Exhibit R
EIR Summary Memorandum
dated October 23, 2023

CARLSBAD
CLOVIS
IRVINE
LOS ANGELES
PALM SPRINGS
POINT RICHMOND
RIVERSIDE
ROSEVILLE
SAN LUIS OBISPO

MEMORANDUM

DATE: October 23, 2023

TO: Steven Martinez, City of Fresno

FROM: Amy Fischer, President
Cara Cunningham, Associate

SUBJECT: Summary of the 2740 West Nielsen Avenue Office/Warehouse Project Environmental Impact Report (EIR)

This memorandum provides an overview of the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) prepared for the proposed 2740 West Nielsen Office/Warehouse Project (Development Permit Application No. P21-02699 and Tentative Parcel Map Application No. P21 05930). The EIR was prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) to evaluate the potential environmental impacts of the proposed project. The EIR is intended to serve as an informational document for the public agency decision-makers and the public regarding the potential environmental impacts associated with the construction of the proposed project.

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

The following summary provides an overview of the analysis contained in the EIR related to Air Quality, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Noise, and Transportation.

Several technical reports were prepared for the project and were incorporated into the EIR including a Health Risk Assessment[1], Biological Evaluation[2], Phase I Cultural Resources Survey[3], Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA)[4], Phase II ESA[5], Water Supply Assessment (WSA)[6], Noise Impact

1 LSA. 2023. *Health Risk Assessment for the 2740 West Nielsen Avenue Office/Warehouse Project*. February 3.

2 Live Oak Associates, Inc. 2021. *Biological Evaluation Nielsen Avenue Office/Warehouse Project, Fresno County, California*. April 13.

3 LSA. 2021. *Phase I Cultural Resources Survey for the 2740 West Nielsen Avenue Office/Warehouse Project in Fresno, Fresno County, California (LSA Project No. SNN2102)*. August 3.

4 SALEM Engineering Group, Inc. 2021 Phase I Environmental Site Assessment. Former California Compress Facility. 2740 West Nielsen Avenue Fresno, CA. January 29.

5 SALEM Engineering Group, Inc. 2021 Phase II Environmental Site Assessment. Former California Compress Facility. 2740 West Nielsen Avenue Fresno, CA. February 3.

6 LSA. 2022. *SB 610 Water Supply Assessment, 2740 West Nielsen Avenue Office/Warehouse Project, Fresno, California*. July.

Analysis Memorandum[1], and Traffic Impact Study (TIS)[2]. All technical studies were included as part of the EIR. The attached Executive Summary Matrix summarizes the impacts, mitigation measures, and resulting level of significance after mitigation for all environmental issue areas evaluated in the Initial Study and EIR.

Air Quality

As described in the EIR, an air quality analysis was prepared using the methodologies and assumptions contained in the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District's (SJVAPCD) Guidance for Assessing and Mitigating Air Quality Impacts (GAMAQI). The air quality analysis utilized the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) and the findings of the Health Risk Assessment (HRA) prepared for the proposed project.

As discussed in the EIR, construction and operational emissions were analyzed using CalEEMod. Based on the results of the modeling, construction and operational emissions for the proposed project would not exceed the SJVAPCD thresholds. Mitigation Measure AIR-1 requires the implementation of the SJVAPCD's Regulation VIII measures for dust control during construction. The operational emissions are based on the project specific trip generation rates and building square footage. The results indicate the proposed project's operational emissions would not exceed significance criteria.

The EIR also describes the potential impact on sensitive receptors from construction and operation of the proposed project based on the HRA prepared for the project. A construction HRA, which evaluates construction-period health risk to off-site receptors, was performed for the proposed project. Based on the results of a construction HRA, with implementation of Mitigation Measure AIR-2, which requires the use of Tier 4 construction equipment, construction of the proposed project would not exceed SJVAPCD thresholds and would not expose nearby sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.

To determine the potential health risk to people living and working near the proposed project associated with the exhaust of diesel-powered trucks and equipment, LSA conducted an operational HRA. As demonstrated, the health risk levels to nearby residents from project operation-related emissions of TACs would be well below the SJVAPCD's HRA thresholds. As discussed in the EIR, according to the CalEnviroScreen, the project site has a pollution burden percentile of 97 and the project area is designated as a Senate Bill (SB) 535 disadvantaged community. Therefore, to reduce cumulative health risk, Mitigation Measure AIR-3 was identified which would require the project provides the infrastructure for AC and/or DC chargers for electric heavy-duty trucks, which would further reduce TAC emissions by providing the accommodations for the latest in electric truck technology. Based on the requirements of the mitigation measure, the infrastructure provided will accommodate a minimum of one future charger per 50,000 square feet. With implementation of Mitigation Measure AIR-3, cumulative health risk impacts related to the exposure of sensitive

---

1 LSA. 2023. *Noise Impact Analysis Memorandum for the 2740 West Nielsen Avenue Office/Warehouse Project*. February 3.

2 LSA, 2021. *Traffic Impact Study 2740 West Nielsen Avenue Warehouse Project, City of Fresno, Fresno County, California*. November.

receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations during project operation would be less than significant.

For additional context, the Attorney General's Warehouse Projects: Best Practices and Mitigation Measures to Comply with the California Environmental Quality Act (Warehouses Best Practices) Document contains recommended air quality and greenhouse gas (GHG) analysis and mitigation. The air quality, HRA, and GHG analysis contained in the EIR is consistent with the examples of best practices when studying air quality and GHG impacts listed in the Warehouses Best Practices Document. In addition, the Warehouses Best Practices Document contains recommended mitigation measures, many of which are consistent with project features and measures identified in the EIR, including the following:

- Requiring all construction equipment to be equipped with Tier 4 engines (required by Mitigation Measure AIR-2);

- Requiring that the project applicant ensure that the proposed project would provide the infrastructure for AC and/or DC chargers for electric heavy-duty trucks (required by Mitigation Measure AIR-3), consistent with the recommendations to require all heavy-duty vehicles engaged in drayage to or from the project site to be zero-emission beginning in 2030, require tenants to use zero-emission light- and medium-duty vehicles as part of business operations, construct zero-emission truck charging/fueling stations, and run conduit to designated locations for future electric truck charging stations;

- Limiting idling of trucks to 5 minutes or less, consistent with the California Air Resources Board (CARB) In-Use Off-Road Diesel Vehicles regulation;

- Compliance with the latest California Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen) building measures and 2022 Title 24 Building Energy Efficiency Standards (Title 24 Standards). The 2022 CALGreen code includes mandatory measures for non-residential projects, which apply to all new non-residential buildings, including requirements for electric vehicle (EV) capable spaces in accordance with Table 5.105.5.3.1 of CALGreen;

- Installation of cool roof materials;

- Implementing a vegetative plan that includes the planning of trees and other landscaping materials throughout the perimeter of the project site; and

- Compliance with SJVAPCD Rule 9410, which requires employers with 100 or more "eligible" employees at a worksite to establish an Employer Trip Reduction Implementation Plan (eTRIP) that encourages employees to reduce single-occupancy vehicle trips, consistent with recommendations to establish and promote a rideshare program.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

As described in the EIR, consistent with the *State CEQA Guidelines*, Section 15183.5, if a project is consistent with an adopted qualified Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy that meets the standards,

it can be presumed that the project would not have significant GHG emission impacts. The City of Fresno's GHG Reduction Plan meets the requirements for a Qualified Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy and is designed to streamline environmental review of future development projects in the City, consistent with *State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15183.5.

The City's GHG Reduction Plan Update includes a Consistency Checklist to help the City provide a streamlined review process for new development projects that are subject to discretionary review pursuant to CEQA. The project would not require a change the General Plan land use designation or the current zoning; therefore, an analysis of the proposed project's estimated GHG emissions compared to maximum buildout of the existing designation would not be required.

The project would be consistent with the applicable strategies from the GHG Reduction Plan Update and would not generate GHG emissions that may have a significant effect on the environment. Further, the proposed project would comply with existing State regulations adopted to achieve the overall GHG emissions reduction goals, and would be consistent with applicable plans and programs designed to reduce GHG emissions. In addition, Mitigation Measure AIR-1 requires the infrastructure for AC and/or DC chargers for electric heavy-duty trucks, which would be consistent with the State's advanced clean fleets rule, which has a goal of achieving a zero-emission truck and bus California fleet by 2045. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs and impacts would be less than significant.

Noise

The noise analysis for the project was extensive, and included noise measurements in the project vicinity and an analysis of project related construction and operational impacts. While construction noise will vary, it is expected that composite noise levels during construction at the nearest off-site sensitive residential use to the south would reach an average noise level of 64 dBA L_{eq} during daytime hours. While construction-related, short-term noise levels have the potential to be higher than quieter daytime ambient noise levels in the project area under existing conditions, the construction noise impacts would be approximately 1.7 dBA greater than the existing average daytime noise level of 64.7 dBA L_{eq} during the allowable hour of construction. When logarithmically combined with the existing average ambient noise level, the total noise level would be 66.2 dBA L_{eq} resulting in an increase of 3.9 dBA L_{eq}. Because the increase would be less than 5 dBA (the threshold of noticeable change to the human ear), construction noise would be considered less than significant. Although the project's potential construction-related noise level increase would be less than 5 dBA, project construction noise has the potential to result in annoyance to surrounding receptors. Therefore, the applicant would be required to implement Mitigation Measure NOI-1, which would ensure that all equipment, fixed or mobile, would be required to be equipped with properly operating and maintained mufflers, consistent with manufacturers' standards.

For the evaluation of permanent operational noise impacts, General Plan Policy NS-1-j: Significance Threshold, establishes a 3 dBA increase as a significant increase in ambient noise. The EIR found that project-related traffic noise would be no greater than 2.1 dBA. In addition, to determine the future noise impacts from project operations to the noise sensitive uses, SoundPLAN, which is a sophisticated 3D noise modeling software, was used for the evaluation and determined that maximum noise levels

generated would approach 66.5 dBA L_{max} at the surrounding sensitive receptors, which be below the City's exterior maximum daytime noise standard of 70 dBA L_{max} but would exceed the 60 dBA L_{max} for nighttime hours. Mitigation Measure NOI-2 was identified to reduce potential impacts related to loading dock and delivery noise by prohibiting loading dock activities at the loading dock doors and trailer parking activities south of Building 1 during nighttime hours. Loading dock and parking activities at all other locations would be shielded by the proposed buildings and would not exceed the City's nighttime noise standards.

Transportation

The Transportation Impact Analysis that was prepared for the project was done in close coordination with City staff. The trip generation for the proposed project, as approved by City staff, was developed using rates from the Western Riverside Council of Governments (WRCOG) Study, which estimates that the project would generate 1,920 average daily trips, including 1,578 vehicle trips and 342 truck trips. The addition of project traffic is not anticipated to exceed the City's level of significance threshold of level of service (LOS) D or better and would not result in a deficiency to existing transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities.

In addition, the City has adopted CEQA Guidelines for Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) Thresholds, pursuant to SB 743. The thresholds described therein are referred to herein as the City of Fresno VMT Thresholds. The City of Fresno VMT Thresholds document was prepared and adopted consistent with the requirements of CEQA Guidelines Sections 15064.3 and 15064.7. The Fresno Council of Governments' (Fresno COG) Activity-Based Model (ABM) was used to estimate the project's VMT and VMT metric. ABM is a tour-based model that captures travel behavior of the region comprehensively. As such, the project employee VMT included VMT from all employee tours and sub-tours, which include employee commute tours, project-related delivery tours within the region, and any other tours related to the project. In addition, the project VMT and the VMT metric used for this analysis are consistent with the City's and Fresno COG's adopted methodology/guidelines for preparation of VMT analysis. The guidelines provide substantial evidence demonstrating the appropriateness of the VMT analysis methodology, consistent with the intended goals for SB 743. In conclusion, the project would result in a less than significant VMT impact concerning consistency with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3(b).

The EIR also included an evaluation of the following additional environmental resource topics: Aesthetics, Biological Resources, Cultural and Tribal Cultural Resources, Energy, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Hydrology and Water Quality, and Utilities and Service Systems. Other environmental resource topics not included in the EIR are analyzed in the Initial Study, including: Agriculture and Forestry Resources, Geology and Soils, Land Use and Planning, Mineral Resources, Population and Housing, Public Services, Recreation, and Wildfire. The topics included in the Initial Study were found to be less than significant and are not included in this memorandum. The attached Executive Summary Matrix outlines all potential environmental effects, mitigation measures that were identified in the EIR, and the level of significance after mitigation.

Attachment: Executive Summary Matrix

ATTACHMENT

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY MATRIX

Executive Summary Matrix

Potential Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
4.1: AESTHETICS			
Threshold 4.1.1: *The proposed project would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista.*	Less than Significant Impact.	No mitigation is required.	N/A
Threshold 4.1.2: *The proposed project would not substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway.*	No Impact.	No mitigation is required.	N/A
Threshold 4.1.3: *The proposed project would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings (public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point), and due to the location of the project in an urbanized area, the project would conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality.*	Less than Significant Impact.	No mitigation is required.	N/A
Threshold 4.1.4: *The project would create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.*	Potentially Significant Impact.	**Mitigation Measure 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. **Mitigation Measure 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. **Mitigation Measure 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. **Mitigation Measure 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	Less than Significant with implementation of Mitigation Measures AES-1 through AES-5.

Executive Summary Matrix

Potential Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		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. **Mitigation Measures AES-5**: Materials used on building facades shall be non-reflective.	
Threshold 4.1.5: *The proposed project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects, would contribute to a significant cumulative impact with respect to aesthetics.*	Potentially Significant Impact.	Refer to Mitigation Measures AES-1 through AES-5 above.	Less than Significant with implementation of Mitigation Measures AES-1 through AES-5.
4.2: AIR QUALITY			
Threshold 4.2.1: *The project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan*	Potentially Significant Impact.	Refer to Mitigation Measure AIR-1 below.	Less than Significant with implementation of Mitigation Measure AIR-1.
Threshold 4.2.2: *Implementation of the proposed project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of criteria pollutants for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or State ambient air quality standards.*	Potentially Significant Impact.	**Mitigation Measure AIR-1:** Consistent with SJVAPCD Regulation VIII (Fugitive PM_{10} Prohibitions), the following controls are required to be included as specifications for the proposed project and implemented at the construction site: • All disturbed areas, including storage piles, which are not being actively utilized for construction purposes, shall be effectively stabilized of dust emissions using water, chemical stabilizer/suppressant, covered with a tarp or other suitable cover or vegetative ground cover. • All on-site unpaved roads and off-site unpaved access roads shall be effectively stabilized of dust emissions using water or chemical stabilizer/suppressant. • All land clearing, grubbing, scraping, excavation, land leveling, grading, cut and fill, and demolition activities shall be effectively controlled of fugitive dust emissions utilizing application of water or by presoaking. • When materials are transported off-site, all material shall be covered, or effectively wetted to limit visible dust emissions, and at least 6 inches of freeboard space from the top of the container shall be maintained.	Less than Significant with implementation of Mitigation Measure AIR-1.

Executive Summary Matrix

Potential Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		• All operations shall limit or expeditiously remove the accumulation of mud or dirt from adjacent public streets at the end of each workday. (The use of dry rotary brushes is expressly prohibited except where preceded or accompanied by sufficient wetting to limit the visible dust emissions. Use of blower devices is expressly forbidden.) • Following the addition of materials to, or the removal of materials from, the surface of out-door storage piles, said piles shall be effectively stabilized of fugitive dust emission utilizing sufficient water or chemical stabilizer/suppressant.	
Threshold 4.2.3: *Implementation of the proposed project would expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.*	Potentially Significant Impact.	**Mitigation Measure AIR-2**: During construction of the proposed project, the project contractor shall ensure all off-road diesel-powered construction equipment of 50 horsepower or more used for the project construction at a minimum meets the California Air Resources Board Tier 4 emissions standards or equivalent. **Mitigation Measure AIR-3**: The project applicant shall ensure that the proposed project provides the infrastructure for AC and/or DC chargers for electric heavy-duty trucks. The infrastructure provided shall accommodate a minimum of one future charger per 50,000 square feet.	Less than Significant with implementation of Mitigation Measures AIR-2 and AIR-3.
Threshold 4.2.4: *The project would not result in significant odors that could adversely affect a substantial number of people.*	Less than Significant Impact.	No mitigation is required.	N/A
Threshold 4.2.5: *The proposed project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects, would contribute to a significant cumulative impact with respect to air quality.*	Potentially Significant Impact.	Refer to Mitigation Measures AIR-1 through AIR-3 above.	Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures AIR-1 through AIR-3.
4.3: BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES			

Executive Summary Matrix

Potential Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Threshold 4.3.1: *The project would have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.*	Potentially Significant Impact.	**Mitigation Measure BIO-1:** If project construction activities occur during nesting season (between February 1 and August 31), a qualified biologist shall conduct pre-construction surveys for active migratory bird nests at the project site within 14 days of the onset of these activities. Should any active nests be discovered in or near proposed construction zones, the biologist shall identify a suitable construction-free buffer around the nest. This buffer shall be identified on the ground with flagging or fencing, and shall be maintained until the biologist has determined that the young have fledged.	Less than Significant with implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-1
Threshold 4.3.2: *The project would not have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community.*	No Impact.	No mitigation is required.	N/A
Threshold 4.3.3: *The project would not have a substantial adverse effect on State or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means.*	No Impact.	No mitigation is required.	N/A
Threshold 4.3.4: *The project would not 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.*	Less Than Significant Impact.	No mitigation is required.	N/A

Executive Summary Matrix

Potential Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Threshold 4.3.5: *The project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance.*	No Impact.	No mitigation is required.	N/A
Threshold 4.3.6: *The project would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan*	No Impact.	No mitigation is required.	N/A
Threshold 4.3.7: *The proposed project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects, would contribute to a significant cumulative impact with respect to biological resources.*	Potentially Significant Impact.	Refer to Mitigation Measure BIO-1 above.	Less than Significant with implementation of Mitigation Measures BIO-1 and BIO-2.
4.4: CULTURAL AND TRIBAL RESOURCES			
Threshold 4.4.1: *The project would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.*	Potentially Significant Impact.	Refer to Mitigation Measures CUL-1 below.	Less than Significant with implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-1.
Threshold 4.4.2: *The project would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource as defined in Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.*	Potentially Significant Impact.	**Mitigation Measure CUL-1:** If previously unknown resources are encountered before or during any ground disturbing activities, construction shall stop in the immediate vicinity of the find and a qualified archaeologist shall be consulted to determine whether the resource requires further study. The qualified archaeologist shall make recommendations to the City on the measures that shall be implemented to protect the discovered resources, including but not limited to excavation of the finds and evaluation of the finds in accordance with Section 15064.5 of the State CEQA Guidelines and the City's Historic Preservation Ordinance.	Less than Significant with implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-1.

Executive Summary Matrix

Potential Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		If the resources are determined to be unique archeological resources as defined under Section 15064.5 of the State CEQA Guidelines, measures shall be identified by a qualified archaeologist meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards for Archaeology 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 ground disturbing activity shall occur in the area of the discovery until the lead agency approves the measures to protect identified resources. Any significant or unique 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.	
Threshold 4.4.3: *The project would disturb human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.*	Potentially Significant Impact.	**Mitigation Measure CUL-2:** In the event that human remains are unearthed during excavation and grading activities of any future development project, all activity shall cease immediately. Pursuant to Health and Safety Code (HSC) Section 7050.5, no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition pursuant to PRC Section 5097.98(a). If the remains are determined to be of Native American descent, the coroner shall within 24 hours notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). The NAHC shall then contact the most likely descendent of the deceased Native American, who shall then serve as the consultant on how to proceed with the remains. Pursuant to PRC Section 5097.98(b), upon the discovery of Native American remains, the landowner shall ensure that the immediate vicinity, according to generally accepted cultural or archaeological standards or practices, where the Native American human remains are located is not damaged or disturbed by further development activity until the landowner has discussed and conferred with the most likely descendants regarding their recommendations, if applicable, taking into account the possibility of multiple human remains. The landowner shall discuss and confer	Less than Significant with implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-2.

Executive Summary Matrix

Potential Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		with the descendants all reasonable options regarding the descendants' preferences for treatment.	
Threshold 4.4.4: *The project would result in 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.*	Potentially Significant Impact.	Refer to Mitigation Measure CUL-1 above.	Less than Significant with implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-1.
Threshold 4.4.5: *The proposed project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects, would contribute to a significant cumulative impact with respect to cultural resources.*	Potentially Significant Impact.	Refer to Mitigation Measures CUL-1 and CUL-2 above.	**Less than Significant with implementation of Mitigation Measures CUL-1 and CUL-2.**
4.5: ENERGY			
Threshold 4.5.1: *The project would not result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation.*	Less than Significant Impact.	No mitigation is required.	N/A
Threshold 4.5.2: *The project would not conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency.*	Less than Significant Impact.	No mitigation is required.	N/A
Threshold 4.5.3: *The proposed project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects, would not contribute to a significant cumulative impact with respect to aesthetics.*	Less than Significant Impact.	No mitigation is required.	N/A
4.6: GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS			
Threshold 4.6.1: *The project would not generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment.*	Less than Significant Impact.	No mitigation is required.	N/A

Executive Summary Matrix

Potential Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Threshold 4.6.2: *The project would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases.*	Less than Significant Impact.	No mitigation is required.	N/A
Threshold 4.6.3: *The proposed project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects, would not contribute to a significant cumulative impact with respect to greenhouse gas emissions.*	Less than Significant Impact.	No mitigation is required.	N/A
4.7: HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS			
Threshold 4.7.1: *The project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.*	Less than Significant Impact.	No mitigation is required.	N/A
Threshold 4.7.2: *The project would 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.*	Potentially Significant Impact.	**Mitigation Measure HAZ-1:** Prior to soil disturbance, a consultant qualified under American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) International Standard E1527-13 for the purposes of identifying hazardous materials shall be retained to prepare a Soil Management Plan (SMP) address soil management procedures that may arise based on historical use of the project site and the known total petroleum hydrocarbons (TPH) and arsenic impacts. Construction may not proceed until the extent and nature of the TPH and arsenic impacts are determined by qualified personnel and in consultation with appropriate City staff. The removal and/or disposal of any contaminants shall be in accordance with all applicable local, State, and federal standards to the degree that adequate public health and safety standards are maintained, to the satisfaction of the City.	Less than Significant with implementation of Mitigation Measure HAZ-1.
Threshold 4.7.3: *The project would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.*	Less than Significant Impact.	No mitigation is required.	N/A

Executive Summary Matrix

Potential Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Threshold 4.7.4: *The project would not be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would create a significant hazard to the public or the environment.*	No Impact.	No mitigation is required.	N/A
Threshold 4.7.5: *The project would be 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, and would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.*	Less than Significant Impact.	No mitigation is required.	N/A
Threshold 4.7.6: *The project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.*	Less than Significant Impact.	No mitigation is required.	N/A
Threshold 4.7.7: *The project would not expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires.*	Less than Significant Impact.	No mitigation is required.	N/A
Threshold 4.7.8: *The proposed project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects, would contribute to a significant cumulative impact with respect to hazards and hazardous materials.*	Potentially Significant Impact.	Refer to Mitigation Measure HAZ-1 above.	Less than Significant with implementation of Mitigation Measure HAZ-1.
4.8: HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY			
Threshold 4.8.1: *The project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality.*	Less Than Significant Impact.	No mitigation is required.	N/A

Executive Summary Matrix

Potential Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Threshold 4.8.2: *The project would not substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin.*	Less Than Significant Impact.	No mitigation is required.	N/A
Threshold 4.8.3: *The project would not create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff.*	Less Than Significant Impact.	No mitigation is required.	N/A
Threshold 4.8.4: *The project would not release of pollutants due to project inundation in a flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones.*	Less Than Significant Impact.	No mitigation is required.	N/A
Threshold 4.8.5: *The project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan (SGMA).*	Less Than Significant Impact.	No mitigation is required.	N/A
Threshold 4.8.6: *The proposed project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects, would not contribute to a significant cumulative impact with respect to hydrology and water quality.*	Less Than Significant Impact.	No mitigation is required.	N/A
4.9: NOISE			
Threshold 4.9.1: *The proposed project would generate a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or in other applicable local, State, or federal standards.*	Potentially Significant Impact.	**Mitigation Measure NOI-1:** The project contractor shall implement the following measures during construction of the project: • Equip all construction equipment, fixed or mobile, with properly operating and maintained mufflers consistent with manufacturers' standards. • Designate a "disturbance coordinator" at the City who would be responsible for responding to any local complaints about construction noise. The disturbance coordinator would determine the cause of the noise complaint (e.g., starting too early, bad muffler) and would determine and implement reasonable measures warranted to correct the problem.	Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures NOI-1 and NOI-2.

Executive Summary Matrix

Potential Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		Mitigation Measure NOI-2: All loading dock activities shall be prohibited at the loading dock doors on the south end of Building 1 during the nighttime hours (10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m.) or once operational, the project proponent shall provide documentation to the City of Fresno Planning and Development Department that demonstrates that nighttime loading dock activities would comply with the noise level specifications of the City's Municipal Code.	
Threshold 4.9.2: *The proposed project would not generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.*	Less Than Significant Impact.	No mitigation is required.	N/A
Threshold 4.9.3: *For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, the proposed project would not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels.*	Less Than Significant Impact.	No mitigation is required.	N/A
Threshold 4.9.4: *The proposed project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects, would contribute to a significant cumulative impact with respect to noise.*	Potentially Significant Impact.	Refer to Mitigation Measures NOI-1 and NOI-2.	Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures NOI-1 and NOI-2.
4.10: TRANSPORTATION			
Threshold 4.10.1: *The project would not conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities.*	Less Than Significant Impact.	No mitigation is required.	N/A

Executive Summary Matrix

Potential Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Threshold 4.10.2: *The proposed project would not conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b).*	Less Than Significant Impact.	No mitigation is required.	N/A
Threshold 4.10.3: *The project would not substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment).*	Less Than Significant Impact.	No mitigation is required.	N/A
Threshold 4.10.4: *The project would not result in inadequate emergency access.*	Less Than Significant Impact.	No mitigation is required.	N/A
Threshold 4.10.: *The proposed project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects, would not contribute to a significant cumulative impact with respect to transportation.*	Less Than Significant Impact.	No mitigation is required.	N/A
4.11: UTILITIES			
Threshold 4.11.1: *The project would not require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects.*	Less Than Significant Impact.	No mitigation is required.	N/A
Threshold 4.11.2: *The project would have insufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years*	Less Than Significant Impact.	No mitigation is required.	N/A
Threshold 4.11.3: *The project would 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.*	Less Than Significant Impact.	No mitigation is required.	N/A

Executive Summary Matrix

Potential Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Threshold 4.11.4: *The project would not the project generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals.*	Less Than Significant Impact.	No mitigation is required.	N/A
Threshold 4.11.5: *The project would comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste.*	Less Than Significant Impact.	No mitigation is required.	N/A
Threshold 4.11.6: *The proposed project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects, would not contribute to a significant cumulative impact with respect to aesthetics.*	Less Than Significant Impact.	No mitigation is required.	N/A
Initial Study			
AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES			
Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use.	No Impact.	No mitigation is required.	No Impact.
Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract.	No Impact.	No mitigation is required.	No Impact.
Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g)).	No Impact.	No mitigation is required.	No Impact.
Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use.	No Impact.	No mitigation is required.	No Impact.

Executive Summary Matrix

Potential Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use.	No Impact.	No mitigation is required.	No Impact.
GEOLOGY AND SOILS			
Directly or Indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:			
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.	No Impact.	No mitigation is required.	No Impact.
Strong seismic ground shaking.	Less than Significant Impact.	No mitigation is required.	Less than Significant Impact.
Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction.	Less than Significant Impact.	No mitigation is required.	Less than Significant Impact.
Landslides.	Less than Significant Impact.	No mitigation is required.	Less than Significant Impact.
Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil.	Less than Significant Impact.	No mitigation is required.	Less than Significant Impact.
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.	Less than Significant Impact.	No mitigation is required.	Less than Significant Impact.
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.	Less than Significant Impact.	No mitigation is required.	Less than Significant Impact.

Executive Summary Matrix

Potential Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water	No Impact.	No mitigation is required.	No Impact.
Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature.	Potentially Significant Impact.	**Mitigation Measure GEO-1:** Subsequent to a preliminary City review of the project grading plans, if there is evidence that a project will include excavation or construction activities within previously undisturbed soils, a field survey and literature search for unique paleontological/geological resources shall be conducted. The following procedures shall be followed: • If unique paleontological/geological resources are not found during either the field survey or literature search, excavation and/or construction activities can commence. In the event that unique paleontological/geological resources are discovered during excavation and/or construction activities, construction shall stop in the immediate vicinity of the find and a qualified paleontologist shall be consulted to determine whether the resource requires further study. The qualified paleontologist shall make recommendations to the City on the measures that shall be implemented to protect the discovered resources, including but not limited to, excavation of the finds and evaluation of the finds. If the resources are determined to be significant, mitigation measures shall be identified by the monitor and recommended to the lead agency. Appropriate mitigation measures for significant resources could include avoidance or capping, incorporation of the site in green space, parks, or open space, or data recovery excavations of the finds. No further grading shall occur in the area of the discovery until the lead agency approves the measures to protect these resources. Any paleontological/geological resources recovered as a result of mitigation shall be provided to a City-approved institution or person who is capable of providing long-term preservation to allow future scientific study. • If unique paleontological/geological resources are found during the field survey or literature review, the resources shall be inventoried and evaluated for significance. If the resources are	Less Than Significant Impact.

Executive Summary Matrix

Potential Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		found to be significant, mitigation measures shall be identified by the qualified paleontologist. Similar to above, appropriate mitigation measures for significant resources could include avoidance or capping, incorporation of the site in green space, parks, or open space, or data recovery excavations of the finds. In addition, appropriate mitigation for excavation and construction activities in the vicinity of the resources found during the field survey or literature review shall include a paleontological monitor. The monitoring period shall be determined by the qualified paleontologist. If additional paleontological/geological resources are found during excavation and/or construction activities, the procedure identified above for the discovery of unknown resources shall be followed.	
LAND USE AND PLANNING			
Physically divide an established community.	No Impact.	No mitigation is required.	No Impact.
Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.	No Impact.	No mitigation is required.	No Impact.
MINERAL RESOURCES			
Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state.	No Impact.	No mitigation is required.	No Impact.
Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan	No Impact.	No mitigation is required.	No Impact.
POPULATION AND HOUSING			
Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure).	Less than Significant Impact.	No mitigation is required.	Less than Significant Impact.

Executive Summary Matrix

Potential Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.	No Impact.	No mitigation is required.	No Impact.
PUBLIC SERVICES			
Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:			
Fire protection?	Less than Significant Impact.	No mitigation is required.	Less than Significant Impact.
Police protection?	Less than Significant Impact.	No mitigation is required.	Less than Significant Impact.
Schools?	No Impact.	No mitigation is required.	No Impact.
Parks?	Less than Significant Impact.	No mitigation is required.	Less than Significant Impact.
Other public facilities?	Less than Significant Impact.	No mitigation is required.	Less than Significant Impact.
RECREATION			
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.	No Impact.	No mitigation is required.	No Impact.
Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment.	No Impact.	No mitigation is required.	No Impact.
WILDFIRE			
Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.	No Impact.	No mitigation is required.	No Impact.

Executive Summary Matrix

Potential Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire.	No Impact.	No mitigation is required.	No Impact.
Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment.	No Impact.	No mitigation is required.	No Impact.
Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes.	No Impact.	No mitigation is required.	No Impact.