

Exhibit D-5
Errata to the Final EIR

City Council:
Costco Commercial Center Project

ERRATA TO THE FINAL EIR

INTRODUCTION

The City of Fresno (City) has prepared this Errata sheet to clarify and correct information in the Final Environmental Impact Report (Final EIR) for the Fresno Costco Commercial Center Project (State Clearinghouse No. 2021100443). Pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5, recirculation is not required where the new information added to the EIR merely clarifies or amplifies or makes insignificant modifications in an adequate EIR. This Errata sheet includes minor text edits to the Final EIR for the project. Revisions herein do not contain significant new information that alter the conclusions of the Final EIR, result in any new significant environmental impacts, or deprive the public of a meaningful opportunity to comment upon a substantial adverse environmental effect of the project.

STAFF INITIATED TEXT CHANGES

The Final EIR is revised as follows to provide greater clarity. Text additions are identified with double underline and text deletions are provided in double ~~strike through~~.

Chapter 2: Responses to Comments

In Table 2-1 (Final EIR page 2-1), the footnote on the row for Comment O1 in Table 2-1 (Final EIR page 2-1) has been removed, as shown below. This change has no effect on the treatment of the comment in the responses contained in the Final EIR.

Table 2-1 List of Commenters

Letter No.	Commenter	Date
AGENCIES		
A1	California Department of Fish and Wildlife	August 14, 2023
A2	California Department of Transportation	August 15, 2023
A3	San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District	August 23, 2023
ORGANIZATIONS		
O1	Burke, Williams & Sorensen, LLP, on behalf of Costco Wholesale	August 28, 2023 ⁺
INDIVIDUALS		
I1	Matthew Schellenberg	July 21, 2023
I2	Teresa Sanchez	July 21, 2023
I3	Dolores Davidian	July 19, 2023
I4	Vernon Valmonte	July 18, 2023
I5	Denise King	July 17, 2023
I6	Sharon Ross	July 17, 2023
I7	Susan Hansen	July 17, 2023
I8	Claudia Readwright	July 17, 2023
I9	Shahzaib Zaman	July 17, 2023
I10	Tj Atwal	July 17, 2023
I11	Rey Alvarez	July 17, 2023
I12	Agnes Habellion	July 16, 2023

Letter No.	Commenter	Date
I13	Linnea and David Faeth	July 16, 2023
I14	Alana L. Lewis	July 16, 2023
I15	Sharon Henson	July 16, 2023
I16	Jeannette Correa	July 16, 2023
I17	Dantenello Velasquez	July 15, 2023
I18	Randy Ames	July 15, 2023
I19	Kiersten Winrow	July 14, 2023
I20	Joseph Pulido	July 14, 2023
I21	Jeremy Bruno	July 14, 2023
I22	Bob Eurich	July 14, 2023
I23	Sukhi Dhillon	July 14, 2023
I24	Sakit Bibra	July 14, 2023
I25	Anya Ellis	July 14, 2023
I26	Michael and Joan Paine	July 14, 2023
I27	Bekah Bryant	July 14, 2023
I28	Randy Mills	July 13, 2023
I29	William and Melody Hardaway	July 13, 2023
I30	Geoff J.	July 13, 2023
I31	Birdevinder	July 13, 2023
I32	Bryan Miller	July 13, 2023
I33	Colton Metzler	July 13, 2023
I34	Ty Murphy	July 13, 2023
I35	Jax Ward	July 13, 2023
I36	Elizabeth Mendoza	July 13, 2023
I37	J. Chmielewski	July 13, 2023
I38	Kent Yamaguchi	July 13, 2023
I39	Nick Quisenberry	July 13, 2023
I40	Don Marshall	July 13, 2023
I41	Jerry Montejano	July 13, 2023
I42	William Duane Peverill	July 21, 2023
I43	Lorraine Arrington	July 21, 2023
I44	Dr. Danielle Biggs	July 21, 2023
I45	Holden Markwith	July 21, 2023
I46	David Scott	July 22, 2023
I47	Amy Siliznoff	July 22, 2023
I48	Betty Williams	July 22, 2023
I49	Jensen Vang	July 22, 2023
I50	Melody Wolverson	July 22, 2023
I51	Joseph Pulido	July 22, 2023
I52	John Olszowka	July 23, 2023
I53	Justin Latham	July 23, 2023

Letter No.	Commenter	Date
I54	Charles Ognibene	July 23, 2023
I55	Jamey Schmidt	July 24, 2023
I56	William Duane Peverill	July 24, 2023
I57	Lorraine Arrington	July 24, 2023
I58	Pat Yaralian	July 25, 2023
I59	Michael Van	July 25, 2023
I60	Sabrina Hernandez	July 26, 2023
I61	Javier Morales	July 27, 2023
I62	James and Louisa Weyant	July 27, 2023
I63	Shirley Hutchison	July 27, 2023
I64	Maria Leon	July 27, 2023
I65	Norman S. Stahl	July 27, 2023
I66	Jesus Diaz	July 27, 2023
I67	Anthony Scheideman	July 27, 2023
I68	Rick and Kathy Haskill	July 28, 2023
I69	Kevin Cartwright	July 28, 2023
I70	Adalino	July 28, 2023
I71	Juan Duran	July 28, 2023
I72	Miguel Duran	July 28, 2023
I73	Fabrizio Robalino	July 31, 2023
I74	Celso "Sal" Romero, Jr.	July 31, 2023
I75	Cindy Diaz	August 1, 2023
I76	Joy Hinrichsen	August 2, 2023
I77	Garrett Schaefer	August 3, 2023
I78	Lynda Allison Doty	August 8, 2023
I79	Tom Basset	August 8, 2023
I80	Beth Durbin	August 9, 2023
I81	Sandra J. Iley	August 9, 2023
I82	Stephanie S.	August 10, 2023
I83	Thomas Coppin	August 10, 2023
I84	Dawn Mathews	August 10, 2023
I85	Larry Rodriguez	August 11, 2023
I86	Sylvia Fernandez	August 11, 2023
I87	Jens Andersen	August 13, 2023
I88	Richee Xavonglianekham	August 14, 2023
I89	Janet Bergman	August 15, 2023
I90	Robin Snowden	August 17, 2023
I91	Shauna Sandin	August 18, 2023
I92	Charles Yuvienco	August 19, 2023
I93	Darius Assemi	August 21, 2023
I94	Noel Delgado	August 21, 2023

Letter No.	Commenter	Date
I95	Ray Gonzales	August 24, 2023
I96	Jennifer Airheart	August 24, 2023
I97	Amy Zehring	August 25, 2023
I98	Brian and Sherryl Kellogg	August 24, 2023
I99	Rodger B. Jensen	August 25, 2023
I100	James Fleck	August 28, 2023
I101	Gabriel Ledesma	August 28, 2023
I102	Lauryn Medina	September 1, 2023 ¹
I103	Daniel Brannick	August 31, 2023 ¹

¹ The comment was received after the close of the public comment period.

The text introducing Mitigation Measure 3.13-2 was clarified in the Final EIR in response Comment O1-3 (Final EIR page 2-33). This same change is also identified in “Revisions to Section 3.13, ‘Transportation and Circulation’” (beginning on Final EIR page 3-4). One change made to that table was not underlined to indicate new text and included an insignificant typographical error. The “Notes” column in Table 3.13-5 for Measure T-11 has been updated as follows to reflect the addition of text that was made in the Final EIR but not properly identified with underline text:

Table 3.13-5 Transportation Sector Measures to Reduce VMT

	Mitigation Measure	Maximum Potential VMT Reduction ¹	Feasible/Applicable to the project?	Notes
T-1	Increase Residential Density	30% from project VMT	N/A	The proposed project does not include residential uses.
T-2	Increase Job Density	30% from project VMT	N/A	This is a plan/communitywide strategy and is not applicable.
T-3	Provide Transit-Oriented Development	31% from project VMT	N/A	This is a plan/communitywide strategy and is not applicable.
T-4	Integrate Affordable and Below Market Rate Housing	28.6% from project/site multifamily residential VMT	N/A	The proposed project does not include residential uses.
T-5	Implement Commute Trip Reduction Program (Voluntary)	4% project/site employee commute VMT	Yes No	See Mitigation Measure 3.13-2 below. Measures T-7 through T-11 must be implemented as part of T-5 to achieve the maximum employee commute VMT reduction. Because T-11 would not be feasible, the commute trip reduction program would not meet the full list of CAPCOA parameters.

	Mitigation Measure	Maximum Potential VMT Reduction ¹	Feasible/Applicable to the project?	Notes
T-6	Implement Commute Trip Reduction Program (Mandatory Implementation and Monitoring)	26% from project/site employee commute VMT	Yes No	See Mitigation Measure 3.13-2 below. Measures T-7 through T-11 must be implemented as part of T-6 to achieve the maximum employee commute VMT reduction. Because T-11 would not be feasible, the commute trip reduction program would not meet the full list of CAPCOA parameters.
T-7	Implement Commute Trip Reduction Marketing	4% project/site employee commute VMT	Yes	See Mitigation Measure 3.13-2 below.
T-8	Provide Ridesharing Program	8% project/site employee commute VMT	Yes	See Mitigation Measure 3.13-2 below.
T-9	Implement Subsidized or Discounted Transit Program	5.5% from employee/resident	Yes	See Mitigation Measure 3.13-2 below.
T-10	Provide End-of-Trip Bicycle Facilities	4.4% project/site employee commute VMT	Yes	See Mitigation Measure 3.13-2 below.
T-11	Provide Employer-Sponsored Vanpool	20.4% project/site employee commute VMT	Yes No	See Mitigation Measure 3.13-2 below. A private vanpool program would involve the capital cost of purchasing vans plus the operating cost of insurances, would raise liability concerns, and would pose logistical challenges such as equal treatment of employees and rules regarding private use of the vans. This measure cannot be feasibly implemented to reduce VMT.
T-12	Price Workplace Parking	20% project/site employee commute VMT	N/A	Measure ineffective due to readily available, uncontrolled and free parking in the immediate vicinity of the proposed project.
T-13	Implement Employee Parking Cash-Out	12% project/site employee commute VMT	N/A	Measure ineffective due to readily available, uncontrolled and free parking in the immediate vicinity of the proposed project.
T-14	Provide Electric Vehicle Charging Infrastructure	--	N/A	See Mitigation Measure 3.3-2a. This measure does not affect VMT.
T-15	Limit Residential Parking Supply	13.7% from residences' VMT	N/A	The proposed project does not include residential uses.
T-16	Unbundle Residential Parking Costs from Property Cost	15.7% from project VMT	N/A	The proposed project does not include residential uses.

	Mitigation Measure	Maximum Potential VMT Reduction ¹	Feasible/Applicable to the project?	Notes
T-17	Improve Street Connectivity	30% from vehicle travel in the plan/community	Yes	The proposed project would construct West Spruce Avenue along the northern project site boundary improving street connectivity. Additionally, the project would construct North Arthur Avenue along the eastern project site boundary, connecting West Spruce Avenue and West Spruce Herndon Avenue. See Chapter 2, "Project Description," and <u>Mitigation Measure 3.13-2 below.</u>
T-18	Provide Pedestrian Network Improvement	6.4% from vehicle travel in the plan/community	Yes	Pedestrian facility improvements provided as part of the proposed project. See Chapter 2, "Project Description," and <u>Mitigation Measure 3.13-2 below.</u>
T-19-A	Construct or Improve Bike Facility	0.8% from vehicles parallel roadways	Yes	Bicycle facility improvements provided as part of the proposed project. See Chapter 2, "Project Description," and <u>Mitigation Measure 3.13-2 below.</u>
T-19-B	Construct or Improve Bike Boulevard	0.2% from vehicles on roadway	Yes	Bicycle facility improvements provided as part of the proposed project. See Chapter 2, "Project Description," and <u>Mitigation Measure 3.13-2 below.</u>
T-20	Expand Bikeway Network	0.5% from vehicles on roadway	Yes	Bicycle facility improvements provided as part of the proposed project. See Chapter 2, "Project Description," and <u>Mitigation Measure 3.13-2 below.</u>
T-21-A	Implement Conventional Carshare Program	0.15% from vehicle travel in the plan/community	No	This is a plan/communitywide strategy and is not feasible.
T-21-B	Implement Electric Carshare Program	VMT reduction not quantified—see CAPCOA handbook	No	This is a plan/communitywide strategy and is not feasible.
T-22-A	Implement Pedal (Non-Electric) Bikeshare Program	0.2% from vehicle travel in the plan/community	No	This is a plan/communitywide strategy and is not feasible.
T-22-B	Implement Electric Bikeshare Program	0.06% from vehicle travel in the plan/community	No	This is a plan/communitywide strategy and is not feasible.
T-22-C	Implement Scootershare Program	0.07% from vehicle travel in the plan/community	No	This is a plan/communitywide strategy and is not feasible.
T-23	Provide Community-Based Travel Planning	2.3% from vehicle travel in the plan/community	N/A	The proposed project does not include residential uses. This measure applies to residences.

	Mitigation Measure	Maximum Potential VMT Reduction ¹	Feasible/Applicable to the project?	Notes
T-24	Implement Market Price Public Parking (On-Street)	30% from vehicle travel in the plan/community	No	The applicant, Costco, does not have jurisdiction over public on-street parking facilities and operation.
T-25	Extend Transit Network Coverage or Hours	4.6% from vehicle travel in the plan/community	No	The applicant, Costco, does not have jurisdiction over the operation of transit service.
T-26	Increase Transit Service Frequency	11.3% from vehicle travel in the plan/community	No	The applicant, Costco, does not have jurisdiction over the operation of transit service.
T-27	Implement Transit-Supportive Roadway Treatments	0.6% from vehicle travel in the plan/community	No	This is a plan/communitywide strategy and is not feasible.
T-28	Provide Bus Rapid Transit	13.8% from vehicle travel in the plan/community	No	The applicant, Costco, does not have jurisdiction over the operation of transit service.
T-29	Reduce Transit Fares	1.2% from vehicle travel in the plan/community	No	This is a plan/communitywide strategy and is not feasible.
T-30	Use Cleaner-Fuel Vehicles	--	N/A	This measure does not affect VMT.

Notes:

1: The CAPCOA Handbook identifies the maximum potential GHG reduction associated with identified measures; however, the CAPCOA Handbook concludes that for the particular measures selected, the percent reduction in VMT would be the same as the percent reduction in GHG emissions. For clarity, this table reports reductions in relation to VMT.

Chapter 3: Revisions to the Draft EIR

The Final EIR acknowledges revisions to the site plan that occurred after publication of the Draft EIR. As explained in Chapter 1, "Introduction," of the Final EIR these proposed design refinements include reduced warehouse size, changes to the design of the warehouse entry, a shorter car wash tunnel, and parking lot design changes. As indicated in the Draft EIR, the proposed changes to the project design do not affect the analysis or conclusions in the Draft EIR and the potential environmental effects of the project are unaffected. Although the Final EIR provides edits to the Draft EIR language to reflect the design refinements, the City has determined that these revisions are not necessary based on the fact that the changes do not affect analysis or conclusions. As a result, these revised text have been omitted, as reflected below.

Page 3-1 of the Final EIR is revised as follows:

~~Revisions to "Executive Summary"~~

~~The first sentence in Section ES.2.4, "Characteristics of the Project," on page ES-2 is revised as follows to reflect the revised site plan:~~

~~The proposed Costco building would occupy 241,342 219,126 square feet, of which approximately 24,000 square feet would be reserved for storage and receiving.~~

~~Revisions to Chapter 2, "Project Description"~~

~~Table 2-1 on page 2-10 is revised as follows to reflect the revised site plan:~~

Table 2-1 Project Elements

Structure	Area (square foot)
Warehouse Retail Building Footprint	241,342 219,126
Warehouse/Retail	162,264 163,539
Loading/Back of house/Storage/Receiving	23,881 4,422
Market delivery operation	46,834
Open canopy space	5,126 3,223
Building envelope	2,955 1,188
Fuel canopy	12,885
Car wash	4,800

Source: Data provided by Urban Planning Partners in 2022 and 2023.

~~The first sentence on page 2-13 under the heading “Costco Warehouse Building” is revised as follows to reflect the revised site plan:~~

~~The proposed warehouse would occupy 241,342 219,126 square feet of which approximately 24,000 square feet would be reserved for storage and receiving.~~

~~The description under the heading “Parking” on page 2-14 is revised as follows to reflect the revised site plan:~~

~~The project includes 889 873 total parking stalls, which meets the City of Fresno’s minimum parking requirements for the project. These parking stalls would include a total of 21 25 accessible spaces and 53 92 electric vehicle ready parking stalls. The design would be in compliance with City and Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements. The project also would provide bicycle parking in accordance with the City’s Citywide Development Code.~~

The text of the second paragraph on page 3-2 of the Final EIR is removed:

~~The first bullet on page 2-22, which describes the entitlements requested from the City is revised to read:~~

- ~~► Approve a Conditional Use Permit to construct a ±241,342 219,126 square foot, warehouse retail building with a ±4,800 square foot car wash; and an ±13,000 square foot, 32 station fuel canopy.~~

The heading “Revisions to Section 3.1, ‘Aesthetics’” (Final EIR page 3-2) and all text that follows is removed, as shown below:

~~Revisions to Section 3.1, “Aesthetics”~~

~~The first sentence under Impact 3.1-1 on page 3-1-6 is revised as follows to reflect the revised site plan:~~

~~The project would construct an approximately 241,342 219,126 square foot single story, contemporary style retail building in the southeast corner of the project site, and a car wash and fueling stations along the northern portions of the site.~~

Under the heading “Revisions to Section 3.11, ‘Noise and Vibration’” beginning on page 3-2 of the Final EIR, the following text is removed:

~~The first sentence under the subheading “Parking and Gas Station” on page 3.11-23 is revised as following to reflect the revised site plan:~~

~~Based on the current conceptual plan the proposed project would include 829-873 parking spaces to accommodate Costco members and employees.~~

In addition, the following change to the Draft EIR is added to page 3-3 of the Final EIR. The City has identified revisions necessary to noise Mitigation Measure 3.11-3 to clarify implementation of the measure and ensure consistency with the analyses in the Draft EIR. Specifically, the City identified a typographical error in the mitigation that incorrectly reports the required noise reduction compared to the analysis in the Draft EIR. The City is correcting that error to increase the noise reduction required by the mitigation. As part of those revisions, the City has also struck restrictive language related to the location of potential noise attenuating features that could be used to achieve the reductions to allow flexibility in identification of appropriate design changes that would provide noise reductions.

Mitigation Measure 3.11-3 on page 3.11-25 has been modified as follows to further clarify implementation:

Mitigation Measure 3.11-3: Reduce Exposure of Existing Sensitive Receptors to Noise Generated by Loading Dock Activity

The project applicant shall construct a sound wall west of the loading docks or other noise attenuating feature ~~west of the loading docks~~ with a demonstrated ability to result in a ~~4-9~~ 9 dB noise decrease at the eastern property line of the existing residences along North Riverside Drive.

The City has also identified revisions necessary to noise Mitigation Measure 3.11-5, which is related to single-event noise levels, to clarify implementation of the measure and ensure consistency with the analysis in the Draft EIR. Page 3.11-14 of the Draft EIR notes, under the subheading “Selection of Noise Metrics for Thresholds of Significance,” that because the City does not have “SENL standards for analyzing heavy vehicle activity that expose receptors for a relatively short period, this noise impact analysis applies SENL standards recommended by the Federal Interagency Committee on Aviation Noise.” The analysis under Impact 3.11-5 (Draft EIR page 3.11-28) applies these metrics, concluding that “SENL’s at the nearest noise-sensitive receptors would exceed 65 SENL” (Draft EIR page 3.11-28). However, the text of the mitigation measure refers to the City’s Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) standards, which are standards weighted over a 24-hour period and are not the basis of the analysis provided.

This change modifies the mitigation to better align with the analysis in the EIR related to noise measurements, clarifying that that the standard is for interior noise as measured by SENL. The revision also cleans up text that was clarified in the Final EIR through addition of text to the introduction language within the measure. Specifically, text was added in the Final EIR in response to comments to clarify that “if one option is not implemented, the other would be required.” As part of this cleanup, text at the end of the measure indicating the same has been removed. This change does not affect the effectiveness of the measure or the applicant’s obligations. Note that there are legal requirements that must be met to modify the existing sound wall on private property, which is the reason for the options presented in the mitigation.

Mitigation Measure 3.11-5: Implement Traffic Noise Reduction Measures along North Riverside Drive

The project proponent shall implement noise reduction measures to ensure that ~~exterior~~ interior noise levels at residential land uses near the west side of North Riverside Drive do not exceed ~~the~~

~~City's current noise standard of 65 SENL dB L_{dn}/CNEI under existing-plus-project conditions. This measure is consistent with General Plan Policy NS-1-l, which recommends the use of design alterations to reduce noise impacts. This performance standard can be achieved using either of the following measures. Therefore, if one option is not implemented, the other would be required.:~~

- Pave the roadway segment with rubberized hot-mix asphalt or equivalent surface treatment with known noise-reducing properties on top of the roadway surface. The rubberized hot-mix asphalt overlay shall be designed with appropriate thickness and rubber component quantity (typically 15 percent by weight of the total blend), such that traffic noise levels are reduced by an average of 4 to 6 dB (noise levels vary depending on travel speeds, meteorological conditions, and pavement quality) as compared to noise levels generated by vehicle traffic traveling on standard asphalt. Rubberized hot-mix asphalt has been found to achieve this level of noise reduction in other parts of California (Sacramento County 1999). Pavement will require more frequent than normal maintenance and repair to maintain its noise attenuation effectiveness. The applicant shall fund the incremental cost for maintaining the roadway segment with the surface treatment.
- Construct a sound barrier taller than the 6-foot cinderblock wall that is currently present from West Spruce Avenue to West Herndon Avenue. The sound barrier shall be constructed of solid material (e.g., wood, brick, adobe, an earthen berm, boulders, or combination thereof). The reflectivity of each sound barrier shall be minimized to ensure that traffic noise reflected off the barrier does not contribute to an exceedance of applicable L_{eq} standards at other receptors. The level of sound reflection from a barrier can be minimized with a textured or absorptive surface or with vegetation on or next to the barrier. A barrier that breaks the line of sight between a source and a receiver will typically result in at least 5 dB of noise reduction (Caltrans 2013: 2-41; FTA 2018: 42). Barriers higher than the line of sight provide increased noise reduction (FTA 2018: 16). Scenic quality factors shall be taken into account during design, such as using more natural materials (e.g., berms and boulders) to reduce the visible mass of a wall. All barriers shall be designed to blend into the landscape along the roadway, to the extent feasible. Ensuring a character consistent with the surrounding area may involve the use of strategically placed native trees or other vegetation; the addition of special materials (e.g., wood or stonework) on the façade of the sound wall; and/or a sound wall that is covered in vegetation. Additionally, the sound barrier shall meet the standards established in General Plan Policy NS-1-o which establishes aesthetic considerations for sound walls including a maximum allowable height of 15 feet. ~~If the sound barriers ensure that exterior traffic noise levels on the residential properties would not exceed 60 dB L_{eq}, then the applicant shall not be required to pave the roadway with a special low noise surface treatment. Sound wall construction would only be implemented if all of the property owners on the west side of North Riverside Drive between West Herndon Avenue and West Spruce Avenue collectively agree to the mitigation.~~

As described above, the City has determined that revisions to the Draft EIR to change the precise square footage noted throughout the Draft EIR are not necessary based on the fact that the changes do not affect analysis or conclusions. As a result, the heading "Revisions to Section 3.14, 'Utilities'" (Final EIR page 3-8) and all text that follows is removed, as shown below:

~~Revisions to Section 3.14, "Utilities"~~

~~The text under "Water Demand and Wastewater Output" on page 3.14-9 is revised as follows to reflect the revised site plan:~~

~~CEQA Guidelines Section 15155 requires preparation of a water supply assessment (WSA) when a project is of sufficient size to be defined as a "water demand project." Several characteristics can deem a project a "water demand project" including:~~

- ~~▶ A shopping center or business establishment employing more than 1,000 persons or having more than 500,000 square feet of floor space (CEQA Guidelines Section 15155(a)(1)(B)).~~

~~The project is estimated to employ approximately 300 individuals, and the warehouse and gas station would encompass approximately 241,342-232,101 square feet. It does not meet the definition of a "water demand project" pursuant to Section 15155 of the State CEQA Guidelines. Preparation of a WSA is not required for the project.~~