of the MEIR because it would have no additional significant effects that were not examined in the MEIR such that no new additional mitigation measures or alternatives may be required. All applicable mitigation measures contained in the Mitigation Measure Monitoring Checklist shall be imposed upon the proposed project. A FINDING OF CONFORMITY will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project is a subsequent project identified in the MEIR but that it is not fully within the scope of the MEIR because the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment that was not examined in the MEIR. However, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. The project specific mitigation measures and all applicable mitigation measures contained in the MEIR Mitigation Measure Monitoring Checklist will be imposed upon the proposed project. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project is a subsequent project identified in the MEIR but that it MAY have a significant effect on the environment that was not examined in the MEIR, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required to analyze the potentially significant effects not examined in the MEIR pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21157.1(d) and CEQA Guidelines 15178(a).


Israel Trejo, Planner

5-11-18
Date

EVALUATION OF ADDITIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS NOT ASSESSED IN THE MEIR:

1. For purposes of this MEIR Initial Study, the following answers have the corresponding meanings:
 - a. "No Impact" means the subsequent project will not cause any additional significant effect related to the threshold under consideration which was not previously examined in the MEIR.
 - b. "Less Than Significant Impact" means there is an impact related to the threshold under consideration that was not previously examined in the MEIR, but that impact is less than significant;
 - c. "Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation" means there is a potentially significant impact related to the threshold under consideration that was not previously examined in the MEIR, however, with the mitigation incorporated into the project, the impact is less than significant.
 - d. "Potentially Significant Impact" means there is an additional potentially significant effect related to the threshold under consideration that was not previously examined in the MEIR.
2. A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
3. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
4. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
5. A "Finding of Conformity" is a determination based on an initial study that the proposed project is a subsequent project identified in the MEIR and that it is fully within the scope of the MEIR because it would have no additional significant effects

that were not examined in the MEIR.

6. "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section XVII, "Earlier Analyses," may be cross-referenced).
7. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR or MEIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a. Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b. Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in the MEIR or another earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c. Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
8. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
9. Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
10. This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
11. The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a. The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b. The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance

| ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
| I. AESTHETICS -- Would the project: | | | | |
| a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? | | | | X |
| b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? | | | | X |
| c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings? | | | | X |
| d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? | | | X | |

The site is located within an area that has been significantly developed with single family residences and planned for residential and commercial uses. No identified or designated public or scenic vistas will be obstructed by the proposed project and no scenic resources will be damaged or removed. The project will not degrade the visual character or quality of the subject site and its surroundings, given that the project site is in an area planned for and developed with residences at comparable densities. Future development of the site will create a new source of light or glare within the area. However, the majority of the project site is already surrounded by existing urban and rural single family residential uses, which already affect day and night time views in the project area; and, given that the site is located adjacent to a future regional mixed use planned area, which will create light and glare to a considerably greater degree than the proposed project, a less than significant impact will occur. In conclusion, the project will not result in any aesthetic impacts beyond those analyzed in MEIR SCH No. 2012111015 prepared for the Fresno General Plan.

| ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
| II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES: In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. -- Would the project: | | | | |
| a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? | | | | X |
| b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? | | | | X |
| c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))? | | | | X |
| d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? | | | | X |

| ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
| e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use? | | | X | |

The subject property is deemed "Farmland of Local Importance" and "Rural Residential", therefore it will not convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared (2014) pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to a non-agricultural use. The project site is not zoned for agricultural uses and does not have a Williamson Act contract. The site is currently zoned for residential and commercial uses, therefore it will not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land or timberland. The project has a less than significant impact on the potential to facilitate the conversion of farmland because the proposed use is consistent with existing single-family residential development in the area.

In conclusion, the proposed project is fully within the scope of the Fresno General Plan and would not result in any agriculture and forestry 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 |
|--|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
| III. AIR QUALITY AND GLOBAL CLIMATE CHANGE - (Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations.) - Would the project: | | | | |

| ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
| a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan (e.g., by having potential emissions of regulated criterion pollutants which exceed the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control Districts (SJVAPCD) adopted thresholds for these pollutants)? | | X | | |
| b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? | | | X | |
| c) 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 | |
| d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? | | | X | |
| e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? | | | | X |

Setting

The subject site is located in Fresno County and within the San Joaquin Valley Air Basin (SJVAB). This region has had chronic non-attainment of federal and state clean air standards for ozone/oxidants and particulate matter due to a combination of topography and climate. The San Joaquin Valley (Valley) is hemmed in on three sides by mountain ranges, with prevailing winds carrying pollutants and pollutant precursors from urbanized areas to the north (and in turn contributing pollutants and precursors to downwind air basins). The Mediterranean climate of this region, with a high number of sunny days and little or no measurable precipitation for several months of the year, fosters photochemical reactions in the atmosphere, creating ozone and particulate matter.

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

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

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

During the winter, wind speed and direction data indicate that wind occasionally originates from the south end of the Valley and flows in a north-northwesterly direction. Also during the winter months, the Valley generally experiences light, variable winds (less than 10 mph). Low wind speeds, combined with low inversion layers in the winter, create a climate conducive to high carbon monoxide (CO) and particulate matter (PM10 and PM2.5) concentrations. The SJVAB has an "Inland Mediterranean" climate averaging over 260 sunny days per year. The Valley floor is characterized by warm, dry summers and cooler winters. For the entire Valley, high daily temperature readings in summer average 95°F. Temperatures below freezing are unusual. Average high temperatures in the winter are in the 50s, but highs in the 30s and 40s can occur on days with persistent fog and low cloudiness. The average daily low temperature is 45°F.

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

Regulations

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.

The Master Environmental Impact Report (MEIR) prepared for the Fresno General Plan and Policy RC-4-c of the Fresno General Plan require that computer models used by the SJVAPCD be used to analyze development projects and estimate future air pollutant emissions that can be expected to be generated from operational emissions (vehicular traffic associated with the project), area-wide emissions (sources such as ongoing maintenance activities and use of appliances), and construction activities.

CalEEMod is a statewide land use emissions computer model designed to provide a uniform platform for government agencies, land use planners, and environmental professionals to quantify potential criteria pollutant and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions associated with both construction and operations from a variety of land use projects. The model quantifies direct emissions from construction and operations (including vehicle and off-road equipment use), as well as indirect emissions, such as GHG emissions from energy use, solid waste disposal, vegetation planting and/or removal, and water use. Further, the model identifies mitigation measures to reduce criteria pollutant and GHG emissions along with calculating the benefits achieved from measures chosen by the user. The GHG mitigation measures were developed and adopted by the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA).

In addition to the above-mentioned factors, the CalEEMod computer model evaluates the following emissions: ozone precursors (Reactive Organic Gases (ROG)) and NOX; CO, SOX, both regulated categories of particulate matter, and the greenhouse gas carbon dioxide (CO2). The model incorporates geographically-customized data on local vehicles, weather, and SJVAPCD Rules.

The analysis was conducted using the CalEEMod Model, Version 2013.2.2. The project is proposing to develop a 163 lot single-family residential subdivision.

Construction Emissions – Short Term

It was assumed that the project would be constructed over a period of three years. Construction equipment estimates were based on CalEEMod default assumptions.

Project Construction Emissions

| <i>[all data given in tons/year]</i> | ROG | NOx | CO | SO2 | PM10 | PM2.5 | CO2 |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|
| 2019 Construction | 0.43 | 4.20 | 2.95 | 5.52 | 0.64 | 0.39 | 492.32 |
| 2020 Construction | 0.32 | 2.84 | 2.48 | 4.85 | 0.22 | 0.16 | 426.73 |
| 2021 Construction | 6.38 | 0.37 | 0.41 | 7.10 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 62.09 |
| Project Total | 7.13 | 7.41 | 5.84 | 17.47 | 0.88 | 0.57 | 981.14 |

| | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|----|----|-----|-----|----|----|-----|
| District Thresholds | 10 | 10 | N/A | N/A | 15 | 15 | N/A |
|----------------------------|----|----|-----|-----|----|----|-----|

The analysis determined that the proposed project will not exceed the threshold of significance limits for regulated air pollutants. SJVAPCD Regulation VIII addresses not only construction and demolition dust control measures, but also regulates ongoing maintenance of open ground areas that may create entrained dust from high winds. 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.

Operational Emissions – Long Term

Operational emissions include emissions associated with area sources (energy use, landscaping, etc.) and vehicle emissions. Emissions from each phase of the project were estimated using the CalEEMod model. The average trips were based on default assumptions in the CalEEMod model.

Project Annual Operational Emissions

| <i>[all data given in tons/year]</i> | ROG | NOx | CO | SO2 | PM10 | PM2.5 | CO2 |
|--------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|------------|------------|-----------|-----------|------------|
| Area | 3.30 | 0.01 | 1.21 | 6.00 | 6.68 | 6.68 | 1.97 |
| Mobile | 0.64 | 7.70 | 6.40 | 0.03 | 1.76 | 0.50 | 2844.86 |
| Project Totals | 3.94 | 7.71 | 7.61 | 6.03 | 8.44 | 7.18 | 2846.83 |
| District Thresholds | 10 | 10 | N/A | N/A | 15 | 15 | N/A |

Project specific emissions of criteria pollutants are not expected to exceed District significance thresholds of 10 tons/year NOX, 10 tons/year ROG, and 15 tons/year PM10. Project specific criteria pollutant emissions would have no significant adverse impact on air quality.

The SJVAPCD has developed the San Joaquin Valley 1991 California Clean Air Act Air Quality Attainment Plan (AQAP), which continues to project nonattainment for the above-noted pollutants in the future. This project will be subject to applicable SJVAPCD rules, regulations, and strategies. In addition, the project will be subject to the SJVAPCD Regulation VIII, Fugitive Dust Rules, related to the control of dust and fine particulate matter. This rule mandates the implementation of dust control measures to reduce the potential for dust to the lowest possible level. The plan includes a number of strategies to improve air quality including a transportation control strategy and a vehicle inspection program.

The proposed project is subject to District Rule 9510 (Indirect Source Review). District Rule 9510 is intended to mitigate a project's impact on air quality through project design elements or by payment of applicable off-site mitigation fees. The SJVAPCD has provided confirmation that the Air Impact Assessment (AIA) application for the proposed project has been approved and the project has been found to comply with the emission reduction requirements of District Rule 9510.

The project's emissions as a percentage of the area source, energy use, and vehicle emissions within Fresno County are very small. The project's overall contribution to the overall emissions is negligible. Therefore, there is no air quality or global climate change impacts perceived to occur as a result of the proposed project. Both short and long term impacts associated with construction and operation are below the District's significance thresholds. The project will not occur at a scale or scope with potential to contribute substantially or cumulatively to existing or projected air quality violations, impacts, or increases of criteria pollutants for which the San Joaquin Valley region is under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors). The proposed project will comply with all applicable air quality plans. Therefore, no violations of air quality standards will occur and a less than significant increase of pollutants will occur; nor will the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. The project will not create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people since the project is a common residential development.

Mitigation Measures

1. The proposed project shall implement and incorporate, as applicable, the air quality related mitigation measures as identified in the attached Master Environmental Impact Report SCH No. 2012111015 Fresno General Plan Mitigation Monitoring Checklist dated May 11, 2018.
2. The proposed project shall implement and incorporate the air quality related mitigation measures as identified in the attached Project Specific Mitigation Monitoring Checklist dated May 11, 2018.

| 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 |

The proposed project will not have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, any sensitive, special status, or candidate 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 subject property has been utilized historically (approx. 20 years ago) for irrigated row and field crops. Irrigated row and field crops include annual and perennial crops, grown in rows. Row and field crops are artificially irrigated and feature a moderate disturbance rate by vehicle and pedestrian encroachment typically associated with farming activities. Since irrigated row and field crops contain active agriculture, and are therefore significantly disturbed with altered substrates, this vegetation community does not provide suitable habitat for any special-status plant species and limited habitat for special-status wildlife species. It is noted the subject property has not been cultivated in approximately 20 years and remains fallow and void of vegetation, other than seasonal weeds with evidence of soil surface disturbance and/or compaction from discing the site of weeds for fire control. There is no riparian habitat or any other sensitive natural community identified in the vicinity of the proposed project by the California Department of Fish and Game or the US Fish and Wildlife Service. No federally protected wetlands are located on the subject site. The proposed project would 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 migratory fish or wildlife species known to exist on the site; nor is there an established wildlife corridor or wildlife nursery site. The project will not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance as there are no policies prohibiting fallow land from being developed. No habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans in the region pertain to the natural resources that exist on the subject site or in its immediate vicinity.

Mitigation Measure MM BIO – 4 of Master Environmental Impact Report SCH No. 2012111015 for the Fresno General Plan requires projects within the Planning Area to avoid, if possible, construction within the general nesting season of February through August for avian species protected under Fish and Game Code 3500 and the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA), if it is determined that suitable nesting habitat occurs on a project site. If construction cannot avoid the nesting season, a pre-construction clearance survey must be conducted to determine if any nesting birds or nesting activity is observed on or within 500-feet of a project site. If an active nest is observed during the survey, a biological monitor must be on site to ensure that no proposed project activities would impact the active nest. A suitable buffer will be established around the active nest until the nestlings have fledged and the nest is no longer active. Project activities may continue in the vicinity of the nest only at the discretion of the biological monitor.

In conclusion, the project is fully within the scope of the Fresno General Plan and will not result in any biological resource impacts beyond those analyzed in MEIR SCH No. 2012111015.

Mitigation Measures

1. The proposed project shall implement and incorporate, as applicable, the biological resources related mitigation measures as identified in the attached Master Environmental Impact Report SCH No. 2012111015 Fresno General Plan

Mitigation Monitoring Checklist dated May 11, 2018.

| 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 '15064.5? | | | | X |
| b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to '15064.5? | | | | X |
| c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? | | | | X |
| d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? | | | | X |

There are no structures which exist within the project area that are listed in the National or Local Register of Historic Places, and the subject site is not within a designated historic district. There are no known archaeological or paleontological resources that exist within the project area; previously unknown paleontological resources or undiscovered human remains could be disturbed during project construction. There is no evidence that cultural resources of any type (including historical, archaeological, paleontological, or unique geologic features) exist on the subject property. Past record searches for the region have not revealed the likelihood of cultural resources on the subject property or in its immediate vicinity. Therefore, it is not expected that the proposed project may impact cultural resources. It should be noted however, that lack of surface evidence of historical resources does not preclude the subsurface existence of archaeological resources. Furthermore, previously unknown paleontological resources or undiscovered human remains could be disturbed during project construction.

Therefore, due to the ground disturbing activities that will occur as a result of the project, the measures within the Master Environmental Impact Report SCH No. 2012111015 for the Fresno General Plan, Mitigation Monitoring Checklist 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.

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

1. The proposed project shall implement and incorporate, as applicable, the cultural resource related mitigation measures as identified in the attached Master Environmental Impact Report SCH No. 2012111015 Fresno General Plan Mitigation Monitoring Checklist dated May 11, 2018.

| ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
| VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS -- Would the project: | | | | |
| a) Expose people or structures to 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. | | | | X |
| ii) Strong seismic ground shaking? | | | | X |
| iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? | | | | X |
| iv) Landslides? | | | | X |

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

There are no geologic hazards or unstable soil conditions known to exist on the site. The existing topography is flat with no apparent unique or significant land forms such as vernal pools. Development of the property requires compliance with grading and drainage standards of the City of Fresno and the Fresno Metropolitan Flood Control District (FMFCD) Standards.

Fresno has no known active earthquake faults and is not in any Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zones. The immediate Fresno area has 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.

Fresno is classified by the State as being in a moderate seismic risk zone, Category "C" or "D," depending on the soils underlying the specific location being categorized and that location's proximity to the nearest known fault lines. All new structures are required to conform to current seismic protection standards in the California Building Code. Seismic upgrade/retrofit requirements are imposed on older structures by the City's

Development and Resource Management Department as may be applicable to building modification and rehabilitation projects.

No adverse environmental effects related to topography, soils or geology are expected as a result of this project.

In conclusion, the proposed project would not result in any geology or soil 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 |
|--|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
| VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS -- Would the project: | | | | |
| a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment? | | | X | |
| b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases? | | | X | |

GHG emissions and global climate change represent cumulative impacts. GHG emissions cumulatively contribute to the significant adverse environmental impacts of global climate change. No single project could generate enough GHG emissions to noticeably change the global average temperature; instead, the combination of GHG emissions from past, present, and future projects have contributed and may contribute to global climate change and its associated environmental impacts.

Significant changes in global climate patterns have recently been associated with global warming, an average increase in the temperature of the atmosphere near the Earth's surface, attributed to accumulation of GHG emissions in the atmosphere. Greenhouse gases trap heat in the atmosphere, which in turn heats the surface of the Earth. Some GHGs occur naturally and are emitted to the atmosphere through natural processes, while others are created and emitted solely through human activities. The emission of GHGs through the combustion of fossil fuels (i.e., fuels containing carbon) in conjunction with other human activities appears to be closely associated with global warming.

State law defines GHGs to include the following: carbon dioxide (CO₂), methane (CH₄), nitrous oxide (N₂O), hydrofluorocarbons, perfluorocarbons, and sulfur hexafluoride

(SF6) [Health and Safety Code, section 38505(g)]. The most common GHG that results from human activity is carbon dioxide, followed by methane and nitrous oxide.

The proposed project will not occur at a scale or scope with potential to contribute substantially or cumulatively to the generation of GHG emissions, either directly or indirectly. 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.

In conclusion, the proposed project will not result in any greenhouse gas emission 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 |
|---|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
| VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIAL -- Would the project: | | | | |
| a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? | | | | X |
| b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? | | | | X |
| c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? | | | | X |

| ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
| d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? | | | | X |
| e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? | | | | X |
| f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? | | | | X |
| g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? | | | | X |
| h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands? | | | | X |

Hazardous materials are 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

There are no known existing hazardous material conditions on the site and the project is not located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. The project is not located near any

wildland fire hazard zones, and poses no interference with the City's or County's Hazard Mitigation Plans or emergency response plans.

The subject site has not been under cultivation for many years. No pesticides or hazardous materials are known to exist on the site and the proposed project will have no environmental impacts related to potential hazards or hazardous materials as identified above.

The project site is not located within the vicinity of the Fresno Yosemite Airport or any other airport or private air strip. No risks or hazards would result from constructing the project in the proposed location.

In conclusion, the project will not result in any hazards and hazardous material 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 |
|---|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
| IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY -- Would the project: | | | | |
| a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements? | | | | X |
| b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)? | | | 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, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site? | | | | X |

| ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
| d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site? | | | | X |
| e) 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? | | X | | |
| f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality? | | | | X |
| g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map? | | | | X |
| h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows? | | | | X |
| i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam? | | | | X |
| j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow? | | | | X |

Fresno is one of the largest cities in the United States still relying primarily on groundwater for its public water supply. Surface water treatment and distribution has been implemented in the northeastern part of the City, but the city is still subject to an EPA Sole Source Aquifer designation. While the aquifer underlying Fresno typically exceeds a depth of 300 feet and is capacious enough to provide adequate quantities of safe drinking water to the metropolitan area well into the twenty-first century, groundwater degradation, increasingly stringent water quality regulations, and an historic trend of high consumptive use of water on a per capita basis (some 250 gallons per day per capita), have resulted in a general decline in aquifer levels, increased cost to provide potable water, and localized water supply limitations.

This mitigated negative declaration prepared for the proposed project is tiered from Master Environmental Impact Report SCH No. 2012111015) prepared for the Fresno General Plan (collectively, the “MEIR”), which contains measures to mitigate projects’ individual and cumulative impacts to groundwater resources and to reverse the groundwater basin’s overdraft conditions.

Fresno has attempted to address these issues through metering and revisions to the City’s Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP). The Fresno Metropolitan Water Resource Management Plan, which has been adopted and the accompanying Final EIR (SCH #95022029) certified, is also under revision. The purpose of these management plans is to provide safe, adequate, and dependable water supplies in order to meet the future needs of the metropolitan area in an economical manner; protect groundwater quality from further degradation and overdraft; and, provide a plan of reasonably implementable measures and facilities. City water wells, pump stations, recharge facilities, water treatment and distribution systems have been expanded incrementally to mitigate increased water demands and respond to groundwater quality challenges.

The 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 Master Environmental Impact Report 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 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 General Plan recognizes the Kings Basin’s Integrated Regional Water Management Plan, Fresno-Area Regional Groundwater Management Plan, and City of Fresno Metropolitan Water Resource Management Plan and cites the findings of the City of Fresno 2010 Urban Water Management Plan. 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. The UWMP was made available for public review together with the MND for the proposed project.

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 planned for southeast Fresno to meet demands anticipated by the growth implicit in the 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 2010 UWMP projects that groundwater pumped by the City will decrease from approximately 128,578 AF/year in 2010 to approximately 85,000 AF/year at buildout of the General Plan Update. This would represent a decrease in the groundwater percentage of total water supply from 87 percent to 36 percent. This reduction in groundwater pumping will recharge the aquifer by approximately 15,000 acre-feet per year because the safe yield is approximately 1000,000 acre-feet per year. In order to meet this projection, the City is planning to rely on expanding their delivery and treatment of surface water supplies and groundwater recharge activities.

The City has been adding to and upgrading its water supplies through capital improvements, including adding pipelines to distribute treated surface water. Additionally, in 2009, the treatment capacity of the Fresno/Clovis Regional Wastewater Reclamation Facility was improved. The City has recently been providing tertiary treatment at some of its wastewater treatment plants to supply tertiary treated recycled water for landscape irrigation to new growth areas and the North Fresno Wastewater Reclamation Facilities Satellite Plant was recently built to serve the Copper River development and golf course in the northern part of Fresno.

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.

The City also has implemented an extensive water conservation program which is detailed in Fresno's current UWMP and additional conservation is anticipated as more of the City's residential customers become metered. The City has implemented a residential water meter program; installing and metering water service for all single-family residential customers in the City by 2013. The City also intends to commence providing tiered rates to incentivize further reduction in water usage. Fresno continues to periodically update its water management plans to ensure the cost-effective use of water resources and continued availability of groundwater and surface water supplies. In accordance with the provisions of the Fresno General Plan and Master EIR No. 2012111015 mitigation measures, project specific water supply and distribution

requirements must assure that an adequate source of water is available to serve the project. The City of Fresno Department of Public Utilities, Water Division has reviewed the proposed project and has determined that water service will be available to the proposed project subject to water mains being extended within the proposed subdivision and major streets along the project frontage to provide service to each lot created; and, subject to payment of applicable water charges. Implementation of the Fresno General Plan policies, the Kings Basin Integrated Regional Water Management Plan, City of Fresno Urban Water Management Plan, Fresno-Area Regional Groundwater Management Plan, and City of Fresno Metropolitan Water Resource Management Plan and the applicable mitigation measures of approved environmental review documents will address the issues of providing an adequate, reliable, and sustainable water supply for the project's urban domestic and public safety consumptive purposes. The mitigation measures of the MEIR are incorporated herein by reference and are required to be implemented by the attached mitigation monitoring checklist. In summary, these mitigation measures equate to City of Fresno policies and initiatives aimed toward ensuring that the City has a reliable, long-range source of water through the implementation of measures to promote water conservation through standards, incentives and capital investments.

The project does not have the potential to substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site. According to the Fresno Metropolitan Flood Control District (FMFCD), the subject site is not located within a flood prone or hazard area. The developer will be required to provide improvements which will convey surface drainage to temporary storage facilities and will, therefore, not create flooding. The developer will be required to provide improvements which will convey surface drainage to temporary storage facilities and will, therefore, not exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems; additionally, the project is similar to existing development in the area, and throughout the City, and is not expected to cause substantial additional sources of polluted runoff or otherwise substantially degrade water quality. The proposed project site will not place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map; nor will the project place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows. The project will not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam as the project will be required to implement the requirements of the Fresno Metropolitan Flood Control District. The project site is not subject to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow as those phenomena do not occur in the subject project area.

There are otherwise no aspects of this project that will result in impacts to water supply or quality beyond those analyzed in the Master Environmental Impact Report SCH No. 2012111015 for the Fresno General Plan.

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

Mitigation Measures

1. The proposed project shall implement and incorporate, as applicable, the hydrology and water quality related mitigation measures as identified in the attached Master Environmental Impact Report SCH No. 2012111015 Fresno General Plan Mitigation Monitoring Checklist dated May 11, 2018.
2. The proposed project shall implement and incorporate the hydrology and water quality related mitigation measures as identified in the attached Project Specific Mitigation Monitoring Checklist dated May 11, 2018.

| ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
| X. LAND USE AND PLANNING - Would the project: | | | | |
| a) Physically divide an established community? | | | | X |
| b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? | | | X | |
| c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan? | | | | X |

The project proposes to develop 163 lots within a developing area and does not have the capability to divide an established community. The proposed tract map is consistent with the proposed medium density residential planned land use designation and does not conflict with any applicable land use plan adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. The project will not conflict with any conservation plans since it is not located within any conservation plan areas.

| ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
| XI. 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 |

The subject site 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. The subject site 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 resource.

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 |
|---|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
| XII. NOISE -- Would the project result in: | | | | |
| a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? | | | X | |

| ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
| b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels? | | | X | |
| c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? | | | X | |
| d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? | | | 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 expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? | | | | X |
| f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? | | | | X |

Generally, the three primary sources of substantial noise that affect the City of Fresno and its residents are transportation-related and consist of major streets and regional highways; airport operations at the Fresno Yosemite International, the Fresno-Chandler Downtown, and the Sierra Sky Park Airports; and railroad operations along the BNSF Railway and the Union Pacific Railroad lines.

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

activities that may be subject to stress and/or significant interference from noise.

Stationary noise sources can also have an effect on the population, and unlike mobile, transportation-related noise sources, these sources generally have a more permanent and consistent impact on people. These stationary noise sources involve a wide spectrum of uses and activities, including various industrial uses, commercial operations, agricultural production, school playgrounds, high school football games, HVAC units, generators, lawn maintenance equipment and swimming pool pumps.

Potential noise sources at the project site would occur primarily from roadway noise from West Shaw and North Grantland Avenues along the respective frontages of the subject site.

The City of Fresno Noise Element of the Fresno General Plan establishes a land use compatibility criterion of 65dB DNL for exterior noise levels in outdoor areas of noise-sensitive land uses. The intent of the exterior noise level requirement is to provide an acceptable noise environment for outdoor activities and recreation. Furthermore, the Noise Element also requires that interior noise levels attributable to exterior noise sources not exceed 45 dB DNL. The intent of the interior noise level standard is to provide an acceptable noise environment for indoor communication and sleep.

The project site is currently vacant. Therefore, it is reasonable to assume that the proposed project will result in an increase in temporary and/or periodic ambient noise levels on the subject property above existing levels.

Although the project will create additional activity in the area, the project will be required to comply with all noise policies and mitigation measures identified within the Fresno General Plan and MEIR as well as the noise ordinance of the Fresno Municipal Code.

In conclusion, the project is fully within the scope of the Fresno General Plan and will not result in any noise impacts beyond those analyzed in MEIR SCH No. 2012111015.

Mitigation Measures

1. The proposed project shall implement and incorporate, as applicable, the Noise related mitigation measures as identified in the attached Master Environmental Impact Report SCH No. 2012111015 Fresno General Plan Mitigation Monitoring Checklist dated May 11, 2018.

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

The subject site is currently designated by the Fresno General Plan for Community Commercial (± 12.66 acres) and Urban Neighborhood (± 14.26 acres) planned land uses. The subject plan amendment application proposes to change the planned land use designation for the entirety of the subject property to Medium Density Residential (± 26.92 acres). The subject site is located within an area that has been significantly developed with rural residences and urban single family residences. The existing Urban Neighborhood planned land use designation allows for 16-30 d.u./ac. and equates to 228-427 d.u. which is less dwelling units than what the subject project is proposing (163 d.u.). As such, the proposed project will not induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly or indirectly. Furthermore, the subject site is currently vacant. Therefore, the proposed project does not have the potential to displace housing or persons as a result of development thereon.

No population and housing impacts will result from the proposed project beyond what was analyzed in the Master Environmental Impact Report SCH No. 2012111015 for the Fresno General Plan.

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

Based on the conditions received from the Fire Department dated March 29, 2018, all proposed developments within the service area of Fire Station 18 are being conditioned with the requirement that no occupancy of any buildings will be allowed until permanent Fire Station 18 is constructed on City owned property located at 6605 West Shaw Avenue. As such, with the Fire conditions imposed, there is less than significant impact associated with the provision need for new or physically altered governmental facilities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios. City police protection services are also available to serve the proposed project with no new facilities required for police protection. The applicant must comply with the conditions submitted by FMFCD for the proposed project. Development of the property requires compliance with grading and drainage standards of the City of Fresno and FMFCD. A typical temporary drainage facility will be required until permanent service is available which will have a less than significant impact with mitigation associated with the provision for new facilities. The proposed project will include the development and dedication of an approximately 9,000 sq. ft. open space area. Demand for parks generated by the project is within planned services levels of the City of Fresno Parks and Community Services Department and

the applicant will pay any required impact fees at the time building permits are obtained. Any urban residential development occurring as a result of the proposed project will have an impact on the District's student housing capacity. The developer will pay appropriate school fees at time of building permits.

Mitigation Measures

1. The proposed project shall implement and incorporate, as applicable, the Public Service related mitigation measures as identified in the attached Master Environmental Impact Report SCH No. 2012111015 Fresno General Plan Mitigation Monitoring Checklist dated May 11, 2018.
2. The proposed project shall implement and incorporate the Public Service related mitigation measures as identified in the attached Project Specific Mitigation Monitoring Checklist dated May 11, 2018.

| ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
| XV. RECREATION -- | | | | |
| a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? | | | 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 | |

The proposed project will have a less than significant impact in the physical deterioration of existing parks or recreational facilities; and, will not require expansion of existing recreational facilities or affect recreational services beyond what was analyzed in the MEIR for the Fresno General Plan.

The proposed project will include the development and dedication of a new approximately 9,000 open space area. The applicant will pay any required impact fees at the time building permits are obtained. Maintenance of the proposed open space area may be afforded through annexation into a Community Facilities District (CFD).

In conclusion, the proposed project would not result in any recreation 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 |
|--|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
| XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC - - Would the project: | | | | |
| a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths and mass transit? | | X | | |
| b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways? | | | X | |
| c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that result in substantial safety risks? | | | X | |
| d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? | | | | X |
| e) Result in inadequate emergency access? | | | | X |

| ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
| f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities? | | | | X |

The Fresno General Plan designates West Shaw and North Grantland Avenues as arterial streets. The proposed project will provide and facilitate pedestrian connectivity through the provisions of public common open space and connection point to the adjacent major street intersection. The proposed project is located within Traffic Impact Zone III pursuant to Figure MT-4 of the Fresno General Plan, which generally represents areas near or outside the City Limits but within the Sphere of Influence (SOI) as of December 31, 2012. In accordance with Policy MT-2-i of the Fresno General Plan, when a project includes a General Plan amendment that changes the General Plan Land Use Designation, a Transportation Impact Study (TIS) is required in order to assess the impacts of new development projects on existing and planned streets. Therefore, a Traffic Impact Study was prepared (Yamabe & Horn Engineering, Inc. dated May 2018) to assess the impacts of the new development on existing and planned streets. Applying the factors outlined in the Institute of Traffic Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual, the proposed project would generate 1,561 Average Daily Trips (ADT), with 123 vehicle trips occurring during the morning peak hour travel period and 164 vehicle trips occurring during the evening peak hour travel period. This is considerably less than if the subject site was developed consistent with the existing planned land use designations which would be expected to generate 4,193 ADT, with 253 a.m. peak hour trips and 384 p.m. peak hour trips. As such, the proposed project would result in a decrease of 2,632 ADT over the life of the project. The analysis of traffic operations within the MEIR was conducted based on roadway segments representative of the City overall transportation network. Traffic volumes on the selected roadway segment analysis are based on traffic counts taken at single location. Traffic operations on the study roadway segments were measured using a qualitative measure called Level of Service (LOS). LOS is a general measure of traffic operating conditions whereby a letter grade, from "A" (the best) to "F" (the worst), is assigned. These grades represent the perspective of drivers and are an indication of the comfort and convenience associated with driving, as well as speed, travel time, traffic interruptions, and freedom to maneuver. The threshold established by the Fresno General Plan in TIZ III is Level of Service "D" representing a high-density, but stable flow. Users experience severe restriction in speed and freedom to maneuver, with poor levels of comfort and convenience.

The TIS evaluated the impacts of the project by analyzing the following 11 study intersections in the vicinity of the project during the AM and PM peak hours for the five traffic analysis scenarios required by the City of Fresno. These scenarios include: (1) Existing Conditions; (2) Existing plus Project Conditions; (3) Near Term (Existing plus Approved/Pending Projects plus Proposed Project) Conditions; (4) Year 2035 No Project Conditions – Current land use and, (5) Cumulative Year 2035 plus Project Conditions.

Study Intersections:

1. West Shaw Avenue & North Garfield Avenue
2. West Shaw Avenue & North Grantland Avenue
3. West Shaw Avenue & North Bryan Avenue
4. West Shaw Avenue & North Hayes Avenue
5. West Shaw Avenue & North Polk Avenue
6. West Barstow Avenue & North Grantland Avenue
7. West Ashlan Avenue & North Grantland Avenue
8. West Bullard Avenue & North Grantland Avenue
9. North Grantland Avenue & Site Access
10. West Shaw Avenue & Site Access
11. West Shaw Avenue & Veterans Blvd.

In summary, based on the analyses included in the TIS, the intersection of Shaw and Polk Avenues is currently operating below the TIZ III LOS D Standard. All other study intersections are currently operating above the City of Fresno TIZ III LOS D standard.

The analyses included in the TIS show the following locations, by scenario and time period, are projected to operate below either the City of Fresno TIZ III LOS D standard or the Caltrans LOS C/D standard:

Existing Plus Project

- Hayes Avenue at Shaw Avenue – AM peak hour
- Polk Avenue at Shaw Avenue – AM peak hour

Near Term Plus Project

- Hayes Avenue at Shaw Avenue – AM and PM peak hours
- Polk Avenue at Shaw Avenue – AM peak hour

Cumulative Year 2035 No Project

- Grantland Avenue at Shaw Avenue – AM and PM peak hours
- Polk Avenue at Shaw Avenue – PM peak hour
- Grantland Avenue at Barstow Avenue – AM and PM peak hours

Cumulative Year 2035 Plus Project

- Grantland Avenue at Barstow Avenue – AM and PM peak hours

In addition, four and eight hour traffic signal warrants have been prepared by Traffic Operations and Planning staff at the intersection of Bryan and Shaw Avenues. The four and eight hour traffic signal warrants prepared by City staff showed the intersection meeting both warrants using existing traffic volumes.

The proposed project shall install a traffic signal at the intersection of Bryan and Shaw Avenues within two years of finalization of the subdivision agreement (this traffic signal condition has also been placed on T-5493). The proposed project shall make modifications to the traffic signal at the intersection of Grantland and Shaw Avenues to locate existing traffic signal equipment to the ultimate locations. The proposed project shall lengthen the southbound left-turn pocket at the intersection of Grantland and Shaw Avenues from the existing 150 feet to a length of 250 feet.

Although some study intersections have been projected to operate below the TIZ III LOS D standard under various scenarios, it must be noted that the Fresno General Plan accepts lower LOS values. This reflects a change in policy for the City of Fresno to acknowledge that transportation planning based solely on roadway LOS, which considers only driver comfort and convenience, is not desirable since it fails to acknowledge other users of the circulation system and other community values. In evaluating the roadway system, a lower LOS may be desired when balanced against other community values related to resource protection, social equity, economic development, and consideration of pedestrians, bicyclists, and transit users. In addition, roadway LOS is directly linked to roadway infrastructure costs. A higher LOS results in greater expenditure of infrastructure for wider roadways that do not necessarily serve all users of the circulation system and may compete with other policies of the General Plan Update.

The Fresno General Plan utilizes and encourages strategic initiatives in compliance with the California Complete Streets Act, which provides priority and emphasis on a multi-modal transportation system; more transportation options result in fewer traffic jams and the overall capacity of the transportation network increases. Therefore, providing more transportation options will allow the City to meet its future travel demands without solely relying on motorized vehicles.

Furthermore, in 2014, through passage of Council Resolution No. 2014-225, the City of Fresno adopted Findings of Fact related to Significant and Unavoidable Effects as well as Statements of Overriding Considerations in order to certify Master Environmental Impact Report SCH No. 2012111015 for purposes of adoption of the Fresno General Plan. Section 15093 of the California Environmental Quality Act requires the lead agency to balance the benefits of a proposed project against its unavoidable environmental risks in determining whether to approve the project.

In keeping with the strategic initiatives and with consideration to balancing the roadway system against other community values, the adopted Statements of Overriding Considerations for the MEIR addressed Findings of Significant Unavoidable Impacts within the categories/areas of Transportation and Traffic; citing specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment

opportunities for highly trained workers as project goals, each and all of which were deemed and considered by the Fresno City Council to be benefits, which outweighed the unavoidable adverse environmental effects attributed to development occurring within the City of Fresno Sphere of Influence (SOI), consistent with the land uses, densities, and intensities set forth in the Fresno General Plan.

The Public Works Department, Traffic Engineering Division has reviewed the potential traffic related impacts for the proposed project and has determined that the streets adjacent to and near the subject site will be able to accommodate the quantity and kind of traffic which may be potentially generated subject to the standard city requirements for street improvements and subject to the project specific mitigation measures determined applicable by the City of Fresno Traffic Engineer. These requirements generally include: (1) The provision of a minimum two points of vehicular access to major streets for any phase of the development; (2) Major and local street dedications; (3) Street improvements, (including, but not limited to, construction of concrete curbs, gutters, pavement, underground street lighting systems; (4) Payment of applicable impact fees (including, but not limited to, the Traffic Signal Mitigation Impact (TSMI) Fee, Fresno Major Street Impact (FMSI) Fee, and the Regional Transportation Mitigation Fee (RTMF) Fee.

Based upon the findings contained within the project TIS and the Fresno General Plan MEIR, with implementation of the Fresno General Plan goals, objectives and policies, including the project specific mitigation measures identified in the subject environmental assessment, impacts to roadways within TIZ III would be less than significant.

Therefore, the Public Works Department/Traffic Engineering Division has determined that, based upon the proposed traffic yield from and the expected traffic generation of the proposed project for the subject property, the proposed project will not significantly impact the existing and projected circulation system based upon implementation of the mitigation measures included within the MEIR and based upon compliance with the project specific mitigation measures referenced herein below. As such the project will not conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation.

The project will not conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways.

The passage of California Assembly Bill 2419 in 1996 allowed counties to "opt out" of the California Congestion Management Program, reference above, if a majority of local governments elected to exempt themselves from California's congestion management plans. On September 25, 1997, the Fresno COG Policy Board rescinded the Fresno County Congestion Management Program at the request of the local member

agencies. Therefore, this impact criteria is not applicable and this impact is less than significant.

The project would not result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks. A review of the City of Fresno General Plan revealed no potential internal policy inconsistencies or discrepancies with other adopted plans or programs supporting the provision of aviation facilities or services in the City of Fresno. In addition, demand for aviation facilities or services, which may increase with population and employment growth in the City of Fresno is not expected to result in a change to air traffic patterns, a change to the location of airports, or result in substantial safety risks.

The project has been reviewed by the Department of Public Works, Traffic Division, and is not expected to substantially increase hazards due to a design feature. The Fire Department has appropriately conditioned the project regarding two points of access, therefore there will not be inadequate emergency access. The project will not conflict with adopted policies or plans regarding public transit, bicycle or pedestrian facilities because said features are incorporated into the conditions of approval for the project.

Mitigation Measures

1. The proposed project shall implement and incorporate, as applicable, the Transportation/Traffic related mitigation measures as identified in the attached Master Environmental Impact Report SCH No. 2012111015 Fresno General Plan Mitigation Monitoring Checklist dated May 11, 2018.
2. The proposed project shall implement and incorporate the Transportation/Traffic related mitigation measures as identified in the attached Project Specific Mitigation Monitoring Checklist dated May 11, 2018.

| ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
| XVII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES -- Would the project: | | | | |

| ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
| a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in PRC section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is? | | | | X |
| i) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in PRC section 5020.1(k), or, | | | | X |
| ii) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of PRC section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of PRC section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe. | | | | X |

The proposed project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource defined in PRC Section 21074. The proposed project site 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 significant resource to a California Native American tribe. The proposed site is vacant and is surrounded by developed and undeveloped land. The City of Fresno provided the Table Mountain Rancheria with notification of this project and an invitation to consult on the CEQA review of the proposed project. Table Mountain Rancheria declined participation but asked to be notified in the unlikely event that cultural resources are identified. Various other tribes have also been provided notification of the project,

including the Big Sandy Rancheria, Cold Springs Rancheria, Dumna Wo Wah, Dunlap Bandon Mono Indians, Kings River Choinumni Farm, North Fork Mono, Santa Rosa Rancheria, Traditional Choinumni and the Wuksache Indian/Eshom Valley Band. The deadline to request for consultation is June 18, 2018. Should there be a request for consultation by June 18, 2018, staff will add the findings of the consultation to the subject environmental assessment and amend as appropriate. In conclusion, with MEIR mitigation measures incorporated, with the information known at this time, the project will not result in any tribal cultural resource 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 |
|--|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
| XVIII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS -- Would the project: | | | | |
| a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board? | | | | X |
| b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? | | | X | |
| c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? | | | X | |
| d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed? | | | X | |

| ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
| e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments? | | | X | |
| f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs? | | | X | |
| g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste? | | | | X |

The Department of Public Utilities has determined that adequate sanitary sewer and water services will be available to serve the proposed project subject to the payment of any applicable connection charges and/or fees; and, compliance with the Department of Public Utilities standards, specifications, and policies.

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

The project site will be serviced by the City of Fresno solid waste division and will have water and sewer facilities available subject to the conditions stipulated for the proposed project.

The MEIR has provided mitigation measures that the proposed project must implement and comply with to mitigate drainage in the area. Development of the property requires compliance with grading and drainage standards of the City of Fresno and FMFCD.

The proposed project is not expected to exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board. The impact to storm drainage facilities will be less than significant given the developer will be required to provide drainage services and convey runoff to Master Plan Facilities.

In conclusion, the project will not result in any utilities and service system 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 |
|--|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
| XVX. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE -- | | | | |
| a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory? | | | X | |
| b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)? | | | X | |
| c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? | | | X | |

The subject project is proposed at a size and scope which will not have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment or 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

There is no evidence in the record to indicate that incremental environmental impacts facilitated by this project would be cumulatively significant. Furthermore, there is also no evidence in the record that the project would have any adverse impacts directly, or indirectly, on human beings.

In summary, given the mitigation measures required of the 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.

Therefore, there are no mandatory findings of significance and preparation of an Environmental Impact Report is not warranted for this project.

**MEIR Mitigation Measure Monitoring Checklist for
EA No. ANX-18-002/A-18-001/R-18-002/T-6198**

May 11, 2018

**INCORPORATING MEASURES FROM THE MASTER ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT (MEIR) CERTIFIED FOR
THE CITY OF FRESNO GENERAL PLAN UPDATE (SCH No. 2012111015)**

This mitigation measure monitoring and reporting checklist was prepared pursuant to California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15097 and Section 21081.6 of the Public Resources Code (PRC). It was certified as part of the Fresno City Council's approval of the MEIR for the Fresno General Plan update (Fresno City Council Resolution 2014-225, adopted December 18, 2014).

Letter designations to the right of each MEIR mitigation measure listed in this Exhibit note how the mitigation measure relates to the environmental assessment of the above-listed project, according to the key found at right and at the bottoms of the following pages:

The timing of implementing each mitigation measure is identified in the checklist, as well as identifies the entity responsible for verifying that the mitigation measures applied to a project are performed. Project applicants are responsible for providing evidence that mitigation measures are implemented. As lead agency, the City of Fresno is responsible for verifying that mitigation is performed/completed.

| MITIGATION MEASURE | WHEN IMPLEMENTED | COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY | A | B | C | D | E | F |
|---|---------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Aesthetics: AES-1. Lighting systems for street and parking areas shall include shields to direct light to the roadway surfaces and parking areas. Vertical shields on the light fixtures shall also be used to direct light away from adjacent light sensitive land uses such as residences. | Prior to issuance of building permits | Public Works Department (PW) and Development & Resource Management Dept. (DARM) | X | | | | | |

Verification comments:

| MITIGATION MEASURE | WHEN IMPLEMENTED | COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY | A | B | C | D | E | F |
|---|---------------------------------------|------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Aesthetics (continued): | | | | | | | | |
| AES-2: Lighting systems for public facilities such as active play areas shall provide adequate illumination for the activity; however, low intensity light fixtures and shields shall be used to minimize spillover light onto adjacent properties. | Prior to issuance of building permits | DARM | X | | | | | |
| Verification comments: | | | | | | | | |
| AES-3: Lighting systems for non-residential uses, not including public facilities, shall provide shields on the light fixtures and orient the lighting system away from adjacent properties. Low intensity light fixtures shall also be used if excessive spillover light onto adjacent properties will occur. | Prior to issuance of building permits | DARM | | | | | X | |
| Verification comments: | | | | | | | | |
| AES-4: Lighting systems for freestanding signs shall not exceed 100 foot Lamberts (FT-L) when adjacent to streets which have an average light intensity of less than 2.0 horizontal footcandles and shall not exceed 500 FT-L when adjacent to streets which have an average light intensity of 2.0 horizontal footcandles or greater. | Prior to issuance of building permits | DARM | | | | | X | |
| Verification comments: | | | | | | | | |

A - Incorporated into Project
B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process
D - Responsible Agency Contacted

E - Part of City-Wide Program
F - Not Applicable

| MITIGATION MEASURE | WHEN IMPLEMENTED | COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY | A | B | C | D | E | F |
|---|---------------------------------------|------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Aesthetics (continued): | | | | | | | | |
| AES-5: Materials used on building facades shall be non-reflective. | Prior to development project approval | DARM | X | | | | | |
| Verification comments: | | | | | | | | |

Air Quality:

| | | | | | | | | |
|--|---------------------------------------|------|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| AIR-1: Projects that include five or more heavy-duty truck deliveries per day with sensitive receptors located within 300 feet of the truck loading area shall provide a screening analysis to determine if the project has the potential to exceed criteria pollutant concentration based standards and thresholds for NO2 and PM2.5. If projects exceed screening criteria, refined dispersion modeling and health risk assessment shall be accomplished and if needed, mitigation measures to reduce impacts shall be included in the project to reduce the impacts to the extent feasible. Mitigation measures include but are not limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Locate loading docks and truck access routes as far from sensitive receptors as reasonably possible considering site design limitations to comply with other City design standards. Post signs requiring drivers to limit idling to 5 minutes or less. | Prior to development project approval | DARM | X | | | | | |
| Verification comments: | | | | | | | | |

A - Incorporated into Project

B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process

D - Responsible Agency Contacted

E - Part of City-Wide Program

F - Not Applicable

| MITIGATION MEASURE | WHEN IMPLEMENTED | COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY | A | B | C | D | E | F |
|---------------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|------|---|---|---|---|---|
| Air Quality (continued): | <p>AIR-2: Projects that result in an increased cancer risk of 10 in a million or exceed criteria pollutant ambient air quality standards shall implement site-specific measures that reduce toxic air contaminant (TAC) exposure to reduce excess cancer risk to less than 10 in a million. Possible control measures include but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Locate loading docks and truck access routes as far from sensitive receptors as reasonably possible considering site design limitations to comply with other City design standards. • Post signs requiring drivers to limit idling to 5 minutes or less • Construct block walls to reduce the flow of emissions toward sensitive receptors • Install a vegetative barrier downwind from the TAC source that can absorb a portion of the diesel PM emissions • For projects proposing to locate a new building containing sensitive receptors near existing sources of TAC emissions, install HEPA filters in HVAC systems to reduce TAC emission levels exceeding risk thresholds. • Install heating and cooling services at truck stops to eliminate the need for idling during overnight stops to run onboard systems. <p>(continued on next page)</p> | Prior to development project approval | DARM | | | | X | |

A - Incorporated into Project
B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process
D - Responsible Agency Contacted

E - Part of City-Wide Program
F - Not Applicable

MEIR CHECKLIST FOR EA NO. ANX-18-002/A-18-001/R-18-002/T-6198

May 11, 2018

| MITIGATION MEASURE | WHEN IMPLEMENTED | COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY | A | B | C | D | E | F |
|---|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| Air Quality (continued): | | | | | | | | |
| AIR-2 (continued from previous page) <ul style="list-style-type: none">For large distribution centers where the owner controls the vehicle fleet, provide facilities to support alternative fueled trucks powered by fuels such as natural gas or bio-dieselUtilize electric powered material handling equipment where feasible for the weight and volume of material to be moved. Verification comments: | [see previous page] | [see previous page] | | | | X | | |
| AIR-3: Require developers proposing projects on ARB's list of projects in its Air Quality and Land Use Handbook (Handbook) warranting special consideration to prepare a cumulative health risk assessment when sensitive receptors are located within the distance screening criteria of the facility as listed in the ARB Handbook. Verification comments: | Prior to development project approval | DARM | | | | X | | |

A - Incorporated into Project

B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process

D - Responsible Agency Contacted

E - Part of City-Wide Program

F - Not Applicable

| MITIGATION MEASURE | WHEN IMPLEMENTED | COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY | A | B | C | D | E | F |
|---|---------------------------------------|------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Air Quality (continued): | | | | | | | X | |
| AIR-4: Require developers of projects containing sensitive receptors to provide a cumulative health risk assessment at project locations exceeding ARB Land Use Handbook distance screening criteria or newer criteria that may be developed by the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD). | Prior to development project approval | DARM | | | | | | |
| Verification comments: | | | | | | | | |
| AIR-5: Require developers of projects with the potential to generate significant odor impacts as determined through review of SJVAPCD odor complaint history for similar facilities and consultation with the SJVAPCD to prepare an odor impact assessment and to implement odor control measures recommended by the SJVAPCD or the City to the extent needed to reduce the impact to less than significant. | Prior to development project approval | DARM | | | | | X | |
| Verification comments: | | | | | | | | |

A - Incorporated into Project
B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process
D - Responsible Agency Contacted

E - Part of City-Wide Program
F - Not Applicable

| MITIGATION MEASURE | WHEN IMPLEMENTED | COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY | A | B | C | D | E | F |
|---|--|------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|
| Biological Resources: <p>BIO-1: Construction of a proposed project should avoid, where possible, vegetation communities that provide suitable habitat for a special-status species known to occur within the Planning Area. If construction within potentially suitable habitat must occur, the presence/absence of any special-status plant or wildlife species must be determined prior to construction, to determine if the habitat supports any special-status species. If special-status species are determined to occupy any portion of a project site, avoidance and minimization measures shall be incorporated into the construction phase of a project to avoid direct or incidental take of a listed species to the greatest extent feasible.</p> <p>Verification comments:</p> | <p>Prior to development project approval</p> | DARM | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | | | | |
| <p>BIO-2: Direct or incidental take of any state or federally listed species should be avoided to the greatest extent feasible. If construction of a proposed project will result in the direct or incidental take of a listed species, consultation with the resources agencies and/or additional permitting may be required. Agency consultation through the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) 2081 and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) Section 7 or Section 10 permitting processes must take place prior to any action that</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>(continued on next page)</i></p> | <p>Prior to development project approval</p> | DARM | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | | | | |

A - Incorporated into Project
B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process
D - Responsible Agency Contacted

E - Part of City-Wide Program
F - Not Applicable

| MITIGATION MEASURE | WHEN IMPLEMENTED | COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY | A | B | C | D | E | F |
|---|---------------------------------------|----------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Biological Resources (continued): BIO-2 (continued from previous page) may result in the direct or incidental take of a listed species. Specific mitigation measures for direct or incidental impacts to a listed species will be determined on a case-by-case basis through agency consultation. Verification comments: | <i>[see previous page]</i> | <i>[see previous page]</i> | | | | | | |
| BIO-3: Development within the Planning Area should avoid, where possible, special-status natural communities and vegetation communities that provide suitable habitat for special-status species. If a proposed project will result in the loss of a special-status natural community or suitable habitat for special-status species, compensatory habitat-based mitigation is required under CEQA and the California Endangered Species Act (CESA). Mitigation will consist of preserving on-site habitat, restoring similar habitat or purchasing off-site credits from an approved mitigation bank. Compensatory mitigation will be determined through consultation with the City and/or resource agencies. An appropriate mitigation strategy and ratio will be agreed upon by the developer and lead agency to reduce project impacts to special-status natural communities to a less than significant (continued on next page) | Prior to development project approval | DARM | X | | | | | |

A - Incorporated into Project

C - Mitigation in Process

B - Mitigated

D - Responsible Agency Contacted

E - Part of City-Wide Program

F - Not Applicable

| MITIGATION MEASURE | WHEN IMPLEMENTED | COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY | A | B | C | D | E | F |
|---|---|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Biological Resources (continued): | | | | | | | | |
| <p>BIO-3 (<i>continued from previous page</i>):</p> <p>Level. Agreed-upon mitigation ratios will depend on the quality of the habitat and presence/absence of a special-status species. The specific mitigation for project level impacts will be determined on a case-by-case basis.</p> <p>Verification comments:</p> | <p><i>[see previous page]</i></p> | <p><i>[see previous page]</i></p> | <p><i>[see previous page]</i></p> | <p><i>[see previous page]</i></p> | <p><i>[see previous page]</i></p> | <p><i>[see previous page]</i></p> | <p><i>[see previous page]</i></p> | <p><i>[see previous page]</i></p> |
| <p>BIO-4: Proposed projects within the Planning Area should avoid, if possible, construction within the general nesting season of February through August for avian species protected under Fish and Game Code 3500 and the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA), if it is determined that suitable nesting habitat occurs on a project site. If construction cannot avoid the nesting season, a pre-construction clearance survey must be conducted to determine if any nesting birds or nesting activity is observed on or within 500-feet of a project site. If an active nest is observed during the survey, a biological monitor must be on site to ensure that no proposed project activities would impact the active nest. A suitable buffer will be established around the active nest until the nestlings have fledged and the nest is no longer active. Project activities</p> | <p>Prior to development project approval and during construction activities</p> | <p>DARM</p> | <p>X</p> | <p></p> | <p></p> | <p></p> | <p></p> | <p></p> |

A - Incorporated into Project

B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process

D - Responsible Agency Contacted

E - Part of City-Wide Program

F - Not Applicable

| MITIGATION MEASURE | WHEN IMPLEMENTED | COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY | A | B | C | D | E | F |
|---|---------------------------------------|------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Biological Resources (continued): BIO-4 (continued from previous page): may continue in the vicinity of the nest only at the discretion of the biological monitor. Verification comments: | [see previous page] | [see previous page] | | | | | | |
| BIO-5: If a proposed project will result in the removal or impact to any riparian habitat and/or a special-status natural community with potential to occur in the Planning Area, compensatory habitat-based mitigation shall be required to reduce project impacts. Compensatory mitigation must involve the preservation or restoration or the purchase of off-site mitigation credits for impacts to riparian habitat and/or a special-status natural community. Mitigation must be conducted in-kind or within an approved mitigation bank in the region. The specific mitigation ratio for habitat-based mitigation will be determined through consultation with the appropriate agency (i.e., CDFW or USFWS) on a case-by-case basis. Verification comments: | Prior to development project approval | DARM | X | | | | | |

A - Incorporated into Project

B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process

D - Responsible Agency Contacted

E - Part of City-Wide Program

F - Not Applicable

| MITIGATION MEASURE | WHEN IMPLEMENTED | COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY |
|-----------------------------------|---|---|
| | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> B <input type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> E <input type="checkbox"/> F |
| Biological Resources (continued): | <p>BIO-6: Project impacts that occur to riparian habitat may also result in significant impacts to streambeds or waterways protected under Section 1600 of Fish and Wildlife Code and Section 404 of the CWA. CDFW and/or USACE consultation, determination of mitigation strategy, and regulatory permitting to reduce impacts, as required for projects that remove riparian habitat and/or alter a streambed or waterway, shall be implemented.</p> <p>Verification comments:</p> | <p>Prior to development project approval</p> <p>DARM</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> X</p> |
| | <p>BIO-7: Project-related impacts to riparian habitat or a special-status natural community may result in direct or incidental impacts to special-status species associated with riparian or wetland habitats. Project impacts to special-status species associated with riparian habitat shall be mitigated through agency consultation, development of a mitigation strategy, and/or issuing incidental take permits for the specific special-status species, as determined by the CDFW and/or USFWS.</p> <p>Verification comments:</p> | <p>Prior to development project approval</p> <p>DARM</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> X</p> |

A - Incorporated into Project

B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process

D - Responsible Agency Contacted

E - Part of City-Wide Program

F - Not Applicable

| MITIGATION MEASURE | WHEN IMPLEMENTED | COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY | A | B | C | D | E | F |
|--|-------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|------|---|---|---|---|
| Biological Resources (continued): | | Prior to development project approval | DARM | | | | X | |
| BIO-8: If a proposed project will result in the significant alteration or fill of a federally protected wetland, a formal wetland delineation conducted according to U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) accepted methodology is required for each project to determine the extent of wetlands on a project site. The delineation shall be used to determine if federal permitting and mitigation strategy are required to reduce project impacts. Acquisition of permits from USACE for the fill of wetlands and USACE approval of a wetland mitigation plan would ensure a “no net loss” of wetland habitat within the Planning Area. Appropriate wetland mitigation/creation shall be implemented in a ratio according to the size of the impacted wetland. | Verification comments: | | Prior to development project approval; but for long-term operational BMPs, prior to issuance of occupancy | DARM | | | | X |

A - Incorporated into Project

B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process

D - Responsible Agency Contacted

E - Part of City-Wide Program

F - Not Applicable

| MITIGATION MEASURE | WHEN IMPLEMENTED | COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY | A | B | C | D | E | F |
|--|------------------|---|------|---------------------|---|---|---|---|
| Biological Resources (continued): BIO-9 (continued from previous page): incorporating detention basins shall assist in ensuring project-related impacts to wetland habitat are minimized to the greatest extent feasible. Verification comments: | | [see previous page] | | [see previous page] | | | | |
| Cultural Resources: | | Prior to commencement of, and during, construction activities | DARM | X | | | | |

CUL-1: If previously unknown resources are encountered before or during grading activities, construction shall stop in the immediate vicinity of the find and a qualified historical resources specialist shall be consulted to determine whether the resource requires further study. The qualified historical resources specialist shall make recommendations to the City on the measures that shall be implemented to protect the discovered resources, including but not limited to excavation of the finds and evaluation of the finds in accordance with Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines and the City's Historic Preservation Ordinance.

If the resources are determined to be unique historical resources as defined under Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines, measures shall be identified by the monitor and (continued on next page)

A - Incorporated into Project

B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process

D - Responsible Agency Contacted

E - Part of City-Wide Program

F - Not Applicable

| MITIGATION MEASURE | WHEN IMPLEMENTED | COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY | A | B | C | D | E | F |
|---|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| Cultural Resources (continued): <p>CUL-1 (continued from previous page) recommended to the Lead Agency. Appropriate measures for significant resources could include avoidance or capping, incorporation of the site in green space, parks, or open space, or data recovery excavations of the finds. No further grading shall occur in the area of the discovery until the Lead Agency approves the measures to protect these. Any historical artifacts recovered as a result of mitigation shall be provided to a City-approved institution or person who is capable of providing long-term preservation to allow future scientific study.</p> <p>Verification comments:</p> <p>CUL-2: Subsequent to a preliminary City review of the project grading plans, if there is evidence that a project will include excavation or construction activities within previously undisturbed soils, a field survey and literature search for prehistoric archaeological resources shall be conducted. The following procedures shall be followed. If prehistoric resources are not found during either the field survey or literature search, excavation and/or construction activities can commence. In the event that buried prehistoric</p> | <p>[see previous page]</p> |

A - Incorporated into Project

B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process

D - Responsible Agency Contacted

E - Part of City-Wide Program

F - Not Applicable

| MITIGATION MEASURE | WHEN IMPLEMENTED | COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY | A | B | C | D | E | F |
|---|---------------------|------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Cultural Resources (continued): | | | | | | | | |
| CUL-2 (continued from previous page) | [see previous page] | [see previous page] | | | | | | |

archaeological resources are discovered during excavation and/or construction activities, construction shall stop in the immediate vicinity of the find and a qualified archaeologist shall be consulted to determine whether the resource requires further study. The qualified archaeologist shall make recommendations to the City on the measures that shall be implemented to protect the discovered resources, including but not limited to excavation of the finds and evaluation of the finds in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5.

If the resources are determined to be unique prehistoric archaeological resources as defined under Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines, mitigation measures shall be identified by the monitor and recommended to the Lead Agency. Appropriate measures for significant resources could include avoidance or capping, incorporation of the site in green space, parks, or open space, or data recovery excavations of the finds. No further grading shall occur in the area of the discovery until the Lead Agency approves the measures to protect these resources. Any prehistoric archaeological artifacts recovered as a result of mitigation shall be provided (continued on next page)

A - Incorporated into Project
B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process
D - Responsible Agency Contacted

E - Part of City-Wide Program
F - Not Applicable

| MITIGATION MEASURE | WHEN IMPLEMENTED | COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY | A | B | C | D | E | F |
|--|----------------------|------------------------|----------------------|---|---|---|---|---|
| Cultural Resources (continued): CUL-2 (further continued from previous two pages) to a City-approved institution or person who is capable of providing long-term preservation to allow future scientific study. | <i>[see Page 14]</i> | <i>[see Page 14]</i> | <i>[see Page 14]</i> | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |

Cultural Resources (continued):

A - Incorporated into Project

B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process

D - Responsible Agency Contacted

E - Part of City-Wide Program

F - Not Applicable

| MITIGATION MEASURE | WHEN IMPLEMENTED | COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY |
|---|----------------------|--|
| | | |
| <p>CUL-2 (continued from previous three pages)</p> <p>excavation and/or construction activities, the procedure identified above for the discovery of unknown resources shall be followed.</p> <p>Verification comments:</p> | <p>[see Page 14]</p> | <p>[see Page 14]</p> |
| | | <p>CUL-3: Subsequent to a preliminary City review of the project grading plans, if there is evidence that a project will include excavation or construction activities within previously undisturbed soils, a field survey and literature search for unique paleontological/geological resources shall be conducted. The following procedures shall be followed:</p> <p>If unique paleontological/geological resources are not found during either the field survey or literature search, excavation and/or construction activities can commence. In the event that unique paleontological/geological resources are discovered during excavation and/or construction activities, construction shall stop in the immediate vicinity of the find and a qualified paleontologist shall be consulted to determine whether the resource requires further study. The qualified paleontologist shall make recommendations to the City on the measures that shall be implemented to protect the discovered (continued on next page)</p> |

A - Incorporated into Project

B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process

D - Responsible Agency Contacted

E - Part of City-Wide Program

F - Not Applicable

| MITIGATION MEASURE | WHEN IMPLEMENTED | COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY | A | B | C | D | E | F |
|--|----------------------------|----------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| CUL-3 (<i>continued from previous page</i>) <p>resources, including but not limited to, excavation of the finds and evaluation of the finds. If the resources are determined to be significant, mitigation measures shall be identified by the monitor and recommended to the Lead Agency. Appropriate mitigation measures for significant resources could include avoidance or capping, incorporation of the site in green space, parks, or open space, or data recovery excavations of the finds. No further grading shall occur in the area of the discovery until the Lead Agency approves the measures to protect these resources. Any paleontological/geological resources recovered as a result of mitigation shall be provided to a City-approved institution or person who is capable of providing long-term preservation to allow future scientific study.</p> <p>If unique paleontological/geological resources are found during the field survey or literature review, the resources shall be inventoried and evaluated for significance. If the resources are found to be significant, mitigation measures shall be identified by the qualified paleontologist. Similar to above, appropriate mitigation measures for significant resources could include avoidance or capping, incorporation of the site in green space, parks, or open space, or data recovery excavations of the finds. In addition, appropriate mitigation for excavation and construction activities in the vicinity of the</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>(continued on next page)</i></p> | <i>[see previous page]</i> | <i>[see previous page]</i> | | | | | | |

A - Incorporated into Project
B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process
D - Responsible Agency Contacted

E - Part of City-Wide Program
F - Not Applicable

| MITIGATION MEASURE | WHEN IMPLEMENTED | COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY | A | B | C | D | E | F |
|---|------------------|---|---------------|---|---|---|---|---|
| Cultural Resources (continued): CUL-3 (further continued from previous two pages) resources found during the field survey or literature review shall include a paleontological monitor. The monitoring period shall be determined by the qualified paleontologist. If additional paleontological/geological resources are found during excavation and/or construction activities, the procedure identified above for the discovery of unknown resources shall be followed. | | [see Page 17] | [see Page 17] | | | | | |
| Verification comments: | | Prior to commencement of, and during, construction activities | DARM | X | | | | |
| CUL-4: In the event that human remains are unearthed during excavation and grading activities of any future development project, all activity shall cease immediately. Pursuant to Health and Safety Code (HSC) Section 7050.5, no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition pursuant to PRC Section 5097.98(a). If the remains are determined to be of Native American descent, the coroner shall within 24 hours notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). The NAHC shall then contact the most | | (continued on next page) | | | | | | |

A - Incorporated into Project
B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process
D - Responsible Agency Contacted

E - Part of City-Wide Program
F - Not Applicable

| MITIGATION MEASURE | WHEN IMPLEMENTED | COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY | A | B | C | D | E | F |
|--|---------------------|------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Cultural Resources (continued): CUL-4 (continued from previous page) likely descendant of the deceased Native American, who shall then serve as the consultant on how to proceed with the remains. | [see previous page] | [see previous page] | | | | | | |

Pursuant to PRC Section 5097.98(b), upon the discovery of Native American remains, the landowner shall ensure that the immediate vicinity, according to generally accepted cultural or archaeological standards or practices, where the Native American human remains are located is not damaged or disturbed by further development activity until the landowner has discussed and conferred with the most likely descendants regarding their recommendations, if applicable, taking into account the possibility of multiple human remains. The landowner shall discuss and confer with the descendants all reasonable options regarding the descendants' preferences for treatment.

Verification comments:

A - Incorporated into Project
B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process
D - Responsible Agency Contacted

E - Part of City-Wide Program
F - Not Applicable

| MITIGATION MEASURE | WHEN IMPLEMENTED | COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY | A | B | C | D | E | F |
|--|--------------------------------|------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Hazards and Hazardous Materials | | | | | | | | |
| HAZ-1: Re-designate the existing vacant land proposed for low density residential located northwest of the intersection of East Garland Avenue and North Dearing Avenue and located within Fresno Yosemite International Airport Zone 1-RPZ, to Open Space. | Prior to development approvals | DARM | | | | | | X |
| Verification comments: | | | | | | | | |
| HAZ-2: Limit the proposed low density residential (1 to 3 dwelling units per acre) located northwest of the airport, and located within Fresno Yosemite International Airport Zone 3-Inner Turning Area, to 2 dwelling units per acre or less. | Prior to development approvals | DARM | | | | | | X |
| Verification comments: | | | | | | | | |
| HAZ-3: Re-designate the current area within Fresno located northeast of the airport to Public Facilities-Airport or Open Space. | Prior to development approvals | DARM | | | | | | X |
| Verification comments: | | | | | | | | |

A - Incorporated into Project

B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process

D - Responsible Agency Contacted

E - Part of City-Wide Program

F - Not Applicable

| MITIGATION MEASURE | WHEN IMPLEMENTED | COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY | A | B | C | D | E | F |
|---|---|--|---|---|---|---|-------------------------------------|---|
| Hazards and Hazardous Materials (continued): | | | | | | | | |
| HAZ-4: Re-designate the current vacant lots at the northeast corner of Kearney Boulevard and South Thorne Avenue to Public Facilities-Airport or Open Space. | Prior to development approvals | DARM | | | | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | |
| Verification comments: | | | | | | | | |
| HAZ-5: Prohibit residential uses within Safety Zone 1 northwest of the Hawes Avenue and South Thorne Avenue intersection. | Prior to development approvals | DARM | | | | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | |
| Verification comments: | | | | | | | | |
| HAZ-6: Establish an alternative Emergency Operations Center in the event the current Emergency Operations Center is under redevelopment or blocked. | Prior to redevelopment of the current Emergency Operations Center | Fresno Fire Department and Mayor/City Manager's Office | | | | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | |
| Verification comments: | | | | | | | | |

A - Incorporated into Project
B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process
D - Responsible Agency Contacted

E - Part of City-Wide Program
F - Not Applicable

| MITIGATION MEASURE | WHEN IMPLEMENTED | COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY | A | B | C | D | E | F |
|--|--|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Hydrology and Water Quality | | | | | | | | |
| HYD-1: The City shall develop and implement water conservation measures to reduce the per capita water use to 215 gallons per capita per day. | Prior to water demand exceeding water supply | Department of Public Utilities (DPU) | X | | | | X | |
| HYD-2: The City shall continue to be an active participant in the Kings Water Authority and the implementation of the Kings Basin IRWMP. | Ongoing | DPU | | | | X | | |
| Verification comments: | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |

| MITIGATION MEASURE | WHEN IMPLEMENTED | COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY | A | B | C | D | E | F |
|---|------------------|------------------------|---------------------|---|---|---|---|---|
| Hydrology and Water Quality (continued): | | | | | | | | |
| HYD-5.1 (continued from previous page) | | [see previous page] | [see previous page] | | | | | |

- Update the SDMP in those drainage areas where the amount of imperviousness increased due to the change in land uses to determine the changes in the collection systems that would need to occur to provide adequate capacity for the stormwater runoff from the increased imperviousness.
- Implement the updated SDMP to provide stormwater collection systems that have sufficient capacity to convey the peak runoff rates from the areas of increased imperviousness.

Require developments that increase site imperviousness to install, operate, and maintain FMFCD approved on-site detention systems to reduce the peak runoff rates resulting from the increased imperviousness to the peak runoff rates that will not exceed the capacity of the existing stormwater collection systems.

Verification comments:

A - Incorporated into Project
B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process
D - Responsible Agency Contacted

E - Part of City-Wide Program
F - Not Applicable

| MITIGATION MEASURE | WHEN IMPLEMENTED | COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY | A | B | C | D | E | F |
|--|--|------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Hydrology and Water Quality (continued): | | | | | | | | |
| HYD-5.2: The City and partnering agencies shall implement the following measures to reduce the impacts on the capacity of existing or planned storm drainage Master Plan retention basins to less than significant. | Prior to exceedance of capacity of existing retention basin facilities | FMFCD, DARM, and PW | | | X | X | | |

HYD-5.2: The City and partnering agencies shall implement the following measures to reduce the impacts on the capacity of existing or planned storm drainage Master Plan retention basins to less than significant.

Consult the SDMP to analyze the impacts to existing and planned retention basins to determine remedial measures required to reduce the impact on retention basin capacity to less than significant. Remedial measures would include:

- Increase the size of the retention basin through the purchase of more land or deepening the basin or a combination for planned retention basins.
- Increase the size of the emergency relief pump capacity required to pump excess runoff volume out of the basin and into adjacent canal that convey the stormwater to a disposal facility for existing retention basins.
- Require developments that increase runoff volume to install, operate, and maintain, Low Impact Development (LID) measures to reduce runoff volume to the runoff volume that will not exceed the capacity of the existing retention basins.

Verification comments:

A - Incorporated into Project
B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process
D - Responsible Agency Contacted

E - Part of City-Wide Program
F - Not Applicable

| MITIGATION MEASURE | WHEN IMPLEMENTED | COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY | A | B | C | D | E | F |
|---|--|----------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| <p>Hydrology and Water Quality (continued):</p> <p>HYD-5.3: The City and partnering agencies shall implement the following measures to reduce the impacts on the capacity of existing or planned storm drainage Master Plan urban detention (stormwater quality) basins to less than significant.</p> <p>Consult the SDMP to determine the impacts to the urban detention basin weir overflow rates and determine remedial measures required to reduce the impact on the detention basin capacity to less than significant. Remedial measures would include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Modify overflow weir to maintain the suspended solids removal rates adopted by the FMFCD Board of Directors. • Increase the size of the urban detention basin to increase residence time by purchasing more land. The existing detention basins are already at the adopted design depth. • Require developments that increase runoff volume to install, operate, and maintain, Low Impact Development (LID) measures to reduce peak runoff rates and runoff volume to the runoff rates and volumes that will not exceed the weir overflow rates of the existing urban detention basins. <p>Verification comments:</p> | <p>Prior to exceedance of capacity of existing urban detention basin (stormwater quality) facilities</p> | <p>FMFCD, DARM, and PW</p> | | | | | X | X |

A - Incorporated into Project
B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process
D - Responsible Agency Contacted

E - Part of City-Wide Program
F - Not Applicable

| MITIGATION MEASURE | WHEN IMPLEMENTED | COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY | A | B | C | D | E | F |
|--------------------|------------------|------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | X | X |

Hydrology and Water Quality (continued):

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|--|--|--|---|---|--|---|---|
| <p>HYD-5.4: The City shall implement the following measures to reduce the impacts on the capacity of existing or planned storm drainage Master Plan pump disposal systems to less than significant.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consult the SDMP to determine the extent and degree to which the capacity of the existing pump system will be exceeded. • Require new developments to install, operate, and maintain FMFCD design standard on-site detention facilities to reduce peak stormwater runoff rates to existing planned peak runoff rates. • Provide additional pump system capacity to maximum allowed by existing permitting to increase the capacity to match or exceed the peak runoff rates determined by the SDMP. <p>Verification comments:</p> | <p>Prior to exceedance of capacity of existing pump disposal systems</p> <p>FMFCD, DARM, and PW</p> | <table border="1"> <tr> <td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>X</td><td>X</td></tr> </table> | | | | | | | | X | X |
| | | | | | | | X | X | | | |

A - Incorporated into Project

B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process

D - Responsible Agency Contacted

E - Part of City-Wide Program

F - Not Applicable

| MITIGATION MEASURE | WHEN IMPLEMENTED | COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY | A | B | C | D | E | F |
|---|--|------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Hydrology and Water Quality (continued): | | | | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> HYD-5.5: The City shall work with FMFCD to develop and adopt an update to the SDMP for the Southeast Development Area that would be adequately designed to collect, convey and dispose of runoff at the rates and volumes which would be generated by the planned land uses in that area. <p>Verification comments:</p> | Prior to development approvals in the Southeast Development Area | FMFCD, DARM, and PW | | | | | X | |

Public Services:

| PS-1: As future fire facilities are planned, the fire department shall evaluate if specific environmental effects would occur. Typical impacts from fire facilities include noise, traffic, and lighting. Typical mitigation to reduce these impacts includes: | During the planning process for future fire department facilities | DARM | | | | | X |
|--|---|------|--|--|--|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noise: Barriers and setbacks on the fire department sites. Traffic: Traffic devices for circulation and a "keep clear zone" during emergency responses. Lighting: Provision of hoods and deflectors on lighting fixtures on the fire department sites. <p>Verification comments:</p> | | | | | | | |

A - Incorporated into Project
B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process
D - Responsible Agency Contacted

E - Part of City-Wide Program
F - Not Applicable

| MITIGATION MEASURE | WHEN IMPLEMENTED | COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY | A | B | C | D | E | F |
|--|--|--|---|---|---|---|---|----------|
| Public Services (continued): <p>PS-2: As future police facilities are planned, the police department shall evaluate if specific environmental effects would occur. Typical impacts from police facilities include noise, traffic, and lighting. Typical mitigation to reduce potential impacts from police department facilities includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noise: Barriers and setbacks on the police department sites. • Traffic: Traffic devices for circulation. • Lighting: Provision of hoods and deflectors on lighting fixtures on the fire department sites. <p>Verification comments:</p> | <p>During the planning process for future Police Department facilities</p> | <p>DARM</p> | | | | | | <p>X</p> |
| <p>PS-3: As future public and private school facilities are planned, school districts shall evaluate if specific environmental effects would occur with regard to public schools, and DARM shall evaluate other school facilities. Typical impacts from school facilities include noise, traffic, and lighting. Typical mitigation to reduce potential impacts from school facilities includes:</p> <p><i>(continued on next page)</i></p> | <p>During the planning process for future school facilities</p> | <p>DARM, local school districts, and the Division of the State Architect</p> | | | | | | <p>X</p> |

A - Incorporated into Project

B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process

D - Responsible Agency Contacted

E - Part of City-Wide Program

F - Not Applicable

| MITIGATION MEASURE | WHEN IMPLEMENTED | COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY | A | B | C | D | E | F |
|--|---|----------------------------|----------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|
| Public Services (continued): PS-3 (continued from previous page) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Noise:</i> Barriers and setbacks placed on school sites. • <i>Traffic:</i> Traffic devices for circulation. • <i>Lighting:</i> Provision of hoods and deflectors on lighting fixtures for stadium lights. Verification comments: | <i>[see previous page]</i> | <i>[see previous page]</i> | <i>[see previous page]</i> | | | | | |
| PS-4: As future parks and recreational facilities are planned, the City shall evaluate if specific environmental effects would occur. Typical impacts from facilities include noise, traffic, and lighting. Typical mitigation to reduce potential impacts from park and recreational facilities includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Noise:</i> Barriers and setbacks placed on school sites. • <i>Traffic:</i> Traffic devices for circulation. • <i>Lighting:</i> Provision of hoods and deflectors on lighting fixtures for outdoor play area/field lights. Verification comments: | During the planning process for future park and recreation facilities | DARM | X | | | | | |

Public Services (continued):

A - Incorporated into Project
B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process
D - Responsible Agency Contacted

E - Part of City-Wide Program
F - Not Applicable

| MITIGATION MEASURE | WHEN IMPLEMENTED | COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY | A | B | C | D | E | F |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| <p>PS-5: As future detention, court, library, and hospital facilities are planned, the appropriate agencies shall evaluate if specific environmental effects would occur. Typical impacts from court, library, and hospital facilities include noise, traffic, and lighting. Typical mitigation to reduce potential impacts includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Noise:</i> Barriers and setbacks placed on school sites. • <i>Traffic:</i> Traffic devices for circulation. • <i>Lighting:</i> Provision of hoods and deflectors on outdoor lighting fixtures <p>Verification comments:</p> | <p>During the planning process for future detention, court, library, and hospital facilities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noise: Barriers and setbacks placed on school sites. • Traffic: Traffic devices for circulation. • Lighting: Provision of hoods and deflectors on outdoor lighting fixtures <p>Verification comments:</p> | <p>DARM, to the extent that agencies constructing these facilities are subject to City of Fresno regulation</p> | | | | | | |

| Utilities and Service Systems | USS-1: The City shall develop and implement a wastewater master plan update. | Prior to wastewater conveyance and treatment demand exceeding capacity | DPU | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|--|--|-----|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | | | |

A - Incorporated into Project
B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process
D - Responsible Agency Contacted

E - Part of City-Wide Program
F - Not Applicable

| MITIGATION MEASURE | WHEN IMPLEMENTED | COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY | A | B | C | D | E | F |
|--|---|------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Utilities and Service Systems (continued): | | | | | | | | |
| US\$-2: Prior to exceeding existing wastewater treatment capacity, the City shall evaluate the wastewater system and shall not approve additional development that contributes wastewater to the wastewater treatment facility that could exceed capacity until additional capacity is provided. By approximately the year 2025, the City shall construct the following improvements: | Prior to exceeding existing wastewater treatment capacity | DPU | | | | | X | X |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Construct an approximately 70 MGD expansion of the Regional Wastewater Treatment and Reclamation Facility and obtain revised waste discharge permits as the generation of wastewater is increased. Construct an approximately 0.49 MGD expansion of the North Facility and obtain revised waste discharge permits as the generation of wastewater is increased. | | | | | | | | |
| Verification comments: | | | | | | | | |
| US\$-3: Prior to exceeding existing wastewater treatment capacity, the City shall evaluate the wastewater system and shall not approve additional development that contributes wastewater to the wastewater treatment facility that could exceed capacity until additional capacity is provided. After (continued on next page) | Prior to exceeding existing wastewater treatment capacity | DPU | | | | | X | X |

A - Incorporated into Project
 B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process
 D - Responsible Agency Contacted

E - Part of City-Wide Program
 F - Not Applicable

| MITIGATION MEASURE | WHEN IMPLEMENTED | COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY | A | B | C | D | E | F |
|--|---------------------|------------------------|---------------------|---|---|---|---|---|
| Utilities and Service Systems (continued): USS-3 (continued from previous page) approximately the year 2025, the City shall construct the following improvements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Construct an approximately 24 MGD wastewater treatment facility within the Southeast Development Area and obtain revised waste discharge requirements as the generation of wastewater is increased. Construct an approximately 9.6 MGD expansion of the Regional Wastewater Treatment and Reclamation Facility and obtain revised waste discharge permits as the generation of wastewater is increased. Verification comments: | [see previous page] | [see previous page] | [see previous page] | | | | | |

A - Incorporated into Project
B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process
D - Responsible Agency Contacted

E - Part of City-Wide Program
F - Not Applicable

| MITIGATION MEASURE | WHEN IMPLEMENTED | COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY | A | B | C | D | E | F |
|--|---|------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Utilities and Service Systems (continued): | | | | | | | | |
| USS-5: Prior to exceeding capacity within the existing wastewater collection system facilities, the City shall evaluate the wastewater collection system and shall not approve additional development that would generate additional wastewater and exceed the capacity of a facility until additional capacity is provided. By approximately the year 2025, the following capacity improvements shall be provided. | Prior to exceeding capacity within the existing wastewater collection system facilities | DPU | | | X | X | | |

• Orange Avenue Trunk Sewer: This facility shall be improved between Dakota and Jensen Avenues. Approximately 37,240 feet of new sewer main shall be installed and approximately 5,760 feet of existing sewer main shall be rehabilitated. The size of the new sewer main shall range from 27 inches to 42 inches in diameter. The associated project designations in the 2006 Wastewater Master Plan are RS03A, RL02, C01-REP, C02-REP, C03-REP, C04-REP, C05-REP, C06-REP and C07-REP.

• Marks Avenue Trunk Sewer: This facility shall be improved between Clinton Avenue and Kearney Boulevard. Approximately 12,150 feet of new sewer main shall be installed. The size of the new sewer main shall range from 33 inches to 60 inches in diameter. The associated project designations in the 2006 Wastewater Master Plan are CM1-REP and CM2-REP.

(continued on next page)

A - Incorporated into Project

B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process

D - Responsible Agency Contacted

E - Part of City-Wide Program

F - Not Applicable

| MITIGATION MEASURE | WHEN IMPLEMENTED | COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY | A | B | C | D | E | F |
|---|---------------------|------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Utilities and Service Systems (continued): | | | | | | | | |
| US\$-5 (continued from previous page) | [see previous page] | [see previous page] | | | | | | |

• North Avenue Trunk Sewer: This facility shall be improved between Polk and Fruit Avenues and also between Orange and Maple Avenues. Approximately 25,700 feet of new sewer main shall be installed. The size of the new sewer main shall range from 48 inches to 66 inches in diameter. The associated project designations in the 2006 Wastewater Master Plan are CN1-REL1 and CN3-REL1.

• Ashlan Avenue Trunk Sewer: This facility shall be improved between Hughes and West Avenues and also between Fruit and Blackstone Avenues. Approximately 9,260 feet of new sewer main shall be installed. The size of the new sewer main shall range from 24 inches to 36 inches in diameter. The associated project designations in the 2006 Wastewater Master Plan are CA1-REL and CA2-REP.

Verification comments:

A - Incorporated into Project
 B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process
 D - Responsible Agency Contacted

E - Part of City-Wide Program
 F - Not Applicable

| MITIGATION MEASURE | WHEN IMPLEMENTED | COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY | A | B | C | D | E | F |
|--|--|------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Utilities and Service Systems (continued): | | | | | | | | |
| USS-6: Prior to exceeding capacity within the existing 28 pipeline segments shown in Figures 1 and 2 in Appendix J-1, the City shall evaluate the wastewater collection system and shall not approve additional development that would generate additional wastewater and exceed the capacity of one of the 28 pipeline segments until additional capacity is provided. | Prior to exceeding capacity within the existing 28 pipeline segments shown in Figures 1 and 2 in Appendix J-1, the City shall evaluate the wastewater collection system and shall not approve additional development that would generate additional wastewater and exceed the capacity of one of the 28 pipeline segments until additional capacity is provided. | DPU | | | | X | X | |
| Verification comments: | In Appendix J-1 of the MEIR | DPU | X | | | X | X | |
| USS-7: Prior to exceeding existing water supply capacity, the City shall evaluate the water supply system and shall not approve additional development that demand additional water until additional capacity is provided. By approximately the year 2025, the following capacity improvements shall be provided. | Prior to exceeding existing water supply capacity | DPU | X | | | X | X | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Construct an approximately 80 million gallon per day (MGD) surface water treatment facility near the intersection of Armstrong and Olive Avenues, in accordance with Chapter 9 and Figure 9-1 of the City of Fresno Metropolitan Water Resources Management Plan Update (2014 Metro Plan Update) Phase 2 Report, dated January 2012. <p>(continued on next page)</p> | | | | | | | |

A - Incorporated into Project

B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process

D - Responsible Agency Contacted

E - Part of City-Wide Program

F - Not Applicable

| MITIGATION MEASURE | WHEN IMPLEMENTED | COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY | A | B | C | D | E | F |
|--|---|------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Utilities and Service Systems (continued): | | | | | | | | |
| USS-7 (continued from previous page) | [see previous page] | [see previous page] | | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Construct an approximately 30 MGD expansion of the existing northeast surface water treatment facility for a total capacity of 60 MGD, in accordance with Chapter 9 and Figure 9-1 of the 2014 Metro Plan Update. Construct an approximately 20 MGD surface water treatment facility in the southwest portion of the City, in accordance with Chapter 9 and Figure 9-1 of the 2014 Metro Plan Update. | | | | | | | | |
| Verification comments: | | | | | | | | |
| USS-8: Prior to exceeding capacity within the existing water conveyance facilities, the City shall evaluate the water conveyance system and shall not approve additional development that would demand additional water and exceed the capacity of a facility until additional capacity is provided. The following capacity improvements shall be provided by approximately 2025. | Prior to exceeding capacity within the existing water conveyance facilities | DPU | | | | | X | X |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Construct 65 new groundwater wells, in accordance with Chapter 9 and Figure 9-1 of the 2014 Metro Plan Update. <p>(continued on next page)</p> | | | | | | | | |

A - Incorporated into Project
 B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process
 D - Responsible Agency Contacted

E - Part of City-Wide Program
 F - Not Applicable

| MITIGATION MEASURE | WHEN IMPLEMENTED | COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY | A | B | C | D | E | F |
|---|---------------------|------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| Utilities and Service Systems (continued): | | | | | | | | |
| US\$-8 (continued from previous page) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Construct a 2.0 million gallon potable water reservoir (Reservoir T2) near the intersection of Clovis and California Avenues, in accordance with Chapter 9 and Figure 9-1 of the 2014 Metro Plan Update. Construct a 3.0 million gallon potable water reservoir (Reservoir T3) near the intersection of Temperance and Dakota Avenues, in accordance with Chapter 9 and Figure 9-1 of the 2014 Metro Plan Update. Construct a 3.0 million gallon potable water reservoir (Reservoir T4) in the Downtown Planning Area, in accordance with Chapter 9 and Figure 9-1 of the 2014 Metro Plan Update. Construct a 4.0 million gallon potable water reservoir (Reservoir T5) near the intersection of Ashlan and Chestnut Avenues, in accordance with Chapter 9 and Figure 9-1 of the 2014 Metro Plan Update. Construct a 4.0 million gallon potable water reservoir (Reservoir T6) near the intersection of Ashlan Avenue and Highway 99, in accordance with Chapter 9 and Figure 9-1 of the 2014 Metro Plan Update. <p>(continued on next page)</p> | [see previous page] | [see previous page] | [see previous page] | [see previous page] | [see previous page] | [see previous page] | [see previous page] | [see previous page] |

A - Incorporated into Project

B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process

D - Responsible Agency Contacted

E - Part of City-Wide Program

F - Not Applicable

| MITIGATION MEASURE | WHEN IMPLEMENTED | COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY | A | B | C | D | E | F |
|---|--|------------------------|-----|---|---|---|---|---|
| Utilities and Service Systems (continued): | | | | | | | | |
| USS-8 (<i>continued from previous two pages</i>) | /see Page 37] | /see Page 37] | DPU | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Construct 50.3 miles of regional water transmission mains ranging in size from 24-inch to 48-inch diameter, in accordance with Chapter 9 and Figure 9-1 of the 2014 Metro Plan Update. Construct 95.9 miles of 16-inch diameter transmission grid mains, in accordance with Chapter 9 and Figure 9-1 of the 2014 Metro Plan Update. <p>Verification comments:</p> <p>USS-9: Prior to exceeding capacity within the existing water conveyance facilities, the City shall evaluate the water conveyance system and shall not approve additional development that would demand additional water and exceed the capacity of a facility until additional capacity is provided. The following capacity improvements shall be provided after approximately the year 2025 and additional water conveyance facilities shall be provided prior to exceedance of capacity within the water conveyance facilities to accommodate full buildout of the General Plan Update.</p> <p>(continued on next page)</p> | Prior to exceeding capacity within the existing water conveyance facilities, the City shall evaluate the water conveyance system and shall not approve additional development that would demand additional water and exceed the capacity of a facility until additional capacity is provided. The following capacity improvements shall be provided after approximately the year 2025 and additional water conveyance facilities shall be provided prior to exceedance of capacity within the water conveyance facilities to accommodate full buildout of the General Plan Update. | | | | | | | |

A - Incorporated into Project

B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process

D - Responsible Agency Contacted

E - Part of City-Wide Program

F - Not Applicable

| MITIGATION MEASURE | WHEN IMPLEMENTED | COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY | A | B | C | D | E | F |
|--|---------------------|------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| Utilities and Service Systems (continued): | | | | | | | | |
| <p>USS-9 (continued from previous page)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Construct a 4.0 million gallon potable water reservoir (SEDA Reservoir 1) within the northern part of the Southeast Development Area. Construct a 4.0 million gallon potable water reservoir (SEDA Reservoir 2) within the southern part of the Southeast Development Area. <p>Additional water conveyance facilities shall be provided prior to exceedance of capacity within the water conveyance facilities to accommodate full buildout of the General Plan Update.</p> <p>Verification comments:</p> | [see previous page] | [see previous page] | [see previous page] | [see previous page] | [see previous page] | [see previous page] | [see previous page] | [see previous page] |

| | | | | |
|---|-----------------------|----------------------------------|---|--|
| <p>Utilities and Service Systems - Hydrology and Water Quality</p> <p>USS-10: In order to maintain Fresno Irrigation District canal operability, FMFCD shall maintain operational intermittent flows during the dry season, within defined channel capacity and downstream capture capabilities, for recharge.</p> <p>Verification comments:</p> | During the dry season | Fresno Irrigation District (FID) | X | |
|---|-----------------------|----------------------------------|---|--|

A - Incorporated into Project

B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process

D - Responsible Agency Contacted

E - Part of City-Wide Program

F - Not Applicable

| MITIGATION MEASURE | WHEN IMPLEMENTED | COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY | A | B | C | D | E | F |
|--|--|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Utilities and Service Systems - Biological/ Resources: | | | | | | | | |
| <p>US-11: When FMFCD proposes to provide drainage service outside of urbanized areas:</p> <p>(a) FMFCD shall conduct preliminary investigations on undeveloped lands outside of highly urbanized areas. These investigations shall examine wetland hydrology, vegetation and soil types. These preliminary investigations shall be the basis for making a determination on whether or not more in-depth wetland studies shall be necessary. If the proposed project site does not exhibit wetland hydrology, support a prevalence of wetland vegetation and wetland soil types then no further action is required.</p> <p>(b) Where proposed activities could have an impact on areas verified by the Corps as jurisdictional wetlands or waters of the U.S. (urban and rural streams, seasonal wetlands, and vernal pools), FMFCD shall obtain the necessary Clean Water Act, Section 404 permits for activities where fill material shall be placed in a wetland, obstruct the flow or circulation of waters of the United States, impair or reduce the reach of such waters. As part of FMFCD's Memorandum of Understanding with CDFG, Section 404 and 401 permits would be obtained from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and from the (continued on next page)</p> | Prior to development approvals outside of highly urbanized areas | California Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), and USACE | | | X | | | |

A - Incorporated into Project

C - Mitigation in Process

B - Mitigated

D - Responsible Agency Contacted

E - Part of City-Wide Program

F - Not Applicable

| MITIGATION MEASURE | WHEN IMPLEMENTED | COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY | A | B | C | D | E | F |
|---|---|------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| Utilities and Service Systems - Biological/ Resources (continued): | | | | | | | | |
| USS-11 (continued from previous page) | Regional Water Quality Control Board for any activity involving filling of jurisdictional waters). At a minimum, to meet "no net loss policy," the permits shall require replacement of wetland habitat at a 1:1 ratio. | [see previous page] | [see previous page] | [see previous page] | [see previous page] | [see previous page] | [see previous page] | [see previous page] |

Utilities and Service Systems - Biological/ Resources (continued):**USS-11 (continued from previous page)**

Regional Water Quality Control Board for any activity involving filling of jurisdictional waters). At a minimum, to meet "no net loss policy," the permits shall require replacement of wetland habitat at a 1:1 ratio.

(c) Where proposed activities could have an impact on areas verified by the Corps as jurisdictional wetlands or waters of the U.S. (urban and rural streams, seasonal wetlands, and vernal pools), FMFCD shall submit and implement a wetland mitigation plan based on the wetland acreage verified by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. The wetland mitigation plan shall be prepared by a qualified biologist or wetland scientist experienced in wetland creation, and shall include the following or equally effective elements:

- i. Specific location, size, and existing hydrology and soils within the wetland creation area.
- ii. Wetland mitigation techniques, seed source, planting specifications, and required buffer setbacks. In addition, the mitigation plan shall ensure adequate water supply is provided to the created wetlands in order to maintain the proper (continued on next page)

A - Incorporated into Project

B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process

D - Responsible Agency Contacted

E - Part of City-Wide Program

F - Not Applicable

| MITIGATION MEASURE | WHEN IMPLEMENTED | COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY | A | B | C | D | E | F |
|---|------------------|------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Utilities and Service Systems - Biological Resources (continued): | | | | | | | | |
| USS-11 (continued from previous two pages) hydrologic regimes required by the different types of wetlands created. Provisions to ensure the wetland water supply is maintained in perpetuity shall be included in the plan. | [see Page 41] | [see Page 41] | [see Page 41] | [see Page 41] | [see Page 41] | [see Page 41] | [see Page 41] | [see Page 41] |

Utilities and Service Systems - Biological Resources (continued):

iii. A monitoring program for restored, enhanced, created, and preserved wetlands on the project site. A monitoring program is required to meet three objectives; 1) establish a wetland creation success criteria to be met; 2) to specify monitoring methodology; 3) to identify as far as is possible, specific remedial actions that will be required in order to achieve the success criteria; and 4) to document the degree of success achieved in establishing wetland vegetation.

(d) A monitoring plan shall be developed and implemented by a qualified biologist to monitor results of any on-site wetland restoration and creation for five years. The monitoring plan shall include specific success criteria, frequency and timing of monitoring, and assessment of whether or not maintenance activities are being carried out and how these shall be adjusted if necessary.
(continued on next page)

A - Incorporated into Project

B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process

D - Responsible Agency Contacted

E - Part of City-Wide Program

F - Not Applicable

| MITIGATION MEASURE | WHEN IMPLEMENTED | COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY | A | B | C | D | E | F |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Utilities and Service Systems - Biological/ Resources (continued): <p>USS-11 (continued from previous three pages)</p> <p>If monitoring reveals that success criteria are not being met, remedial habitat creation or restoration should be designed and implemented by a qualified biologist and subject to five years of monitoring as described above.</p> <p>Or</p> <p>(e) In lieu of developing a mitigation plan that outlines the avoidance, purchase, or creation of wetlands, FMFCD could purchase mitigation credits through a Corps approved Mitigation Bank.</p> <p>Verification comments:</p> | <p>[see Page 41]</p> | <p>[see Page 41]</p> | | | | | X | |
| <p>USS-12: When FMFCD proposes to provide drainage service outside in areas that support seasonal wetlands or vernal pools:</p> <p>(a) During facility design and prior to initiation of ground disturbing activities in areas that support seasonal wetlands or vernal pools, FMFCD shall conduct a preliminary rare plant assessment. The assessment will determine the likelihood on whether or not the project site could support rare plants. If it is determined that the project site would not support rare plants, then no further</p> <p>(continued on next page)</p> | <p>During facility design and prior to initiation of ground disturbing activities in areas that support seasonal wetlands or vernal pools</p> | <p>California Department of Fish & Wildlife (CDFW) and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)</p> | | | | | X | |

A - Incorporated into Project
 B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process
 D - Responsible Agency Contacted

E - Part of City-Wide Program
 F - Not Applicable

| MITIGATION MEASURE | WHEN IMPLEMENTED | COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY | A | B | C | D | E | F |
|--|---------------------|------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| Utilities and Service Systems - Biological Resources (continued): | | | | | | | | |
| USS-12 (continued from previous page) | [see previous page] | [see previous page] | [see previous page] | [see previous page] | [see previous page] | [see previous page] | [see previous page] | [see previous page] |

USS-12 (continued from previous page)

action is required. However, if the project site has the potential to support rare plants; then a rare plant survey shall be conducted. Rare plant surveys shall be conducted by qualified biologists in accordance with the most current CDFG/USFWS guidelines or protocols and shall be conducted at the time of year when the plants in question are identifiable.

(b) Based on the results of the survey, prior to design approval, FMFCD shall coordinate with CDFG and/or implement a Section 7 consultation with USFWS, shall determine whether the project facility would result in a significant impact to any special status plant species. Evaluation of project impacts shall consider the following:

- The status of the species in question (e.g., officially listed by the State or Federal Endangered Species Acts).
- The relative density and distribution of the on-site occurrence versus typical occurrences of the species in question.

(continued on next page)

A - Incorporated into Project

B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process

D - Responsible Agency Contacted

E - Part of City-Wide Program

F - Not Applicable

| MITIGATION MEASURE | WHEN IMPLEMENTED | COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY | A | B | C | D | E | F |
|---|---|------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Utilities and Service Systems - Biological Resources (continued): | | | | | | | | |
| USS-12 (continued from previous two pages) | [see Page 44] | [see Page 44] | | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The habitat quality of the on-site occurrence relative to historic, current or potential distribution of the population. <p>(c) Prior to design approval, and in consultation with the CDFG and/or the USFWS, FMFCD shall prepare and implement a mitigation plan, in accordance with any applicable State and/or federal statutes or laws, that reduces impacts to a less than significant level.</p> <p>Verification comments:</p> | | | | | | | | |
| USS-13: When FMFCD proposes to provide drainage service outside in areas that support seasonal wetlands or vernal pools: | During facility design and prior to initiation of ground disturbing activities in areas that support seasonal wetlands or vernal pools, FMFCD shall conduct a preliminary survey to determine the presence of listed vernal pool crustaceans. | CDFW and USFWS | | | | | | X |
| | (continued on next page) | | | | | | | |

A - Incorporated into Project

B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process

D - Responsible Agency Contacted

E - Part of City-Wide Program

F - Not Applicable

| MITIGATION MEASURE | WHEN IMPLEMENTED | COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY | A | B | C | D | E | F |
|---|--|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| Utilities and Service Systems - Biological/ Resources (continued): | | | | | | | | |
| USS-13 (continued from previous page) | (b) If potential habitat (vernal pools, seasonally inundated areas) or fairy shrimp exist within areas proposed to be disturbed, FMFCD shall complete the first and second phase of fairy shrimp presence or absence surveys. If an absence finding is determined and accepted by the USFWS, then no further mitigation shall be required for fairy shrimp. | [see previous page] |

(c) If fairy shrimp are found to be present within vernal pools or other areas of inundation to be impacted by the implementation of storm drainage facilities, FMFCD shall mitigate impacts on fairy shrimp habitat in accordance with the USFWS requirements of the Programmatic Biological Opinion. This shall include on-site or off-site creation and/or preservation of fairy shrimp habitat at ratios ranging from 3:1 to 5:1 depending on the habitat impacted and the choice of on-site or off-site mitigation. Or mitigation shall be the purchase of mitigation credit through an accredited mitigation bank.

Verification comments:

A - Incorporated into Project
B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process
D - Responsible Agency Contacted

E - Part of City-Wide Program
F - Not Applicable

| MITIGATION MEASURE | WHEN IMPLEMENTED | COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY | A | B | C | D | E | F |
|--|--|------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Utilities and Service Systems - Biological/ Resources (continued): | | | | | | | | |
| US\$-14: When FMFCD proposes to construct drainage facilities in an area where elderberry bushes may occur: | <p>During facility design and prior to initiation of construction activities</p> <p>(a) During facility design and prior to initiation of construction activities, FMFCD shall conduct a project-specific survey for all potential Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle (VELB) habitats (elderberry shrubs), including a stem count and an assessment of historic or current VELB habitat.</p> <p>(b) FMFCD shall avoid and protect all potential identified VELB habitat where feasible.</p> <p>(c) Where avoidance is infeasible, develop and implement a VELB mitigation plan in accordance with the most current USFWS mitigation guidelines for unavoidable take of VELB habitat pursuant to either Section 7 or Section 10(a) of the Federal Endangered Species Act. The mitigation plan shall include, but might not be limited to, relocation of elderberry shrubs, planting of elderberry shrubs, and monitoring of relocated and planted elderberry shrubs.</p> | CDFW and USFWS | | | | | | X |

Verification comments:

A - Incorporated into Project

B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process

D - Responsible Agency Contacted

E - Part of City-Wide Program

F - Not Applicable

| MITIGATION MEASURE | WHEN IMPLEMENTED | COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY | A | B | C | D | E | F |
|---|---|------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Utilities and Service Systems - Biological/ Resources (continued): | | | | | | | | |
| USS-15: Prior to ground disturbing activities during nesting season (March through July) for a project that supports bird nesting habitat, FMFCD shall conduct a survey of trees. If nests are found during the survey, a qualified biologist shall assess the nesting activity on the project site. If active nests are located, no construction activities shall be allowed within 250 feet of the nest until the young have fledged. If construction activities are planned during the non-breeding period (August through February), a nest survey is not necessary. | Prior to ground disturbing activities during nesting season (March through July) for a project that supports bird nesting habitat | CDFW and USFWS | | | | | | X |
| <p>Verification comments:</p> <p>USS-16: When FMFCD proposes to construct drainage facilities in an area that supports bird nesting habitat:</p> <p>(a) FMFCD shall conduct a pre-construction breeding-season survey (approximately February 1 through August 31) of proposed project sites in suitable habitat (levee and canal berms, open grasslands with suitable burrows) during the same calendar year that construction is planned to begin. If phased construction procedures are planned for the proposed project, the results of the above survey shall be valid only for the season when it is conducted.</p> <p>(continued on next page)</p> | Prior to ground disturbing activities during nesting season (March through July) for a project that supports bird nesting habitat | CDFW and USFWS | | | | | X | |

A - Incorporated into Project
B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process
D - Responsible Agency Contacted

E - Part of City-Wide Program
F - Not Applicable

| MITIGATION MEASURE | WHEN IMPLEMENTED | COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY | A | B | C | D | E | F |
|---|---------------------|------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---|
| Utilities and Service Systems - Biological Resources (continued): | | | | | | | | |
| <p>USS-16 (continued from previous page)</p> <p>(b) During the construction stage, FMFCD shall avoid all burrowing owl nest sites potentially disturbed by project construction during the breeding season while the nest is occupied with adults and/or young. The occupied nest site shall be monitored by a qualified biologist to determine when the nest is no longer used. Avoidance shall include the establishment of a 160-foot diameter non-disturbance buffer zone around the nest site. Disturbance of any nest sites shall only occur outside of the breeding season and when the nests are unoccupied based on monitoring by a qualified biologist. The buffer zone shall be delineated by highly visible temporary construction fencing.</p> <p>Based on approval by CDFG, pre-construction and pre-breeding season exclusion measures may be implemented to preclude burrowing owl occupation of the project site prior to project-related disturbance. Burrowing owls can be passively excluded from potential nest sites in the construction area, either by closing the burrows or placing one-way doors in the burrows according to current CDFG protocol. Burrows shall be examined not more than 30 days before construction to ensure that no owls have recolonized the area of construction.</p> <p>(continued on next page)</p> | [see previous page] | [see previous page] | [see previous page] | [see previous page] | [see previous page] | [see previous page] | [see previous page] | |

A - Incorporated into Project
 B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process
 D - Responsible Agency Contacted

E - Part of City-Wide Program
 F - Not Applicable

| MITIGATION MEASURE | WHEN IMPLEMENTED | COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY | A B C D E F | | |
|---|---|------------------------|-------------|--|---|
| Utilities and Service Systems - Biological Resources (continued): | | | | | |
| USS-16 (continued from previous two pages) For each burrow destroyed, a new burrow shall be created (by installing artificial burrows at a ratio of 2:1 on protected lands nearby. | [see Page 49] | [see Page 49] | | | |
| Verification comments: | | | | | |
| USS-17: When FMFCD proposes to construct drainage facilities in the San Joaquin River corridor: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) FMFCD shall not conduct instream activities in the San Joaquin River between October 15 and April 15. If this is not feasible, FMFCD shall consult with the National Marine Fisheries Service and CDFW on the appropriate measures to be implemented in order to protect listed salmonids in the San Joaquin River. (b) Riparian vegetation shading the main-channel that is removed or damaged shall be replaced at a ratio and quantity sufficient to maintain the existing shading of the channel. The location of replacement trees on or within (continued on next page) | During instream activities conducted between October 15 and April 15 National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), CDFW, and Central Valley Flood Protection Board (CVFPB) | | | | X |

A - Incorporated into Project

B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process

D - Responsible Agency Contacted

E - Part of City-Wide Program

F - Not Applicable

| MITIGATION MEASURE | WHEN IMPLEMENTED | COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY | | | |
|---|------------------|------------------------|---|---|---|
| A | B | C | D | E | F |
| Utilities and Service Systems / Biological Resources (continued): | | | | | |
| USS-17 (continued from previous page) FMFCD berms, detention ponds or river channels shall be approved by FMFCD and the Central Valley Flood Protection Board. | | | | | |
| Verification comments: | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| Utilities and Service Systems – Recreation / Trails: | | | | | |
| USS-18: When FMFCD updates its District Service Plan: Prior to final design approval of all elements of the District Services Plan, FMFCD shall consult with Fresno County, City of Fresno, and City of Clovis to determine if any element would temporarily disrupt or permanently displace adopted existing or planned trails and associated recreational facilities as a result of the proposed District Services Plan. If the proposed project would not temporarily disrupt or permanently displace adopted existing or planned trails, no further mitigation is necessary. If the proposed project would have an effect on the trails and associated facilities, FMFCD shall implement the following: <i>(continued on next page)</i> | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

A - Incorporated into Project
B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process
D - Responsible Agency Contacted

E - Part of City-Wide Program
F - Not Applicable

| MITIGATION MEASURE | WHEN IMPLEMENTED | COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY | A | B | C | D | E | F |
|---|----------------------------|----------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Utilities and Service Systems – Recreation / Trails (continued): | | | | | | | | |
| USS-18 <i>(continued from previous page)</i> (a) If short-term disruption of adopted existing or planned trails and associated recreational facilities occur, FMFCD shall consult and coordinate with Fresno County, City of Fresno, and City of Clovis to temporarily re-route the trails and associated facilities. (b) If permanent displacement of the adopted existing or planned trails and associated recreational facilities occur, the appropriate design modifications to prevent permanent displacement shall be implemented in the final project design or FMFCD shall replace these facilities. | <i>[see previous page]</i> | <i>[see previous page]</i> | | | | | | |

Utilities and Service Systems – Air Quality:

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| USS-19: When District drainage facilities are constructed, FMFCD shall: | During storm water drainage facility construction activities | Fresno Metropolitan Flood Control District and SJVAPCD | | | | | | |
| (a) Minimize idling time of construction equipment vehicles to no more than ten minutes, or require that engines be shut off when not in use. | <i>(continued on next page)</i> | | | | | | | |

A - Incorporated into Project

B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process

D - Responsible Agency Contacted

E - Part of City-Wide Program

F - Not Applicable

| MITIGATION MEASURE | WHEN IMPLEMENTED | COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY | A | B | C | D | E | F |
|--------------------|------------------|------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|--------------------|------------------|------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|

Utilities and Service Systems – Air Quality (continued):**USS-19 (continued from previous page)**

- (b) Construction shall be curtailed as much as possible when the Air Quality Index (AQI) is above 150. AQI forecasts can be found on the SJVAPCD web site.
- (c) Off-road trucks should be equipped with on-road engines if possible.
- (d) Construction equipment should have engines that meet the current off-road engine emission standard (as certified by CARB), or be re-powered with an engine that meets this standard.

Verification comments:

| | |
|---------------------|---------------------|
| [see previous page] | [see previous page] |
|---------------------|---------------------|

Utilities and Service Systems – Adequacy of Storm Water Drainage Facilities:

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---------------------|--|--|--|--|---|--|
| USS-20: Prior to exceeding capacity within the existing storm water drainage facilities, the City shall coordinate with FMFCD to evaluate the storm water drainage system and shall not approve additional development that would convey additional storm water to a facility that would experience an exceedance of capacity until the necessary additional capacity is provided. | Prior to exceeding capacity within the existing storm water drainage facilities | FMFCD, PW, and DARM | | | | | X | |
|---|---|---------------------|--|--|--|--|---|--|

A - Incorporated into Project

B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process

D - Responsible Agency Contacted

E - Part of City-Wide Program

F - Not Applicable

| MITIGATION MEASURE | WHEN IMPLEMENTED | COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY | | | |
|---|--|------------------------|---|---|---|
| A | B | C | D | E | F |
| <p>Utilities and Service Systems – Adequacy of Water Supply Capacity:</p> <p>USS-21: Prior to exceeding existing water supply capacity, the City shall evaluate the water supply system and shall not approve additional development that demand additional water until additional capacity is provided. By approximately the year 2025, the City shall construct an approximately 25,000 AF/year tertiary recycled water expansion to the Fresno-Clovis Regional Wastewater Reclamation Facility in accordance with the 2013 Recycled Water Master Plan and the 2014 City of Fresno Metropolitan Water Resources Management Plan update.</p> <p>Implementation of Mitigation Measure USS-5 is also required prior to approximately the year 2025.</p> <p>Verification comments:</p> | <p>Prior to exceeding existing water supply capacity</p> <p>DPU and DARM</p> | | | | |
| <p>Utilities and Service Systems – Adequacy of Landfill Capacity:</p> <p>USS-22: Prior to exceeding landfill capacity, the City shall evaluate additional landfill locations and shall not approve additional development that could contribute solid waste to a landfill that is at capacity until additional capacity is provided.</p> <p>Verification comments:</p> | <p>Prior to exceeding landfill capacity</p> <p>DPU and DARM</p> | | | | |

A - Incorporated into Project
 B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process
 D - Responsible Agency Contacted

E - Part of City-Wide Program
 F - Not Applicable

**MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION
PROJECT SPECIFIC MITIGATION MONITORING CHECKLIST
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT NO. ANX-18-002/A-18-001/R-18-002/T-6198**

Project/EA No. ANX-18-002/A-18-001/R-18-002/T-6198

| Mitigation Measure | | Date: May 11, 2018 | | |
|---|---|--------------------|--|--|
| | | Implemented By | When Implemented | Verified By |
| III-Air Quality and Global Climate Change | <p>III.1 The project site is subject to the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District Rules and Regulations, including Rule 9510 (Indirect Source Review), Regulation VIII (Fugitive Dust Prohibitions), Rule 22201 (New and Modified Stationary Source Review, applying to any stationary/industrial equipment that emits regulated pollutants in amounts specified by the rule), Rule 4002 (National Emissions Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants), Rule 4102 (Nuisance, applying to any operation that emits or may emit air contaminants or other materials) and Rule 4641 (Cutback, Slow Cure and Emulsified Asphalt, Paving and Maintenance Operations).</p> <p>III.2 Development projects that exceed San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District thresholds after accounting for Rule 9510 reductions to mitigate significant criteria pollutant impacts shall enter into Voluntary Emission Reduction Agreement (VERA) contracts with the SJVAPCD to purchase emission reductions obtained through projects funded under SJVAPCD grant and incentive programs.</p> | Applicant | Prior to applying for final discretionary approval and/or issuance of grading permit for any phase of development. | San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD) / City of Fresno, Development and Resource Management Department |
| IX-Hydrology & Water Quality | <p>IX.1 The proposed project shall mitigate the impacts of the runoff from the proposed via an on-site temporary storage facility.</p> <p>IX.2 Lot coverage will be required to be provided to the FMFCD prior to submittal of improvement plans. The final drainage fee will be calculated commensurate with the lot coverage provided by the developer. If the lot coverage indicates a density higher than Master Planned, mitigation may be required. The lot coverage calculated by the FMFCD includes the front yard walkway, sidewalk walkway and the rear yard patio equaling an additional 6% of impervious area in addition to the City typical lot coverage calculation.</p> | Applicant | Prior to recordation of a Final Map or issuance of grading or building permits for development on any portion of the subject property. | Fresno Metropolitan Flood Control District & City of Fresno Development & Resource Management Department |
| XIV-Public Services | XIV.1 The proposed project shall mitigate the impacts of the runoff from the proposed via an on-site temporary storage facility. | Applicant | Prior to recordation of a Final Map or issuance of grading or building permits | Fresno Metropolitan Flood Control District & City of Fresno Development & Resource Management |

**MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION
PROJECT SPECIFIC MITIGATION MONITORING CHECKLIST
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT NO. ANX-18-002/A-18-001/R-18-002/T-6198**

Project/EA No. ANX-18-002/A-18-001/R-18-002/T-6198

| | | Date: May 11, 2018 | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|---------------------------|---|---|
| | Mitigation Measure | Implemented By | When Implemented for development on any portion of the subject property. | Verified By Department |
| XVI- Transportation / Traffic | <p>XVI.1 The proposed project shall install a traffic signal at the intersection of Bryan and Shaw Avenues within two years of finalization of the subdivision agreement</p> <p>XVI.2 The proposed project shall make modifications to the traffic signal at the intersection of Grantland and Shaw Avenues to locate existing traffic signal equipment to the ultimate locations</p> <p>XVI.3 The proposed project shall lengthen the southbound left-turn pocket at the intersection of Grantland and Shaw Avenues from the existing 150 feet to a length of 250 feet)</p> <p>XVI.4 The proposed project shall pay the Traffic Signal Mitigation Impact (TSMI) Fee, per the Master Fee Schedule, at the time of building permit.</p> <p>XVI.5 The proposed project shall pay the Fresno Major Street Impact (FMSI) Fee, which will be determined at time of building permit.</p> <p>XVI.6 The proposed project shall pay the Regional Transportation Mitigation Fee (RTMF) to the Joint Powers Agency. Provide proof of payment prior to issuance of building permits</p> | | Within two years of finalization of the subdivision agreement or prior to issuance of building permit, as noted within the conditions of approval | City of Fresno, Department of Public Works, Traffic & Engineering Services Division |