

**CITY OF FRESNO – ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT
FINDING OF CONFORMITY / MEIR SCH No. 2012111015**

Pursuant to Section 21157.1 of the California Public Resource Code (California Environmental Quality Act) the project described below is determined to be within the scope of the Master Environmental Impact Report (MEIR) SCH No. 2012111015 prepared for the Fresno General Plan Update adopted by the Fresno City Council on December 18, 2014.

**DATE RECEIVED FOR
FILING:**

Filed with the Fresno
County Clerk's office on
March 3, 2017

Applicant:

Jeffrey T. Roberts
Granville Homes, Inc.
1396 West Herndon Avenue, #101
Fresno, CA 93711

Initial Study Prepared By:

Andreina Aguilar, Planner
March 3, 2017

Environmental Assessment Number:

EA No. R-16-020/C-16-062/T-6160 for
Rezone Application No. R-16-020,
Conditional Use Permit Application No.
C-16-062, and Vesting Tentative Tract
Map No. 6160

Project Location (including APN):

614 West San Jose Avenue; Located at the northeast
corner of West San Jose Avenue and North Colonial
Avenue

36°48'46.49" N Latitude, -119°48'15.27" W Longitude

(APN: 417-140-21)

Project Description: Jeffrey T. Roberts of Granville Homes, on behalf of AFREI, LLC, has filed Rezone Application No. R-16-020, Conditional Use Permit Application No. C-16-062, and Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 6160. The proposed project pertains to ±1.13 acres of property located on the northeast corner of West San Jose and North Colonial Avenues.

Rezone Application No. R-16-020 requests the addition of "planned development" (PD) to the project zoning. The property is zoned RS-5 (*Residential Single Family, Medium Density*) and the requested zoning is RS-5/PD (*Residential Single Family, Medium Density/Planned Development*). Conditional Use Permit Application No. C-16-062 proposes a planned development with reduced property development standards for the construction of six two-unit buildings and one single-unit building with private open space area and a gated entrance at the shared driveway. Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 6160 proposes a 13-lot residential planned unit development with one outlot. The planned development proposes reduced lot sizes ranging from 1,700 square feet to 4,200 square feet in size; a 17,400 square-foot Outlot A that will provide a private driveway/access; and a modification to the public street frontage requirement for four lots located within the subdivision, which will have a private street access. The total units proposed is 13.

The proposed project will require dedications for public street rights-of-way as well as the installation and construction of both public and private facilities and infrastructure in accordance with the standards, specifications and policies of the City of Fresno.

The existing RS-5 (*Residential Single Family*) zoning for the subject property and the proposed density of approximately 11.5 dwelling units per acre, is consistent with the Medium Density Residential (5.0-12.0 dwelling units/acre) planned land use designation for the subject property as designated by the Fresno General Plan and Bullard Community Plan.

Conformance to Master Environmental Impact Report (MEIR) SCH No. 2012111015 prepared for the Fresno General Plan adopted by the Fresno City Council on December 18, 2014:

The Fresno General Plan and the Bullard Community Plan designate the subject site for Medium Density Planned land uses. The existing RS-5 (*Single Family Residential*) zone district designation for the subject property conforms to the Medium Density Planned land use designation.

The Development and Resource Management Department staff has prepared an Initial Study (See Attached "Appendix G To Analyze Subsequent Project Identified In MEIR No. SCH No. 2012111015/Initial Study") to evaluate the proposed application in accordance with the land use and environmental policies and provisions of lead agency City of Fresno's General Plan adopted by the Fresno City Council on December 18, 2014 and the related MEIR SCH No. 2012111015. The proposed project will not facilitate an additional intensification of uses beyond that which would be allowed by the above-noted zoning, planned land use designation and street classification. Moreover, it is not expected that the future development will adversely impact existing city service systems or the traffic circulation system that serves the subject property. These infrastructure findings have been verified by the Public Works and Public Utilities Departments. It has been further determined that all applicable mitigation measures of the MEIR have been applied to the project necessary to assure that the project will not cause significant adverse cumulative impacts, growth inducing impacts, and irreversible significant effects beyond those identified by the MEIR as provided by California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15177(b)(3).

Pursuant to Section 21157.1 of the California Public Resources Code (California Environmental Quality Act), it may be determined that a subsequent project falls within the scope of the MEIR, provided that the project does not cause additional significant impacts on the environment that were not previously examined by the MEIR. Relative to this specific project proposal, the environmental impacts noted in the MEIR, pursuant to the Fresno General Plan land use designation, include impacts associated with the above mentioned planned land use designation specified for the subject site. Based on this Initial Study, the following findings are made: (1) The proposed project was identified as a Subsequent Project in the MEIR because its, location, land use designation and permissible densities and intensities are set forth in the Fresno General Plan; (2) The proposed project is fully within the scope of the MEIR because it will not generate additional significant effects on the environment not previously examined and analyzed by the MEIR for the reasons set forth in the Initial Study; and (3) other than identified below, there are no new or additional mitigation measures or alternatives required.

In addition, 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. Moreover, as lead agency for this project, the Development and Resource Management Department, per Section 15177(d) of the CEQA Guidelines, has determined that all feasible mitigation measures from the MEIR shall be applied to the project as conditions of approval as set forth in the attached MEIR Mitigation Measure Monitoring Checklist (See "Master Environmental Impact Report (MEIR) SCH

No. 2012111015 for the General Plan, Mitigation Monitoring Checklist".)

Public notice has been provided regarding staff's finding in the manner prescribed by Section 15177(d) of the CEQA Guidelines and by Section 21092 of the California Public Resources Code (CEQA provisions).



McKencie Contreras, Supervising Planner
City of Fresno


March 3, 2017

Date

Attachments:

- Exhibit A: Vicinity Map
- Exhibit B: Notice of Intent to Adopt a Finding of Conformity
- Exhibit C: Appendix G To Analyze Subsequent Project Identified In MEIR No. 2012111015/Initial Study for Environmental Assessment No. R-16-020/C-16-062/T-6160
- Exhibit D: MEIR Mitigation Measure Monitoring Checklist for Environmental Assessment No. R-16-020/C-16-062/T-6160

Exhibit A:
Vicinity Map




LEGEND



Subject Property

VICINITY MAP

Rezone Application No. R-16-020
Conditional Use Permit Application No. C-16-062
Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 6160



NOT TO SCALE

Exhibit B:
Notice of Intent

CITY OF FRESNO

NOTICE OF INTENT TO ADOPT A
FINDING OF CONFORMITY

PROJECT TITLE AND ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT:
EA No. R-16-020/C-16-062/T-6160 for Rezone Application
No. R-16-020, Conditional Use Permit Application No. C-16-
062, and Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 6160

APPLICANT:

Jeffrey T. Roberts
Granville Homes, Inc.
1396 West Herndon Avenue, #101
Fresno, CA 93711

PROJECT LOCATION:

614 West San Jose Avenue; Located at the northeast corner
of West San Jose Avenue and North Colonial Avenue

36°48'46.49" N Latitude, -119°48'15.27" W Longitude

(APN: 417-140-21)

Filed with:

FRESNO COUNTY CLERK
2220 Tulare Street,
Fresno, CA 93721

FILED

MAR 03 2017 TIME 8:58pm

FRESNO COUNTY CLERK
By Christopher Roberts DEPUTY

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: Jeffrey T. Roberts of Granville Homes, on behalf of AFREI, LLC, has filed Rezone Application No. R-16-020, Conditional Use Permit Application No. C-16-062, and Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 6160. The proposed project pertains to ±1.13 acres of property located on the northeast corner of West San Jose and North Colonial Avenues.

Rezone Application No. R-16-020 requests the addition of "planned development" (PD) to the project zoning. The property is zoned RS-5 (*Residential Single Family, Medium Density*) and the requested zoning is RS-5/PD (*Residential Single Family, Medium Density/Planned Development*). Conditional Use Permit Application No. C-16-062 proposes a planned development with reduced property development standards for the construction of six two-unit buildings and one single-unit building with private open space area and a gated entrance at the shared driveway. Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 6160 proposes a 13-lot residential planned unit development with one outlot. The planned development proposes reduced lot sizes ranging from 1,700 square feet to 4,200 square feet in size; a 17,400 square-foot Outlot A that will provide a private driveway/access; and a modification to the public street frontage requirement for four lots located within the subdivision, which will have a private street access. The total units proposed is 13.

The proposed project will require dedications for public street rights-of-way as well as the installation and construction of both public and private facilities and infrastructure in accordance with the standards, specifications and policies of the City of Fresno.

The existing RS-5 (*Residential Single Family*) zoning for the subject property and the proposed density of approximately 11.5 dwelling units per acre, is consistent with the Medium Density Residential (5.0-12.0 dwelling units/acre) planned land use designation for the subject property as

designated by the Fresno General Plan and Bullard Community Plan.


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 fully within the scope of the Master Environmental Impact Report (MEIR) SCH No. 2012111015. Therefore, the Development and Resource Management Department proposes to adopt a Finding of Conformity for this project.

With the 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, proposed environmental finding 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 Andreina Aguilar at (559) 621-8075 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 April 4, 2017. Please direct comments to Andreina Aguilar, Planner, City of Fresno Development and Resource Management Department, City Hall, 2600 Fresno Street, Room 3043, Fresno, California, 93721-3604; or by email to Andreina.Aguilar@fresno.gov ; or comments can be sent by facsimile to (559) 498-1026.

INITIAL STUDY PREPARED BY:


Andreina Aguilar, Planner

SUBMITTED BY:



McKencie Contreras, Supervising
Planner

CITY OF FRESNO DEVELOPMENT
AND RESOURCE MANAGEMENT
DEPARTMENT

DATE: March 3, 2017

E201710000052

Exhibit C:
Appendix G

**APPENDIX G TO ANALYZE
SUBSEQUENT PROJECT IDENTIFIED IN MEIR SCH No. 2012111015 /
INITIAL STUDY**

Environmental Checklist Form for:

EA No. R-16-020/C-16-062/T-6160

1. Project title:

Rezone Application No. R-16-020, Conditional Use Permit Application No. C-16-062,
Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 6160

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:

Andreina Aguilar, Planner
City of Fresno
Development and Resource Management Dept.
(559) 621-8075

4. Project location:

614 West San Jose Avenue; Located at the northeast corner of West San Jose
Avenue and North Colonial Avenue, in the City and County of Fresno, California
Assessor's Parcel Number: 417-140-21
Site Latitude: 36°48'46.49" N
Site Longitude: -119°48'15.27" W

5. Project sponsor's name and address:

Jeffrey T. Roberts
Granville Homes, Inc.
1396 West Herndon Avenue, #101
Fresno, CA 93711

6. General & Community plan designation:

Medium Density Residential

7. **Zoning:** Existing: RS-5 (*Residential Single-Family*)
Proposed: RS-5/PD (*Residential Single-Family/Planned Development*)

8. **Description of project:**

Jeffrey T. Roberts of Granville Homes, on behalf of AFREI, LLC, has filed Rezone Application No. R-16-020, Conditional Use Permit Application No. C-16-062, and Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 6160. The proposed project pertains to ±1.13 acres of property located on the northeast corner of West San Jose and North Colonial Avenues.

Rezone Application No. R-16-020 requests the addition of “planned development” (PD) to the project zoning. The property is zoned RS-5 (*Residential Single Family, Medium Density*) and the requested zoning is RS-5/PD (*Residential Single Family, Medium Density/Planned Development*). Conditional Use Permit Application No. C-16-062 proposes a planned development with reduced property development standards for the construction of six two-unit buildings and one single-unit building with private open space area and a gated entrance at the shared driveway. Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 6160 proposes a 13-lot residential planned unit development with one outlot. The planned development proposes reduced lot sizes ranging from 1,700 square feet to 4,200 square feet in size; a 17,400 square-foot Outlot A that will provide a private driveway/access; and a modification to the public street frontage requirement for four lots located within the subdivision, which will have a private street access. The total units proposed is 13.

The proposed project will require dedications for public street rights-of-way as well as the installation and construction of both public and private facilities and infrastructure in accordance with the standards, specifications and policies of the City of Fresno.

The existing RS-5 (*Residential Single Family*) zoning for the subject property and the proposed density of approximately 11.5 dwelling units per acre, is consistent with the Medium Density Residential (5.0-12.0 dwelling units/acre) planned land use designation for the subject property as designated by the Fresno General Plan and Bullard Community Plan.

9. **Surrounding land uses and setting:**

| | Planned Land Use | Existing Zoning | Existing Land Use |
|-------|---------------------------|---|---------------------------|
| North | Single Family Residential | RS-4 (<i>Medium Low Density Residential</i>) | Single Family Residential |

| | | | |
|--------------|---------------------------|--|---------------------------|
| East | Single Family Residential | RS-5 <i>(Medium Density Residential)</i> | Single Family Residential |
| South | Regional Mixed Use | RMX <i>(Regional Mixed Use)</i> | Offices |
| West | Regional Mixed Use | RMX <i>(Regional Mixed Use)</i> | Offices |

10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement):

City of Fresno (COF) Building & Safety Division, COF Public Works Department, COF Public Utilities Department, COF Fire Department Fire, COF Police Department, COF Fresno Area Express, COF Historic Preservation, County of Fresno, Department of Community Health, Fresno Irrigation District, Fresno Metropolitan Flood Control District (FMFCD), Fresno Unified School District, and the 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?

The State requires lead agencies to consider the potential effects of proposed projects and consult with California Native American tribes during the local planning process for the purpose of protecting Traditional Tribal Cultural Resources through the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines. Pursuant to PRC section 21080.3.1, the lead agency shall begin consultation with the California Native American tribe that is traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographical area of the proposed project. Such significant cultural resources are either sites, features, places, cultural landscapes, sacred places, and objects with cultural value to a tribe which is either on or eligible for inclusion in the California Historic Register or local historic register, or, the lead agency, at its discretion, and support by substantial evidence, choose to treat the resources as a Tribal Cultural Resources (PRC Section 21074(a)(1-2)). According to the most recent census data, California is home to 109 currently recognized Indian tribes. Tribes in California currently have nearly 100 separate reservations or Rancherias. Fresno County has a number of Rancherias such as Table Mountain Rancheria, Millerton Rancheria, Big Sandy Rancheria, Cold Springs Rancheria, and Squaw Valley Rancheria. These Rancherias are not located

within the city limits. As for the proposed project site, it is an approximate 1.13 acres of vacant infill land located in the City of Fresno surrounded by commercial and professional businesses and single family residences; it is to the City's knowledge that the site is not traditionally and culturally affiliated to California Native American tribes. According to aerial images from 1992, the land had a single family residence on it. In the case that Tribal Cultural Resources are discovered, a consultation shall be done.

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.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

Pursuant to PRC Code 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) SCH No. 2012111015 and whether the subsequent project may cause any additional significant effect on the environment, which was not previously examined in MEIR SCH No. 2012111015 adopted for the Fresno General Plan.

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.

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture and Forestry Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Geology /Soils |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions | <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology/Water Quality |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use/Planning | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Population /Housing | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic | <input type="checkbox"/> Tribal Cultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities/Service Systems |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 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 COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION 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 PRC Section 21157.1(d) and CEQA Guidelines 15178(a).


Andreina Aguilar, Planner

March 3, 2017
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: | | | | |

| ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|---------------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|------------------|
| 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 subject property is a vacant lot of undeveloped land in Fresno, California. The subject site area is surrounded by single family residential properties and a mix of business professional and commercial properties.

The subject property or the vicinity is not designated as a scenic site or area and it does not appear that any scenic vistas would be impacted from implementation of the proposed project. The project would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the subject site area and its vicinity, because the project site is surrounded by single family residential uses and developing this vacant lot would provide a development that complies with building height requirements and land use of the RS-5 zone district. Exterior lighting associated with the development of the subject property is required to be in compliance with the City of Fresno Municipal Code to ensure that the height and intensity of lighting does not create substantial spillover outside the project area boundary.

Further, Mitigation Measure (MM) AES-1 and MM AES-3 require lighting systems for street and parking areas to be shielded to direct light to surfaces and orient light away from adjacent properties. As a result, the project will have a less than significant impact on aesthetics. The proposed project will improve the aesthetics of the site area since the site is currently vacant and will not degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.

In conclusion, with MEIR mitigation measures incorporated, the project will not result in any aesthetics 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 |
|---|---------------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|------------------|
| <p>II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES: In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the CA Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the CA Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the CA Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the CA Air Resources Board. -- Would the project:</p> | | | | |

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

The subject site is designated as "Urban and Built-up Land" on the 2014 Rural Mapping Edition: Fresno County Important Farmland Map and thus has no farmland considered to be prime farmland, farmland of statewide importance, unique farmland, or farmland of local importance. The subject site is not currently under cultivation. The land surrounding the site is "urban and built-up land".

To reduce potential project-specific and cumulative impacts on agricultural uses, the General Plan incorporates objectives and policies, which include but are not limited to the following:

G-5 Objective: While recognizing that the County of Fresno retains the primary responsibility for agricultural land use policies and the protection and advancement of farming operations, the City of Fresno will support efforts to preserve agricultural land outside of the area planned for urbanization and outside of the City's public service delivery capacity by being responsible in its land use plans, public service delivery plans, and development policies.

G-5-b. Policy: Plan for the location and intensity of urban development in a manner that efficiently utilizes land area located within the planned urban boundary, including the North and Southeast Growth Areas, while promoting compatibility with agricultural uses located outside of the planned urban area.

According to the 2015/2016 Fresno County Williamson Act Map, the subject site is not under a Williamson Act contract. Therefore, the proposed project on the subject site will not affect the Williamson Act contract parcels.

The proposed project does not conflict with any forest land or Timberland Production or result in any loss of forest land. The proposed project does not include any changes which will affect the existing environment.

In conclusion, the proposed project will 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 – 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 |

The San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD) establishes thresholds of significance in guidelines adopted by the District. The guidelines define separate thresholds for construction emissions, project operation and occupation, and cumulative impacts. Project development would cause a significant air quality impact if it were to result in:

- Construction activities that would not comply with District Regulation VIII or

implement effective and comprehensive control measures.

- Emissions of air pollutants that would cause or substantially contribute to either localized or regional violations of the ambient air quality standards.
- Exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial concentrations of pollutant concentrations or objectionable odors.

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. For purposes of this analysis the project has been evaluated with consideration to the subdivision of the subject property for purposes of creating an 13-unit single family residential development on approximately 1.13 acres of land at a density of approximately 11.5 dwelling units/acre; consistent with the applicable Medium Density Residential (5.0-12.0 dwelling units/acre) planned land use designation of the Fresno General Plan.

Construction Emissions – Short Term

It was assumed that the project would be constructed in one phase, over a two-year period. Construction equipment estimates were based on CalEEMod default assumptions. In accordance with District guidance, the architectural coatings were assumed to be mitigated in accordance with CalEEMod default assumptions. Total emissions from project construction are below the District's threshold levels. The project will meet all of the SJVAPCD's construction fleet and control requirements.

Project Construction Emissions

| <i>[all data given in tons/year]</i> | ROG | NOX | CO | SO2 | PM10 | PM2.5 | CO2 |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|
| 2017 Construction | 0.22 | 1.56 | 1.20 | 0.0017 | 0.12 | 0.10 | 150.17 |
| 2018 Construction | 0.56 | 0.68 | 0.56 | 0.0008 | 0.04 | 0.04 | 74.77 |
| Project Total | 0.79 | 2.25 | 1.72 | 0.0026 | 0.16 | 0.14 | 224.95 |
| 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. During the construction phase of this project grading and trenching on the site may generate particulate matter pollution through fugitive dust emissions. 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 applicant is required to provide landscaping on the project site which will contain trees to assist in the absorption of air pollutants, reduce ozone levels, and curtail storm water runoff.

Operational Emissions – Long Term

Project Operational Emissions

| <i>[all data given in tons/year]</i> | ROG | NOx | CO | SO2 | PM10 | PM2.5 | CO2 |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|----------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Area | 0.24 | 0.001 | 0.098 | 0.0001 | .00092 | .00092 | 5.7894 |
| Mobile | 0.11 | 0.405 | 1.29 | 0.0024 | 0.142 | 0.042 | 192.98 |
| Project Totals | 0.35 | 0.424 | 1.396 | 0.00255 | 0.1445 | 0.044 | 254.78 |
| District Thresholds | 10 | 10 | N/A | N/A | 15 | 15 | N/A |

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 upon 13 proposed single family residential units and default assumptions in the CalEEMod model.

Project specific emissions of criteria pollutants will not 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.

These project emissions as a percentage of the area source, energy use, and vehicle emissions within Fresno County are very small and the project's overall contribution to the overall emissions is negligible. 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 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.

The subject project proposes single family residential units on land that is planned for residential uses in the Fresno General Plan. 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 the project will not conflict with or obstruct an applicable air quality plan. The project must comply with the construction and development requirements of the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD), therefore, no violations of air quality standards will occur. Development of the subject property will not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. Due to the close proximity of other residential and urban uses surrounding the subject site, the project will not result in a significant impact to sensitive receptors as no net increase of pollutants will occur. Residential development is considered a "sensitive receptor" type use. However, the subject site is not located adjacent to high traffic freeways and roads and rail yard uses called out by the California Environmental Protection Agency California Air Resources Board dated April 2005 that may have significant negative air quality impacts.

The proposed project may be subject to District Rule 9510 (Indirect Source Review). District Rule 9510 was adopted to reduce the impact of NOX and provide emission reductions needed by the SJVAPCD to demonstrate attainment of the federal PM10 standard and contributed reductions that assist in attaining federal ozone standards. Rule 9510 also contributes toward attainment of state standards for these pollutants. Compliance with SJVAPCD Rule 9510 reduces the emissions impacts through incorporation of onsite measures as well as payment of an offsite fee that funds emission reduction projects in the Air Basin.

All development projects that involve soil disturbance are subject to at least one provision of the SJVAPCD Regulation VIII, Fugitive Dust Rules, related to the control of dust and fine particulate matter. The District's Regulation VIII – Fugitive PM10 prohibitions requires controls for sources of particulate matter necessary for attaining the federal PM10 standards and achieving progress toward attaining the state PM10 Standards. 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 may be subject to Rule 4601, 4641, and 4901. This is determined by the San Joaquin Valley Air Control District.

In conclusion, with MEIR mitigation measures incorporated, the project will not result in any air quality 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 |
|---|---------------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|------------------|
| 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 CA Dept. of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service? | | | | X |
| 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 CA Dept. 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 |

| ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|---------------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|------------------|
| 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 is the development of a currently vacant parcel surrounded by residential and commercial land uses. The site was previously developed with a single family home. There are no obvious wetlands, biological habitats, foraging habitat, or evidence of flora or fauna of any sort on the subject property. The subject site is not in proximity to any designated State or National Parks, National Game Preserves, Wilderness Areas, or wild or scenic rivers.

There are no endangered species present in the project area and the subject property is located in an established urban area. There are no listed, threatened or endangered species of designated critical habitats within the boundaries of the subject property. There are also no wetlands or riparian habitat on or adjacent to the subject site. There will be no adverse impact on rare, threatened, or endangered plants or animals in the project area.

Existing Conditions as of December 5, 2016 at time of Project Submittal

The project proposes to remove three trees within the project site: two Cedar Deodora Trees (one 30 inches and one 36 inches in diameter) and one 42 inch in diameter Camphor Tree. The trees proposed to be removed for this project are classified as

Protected Trees. A Protected Tree is any tree which measures 12 inches or greater in diameter or 36 inches or greater in circumference, measured four feet above the adjacent grade, except for developed single-family residential properties. The proposed project site is a vacant site and all three trees are greater than 12 inches in diameter, therefore a Tree Removal Permit shall be required.

Existing Conditions as of January 24, 2017

As of January 24, 2017, the project site conditions changed. The property owner, and applicant, removed three trees prior to obtaining a Tree Removal Permit. The trees removed were proposed to be removed as part of the project, but no project determination had been completed at the time of removal.

Since the applicant removed Protected Trees without first obtaining the proper Tree Removal Permit, the applicant is subject to Section 15-2308-I Violations of the FMC, which requires that the violator do the following;

1. Apply for and obtain a Tree Removal Permit and pay a double application fee.
2. Be responsible for property restoration which shall include:
 - a. Replacing the trees removed with trees of reasonably equivalent value and largest size feasible per Table 15-2308-E-4.
 - b. The number, size, and location of replacement trees shall be determined by the Director after receipt of a report and recommendation by a licensed arborist.
 - c. Paying the fees of the licensed arborist, including any fees for the valuation.
3. Pay a civil penalty to the City, with the funds placed in the City's tree planting fund, in the amount of \$2,500 or the actual monetary value of the trees, as determined by a licensed arborist, whichever is less.

The applicant shall comply with the Violation Section of Article 23 of the FMC. The above listed violation requirements will be incorporated into the Conditions of Approval for the proposed project.

Although the trees were removed prior to issuance of a building permit, the removal of the trees does not result in a significant environmental impact given that the trees were in a completely urban area and were not part of a riparian habitat or any other sensitive natural community. The Deodora Trees served as character features of the neighborhood, as this type of tree is found throughout the neighborhood. The applicant will be required to plant trees on-site in compliance with the FMC.

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 their immediate vicinity. Therefore, there would be no impacts.

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

| ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|---------------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|------------------|
| V. CULTURAL RESOURCES -- Would the project: | | | | |
| a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5? | | | | X |
| b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 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 MEIR SCH No. 2012111015 for the Fresno General Plan, Mitigation Measure 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.

| 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: | | | | X |
| 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 |

The greatest occurrence of earthquakes has been and likely will continue to be associated with the active San Andreas Fault System located 130 kilometers southwest of the subject property and the Great Valley Fault located 67 kilometers southwest of the subject property. No faults have been mapped crossing the subject property vicinity and the potential for ground rupture is low. The property does not lie within a Fault-Rupture Hazard Zone as identified under the Alquist-Priolo Geologic Hazards Zone Act. The subject site lies outside of the limits of the 100-year flood plain. The soils in the area are not subject to liquefaction. Consequently, it does not appear that the proposed project on the subject property would be impacted by unsuitable geologic or soil conditions in the area or result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil. The installation of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems is not included as part of the proposed project. Therefore, no significant effects related to topography, soils or geology are expected as a result of this project.

In conclusion, the proposed project will 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 |

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 greenhouse (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 [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.

CEQA requires public agencies to identify the potentially significant effects on the environment of projects they intend to carry out or approve, and to mitigate significant effects whenever it is feasible to do so.

The proposed project will not occur at a scale or scope with potential to contribute substantially or cumulatively to the generation of greenhouse gas 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 |

There are no known existing hazardous material conditions on the property and the property is not included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. The project itself will not generate or use

hazardous materials in a manner outside health department requirements, is not near any wild land fire hazard zones, and poses no interference with the City's or County's Hazard Mitigation Plans or emergency response plans.

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 area is not located in an FAA-designated Runway Protection Zone, Inner Safety Zone and Sideline Safety Zone according to review of the Downtown Fresno Chandler Airport and Yosemite International Airport Existing Safety Zones Maps. Based upon the goals of the proposed project, no potential interference with an adopted emergency response or evacuation plan has been identified.

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 | |

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

| ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|---------------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|------------------|
| 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 Finding of Conformity prepared for the proposed project is tiered from MEIR SCH No. 2012111015) prepared for the Fresno General Plan, 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) which was recently adopted in 2015. 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.

In response to the need for a comprehensive long-range water supply and distribution strategy, the Fresno General Plan recognizes the Kings Basin's Integrated Regional

Water Management Plan, Fresno-Area Regional Groundwater Management Plan, and City of Fresno Metropolitan Water Resource Management Plan and cites the findings of the City of Fresno UWMP. The purpose of these management plans is to provide safe, adequate, and dependable water supplies to meet the future needs of the Kings Basin regions and the Fresno-Clovis metropolitan area in an economical manner; protect groundwater quality from further degradation and overdraft; and, provide a plan of reasonably implementable measures and facilities.

The 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 to meet demands anticipated by the growth implicit in the 2025 Fresno General Plan. Surface water is used to replace lost groundwater through Fresno's artificial recharge program at the City-owned Leaky Acres and smaller facilities in Southeast Fresno. Fresno holds entitlements to surface water from Millerton Lake and Pine Flat Reservoir. In 2006, Fresno renewed its contract with the United States Bureau of Reclamation, through the year 2045, which entitles the City to 60,000 acre-feet per year of Class 1 water. This water supply has further increased the reliability of Fresno's water supply.

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

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

In addition, the General Plan policies require the City to maintain a comprehensive conservation program to help reduce per capita water usage, and includes conservation programs such as landscaping standards for drought tolerance, irrigation control

devices, leak detection and retrofits, water audits, public education and implementing US Bureau of Reclamation Best Management Practices for water conservation to maintain surface water entitlements.

Implementation of the Fresno General Plan policies, the Kings Basin Integrated Regional Water Management Plan, City of Fresno UWMP, Fresno-Area Regional Groundwater Management Plan, and City of Fresno Metropolitan Water Resource Management Plan and the applicable mitigation measures of approved environmental review documents will address the issues of providing an adequate, reliable, and sustainable water supply for the project's urban domestic and public safety consumptive purposes. The recently adopted 2015 UWMP analyzed the Fresno General Plans land use capacity. The project described below is a permitted project in the O zone district and Office planned land use.

The applicant will be required to comply with all requirements of the City of Fresno Department of Public Utilities that will reduce the project's water impacts to less than significant. When development permits are issued, the subject site will be required to pay drainage fees pursuant to the Drainage Fee Ordinance. The Fresno Metropolitan Flood Control District (FMFCD) has stated that the FMFCD system can accommodate the proposed request subject to several conditions of approval.

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

| 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 subject property is located in the RS-5 (*Single Family Residential*) zone district and is planned Medium Density Residential by the Bullard Community Plan and the Fresno General Plan. The proposed project is a 13-unit single family residential planned development. According to Article 59 of the Fresno Municipal Code (FMC), a proposed planned development shall apply for a Planned Development Permit and shall be processed as a Conditional Use Permit. The applicant has applied for a Planned Development Permit within this proposed project. The proposed project is on 1.13 acres and the proposed density is approximately 11.5 dwelling units per acre, which is consistent with the Medium Density Residential (5.0-12.0 dwelling units/acre) planned land use designated by the Fresno General Plan.

Fresno General Plan Goals, Objectives and Policies

As proposed, the project is consistent with the Fresno General Plan goals and objectives related to residential land use and the urban form. Some of the goals are outlined below:

- Provide for a diversity of districts, neighborhoods, housing types (including affordable housing), residential densities, job opportunities, recreation, open space, and educational venues that appeal to a broad range of people throughout the city.
- Plan for a diverse housing stock that will support balanced urban growth, and make efficient use of resources and public facilities.
- Make full use of existing infrastructure, and investment in improvements to increase competitiveness and promote economic growth.

- Promote orderly land use development in pace with public facilities and services needed to serve development.
- Encourage the development of Complete Neighborhoods and districts with an efficient and diverse mix of residential densities, building types, and affordability which are designed to be healthy, attractive, and centered by schools, parks, and public and commercial services to provide a sense of place and that provide as many services as possible within walking distance. Healthy communities demonstrate efficient development patterns providing for: Sufficient affordable housing development in appropriate locations; A mix of land uses and a built environment that supports walking and biking; Multimodal, affordable transportation choices; and, Safe public spaces for social interaction.

These Goals contribute to the establishment of a comprehensive city-wide land use planning strategy to meet economic development objectives, achieve efficient and equitable use of resources and infrastructure, and create an attractive living environment in accordance with Objective LU-1 of the Fresno General Plan.

Policy UF-1-d further emphasizes provisions for a diversity and variation of building types, densities, and scale of development in order to reinforce the identity of individual neighborhoods, foster a variety of market-based options for living and working to suit a large range of income levels, and further affordable housing opportunities throughout the city.

Likewise, Objective LU-5 of the General Plan calls for a diverse housing stock that will support balanced urban growth, and make efficient use of resources and public facilities; and, Implementing Policy LU-5-c promotes medium density residential use to maximize efficient use of residential property through a wide range of densities.

Objective UF-12 of the Fresno General Plan directs the City to locate roughly one-half of future residential development in infill areas – defined as being within the City on December 31, 2012 – including the Downtown core area and surrounding neighborhoods, mixed-use centers and transit-oriented development along major BRT corridors, and other non-corridor infill areas, and vacant land.

Supporting Policy LU-1-a of the Fresno General Plan also promotes new development within the existing City limits as of December 31, 2012.

The subject property qualifies as infill development under the definition provided in the Fresno General Plan.

The goals of the Bullard Community Plan include the following:

- Provide for a diversity of housing types and housing opportunities to meet the need of all ages and income levels.

- Provide for efficient use of land and the public service delivery system while protecting the integrity of established neighborhoods.
- Encourage mixed use, i.e. residential/office development along major transportation corridors in order to minimize vehicular trips, promote innovative design and allow for flexibility to meet changing market needs.
- Provide for safe, clean and aesthetically pleasing neighborhoods free from excessive traffic and noise.
- Provide for a compatible relationship between differing housing types and densities.

This project supports the above mentioned goals in that the integrity and design of the proposed development conform to the applicable land use designation of the Fresno General Plan and Bullard Community Plan.

The project will not conflict with any conservation plans since it is not located within any conservation plan areas. 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. Therefore, there would be no impacts.

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

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

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

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 uses, 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.

Generally, the three primary sources of substantial noise that affect the City of Fresno and its residents are all transportation-related and consist of local 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. The project site is not located within the vicinity of any rail lines and is outside of the noise contours for the Fresno Yosemite Airport, or any other airport or private air strip.

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.

The City of Fresno Noise Element of the Fresno General Plan establishes a land use compatibility criterion of 60dB 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.

For stationary noise sources, the noise element establishes noise compatibility criteria in terms of the exterior hourly equivalent sound level (L_{eq}) and maximum sound level (L_{max}). The standards are more restrictive during the nighttime hours, defined as 10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m. The standards may be adjusted upward (less restrictive) if the existing ambient noise level without the source of interest already exceeds these standards. The Noise Element standards for stationary noise sources are: (1) 50 dBA L_{eq} for the daytime and 45 dBA L_{eq} for the nighttime hourly equivalent sound levels; and, (2) 70 dBA L_{max} for the daytime and 65 dBA L_{max} for the nighttime maximum sound levels.

Noise created by new proposed stationary noise sources or existing stationary noise sources which undergo modification that may increase noise levels shall be mitigated so as not to exceed the noise level standards of Table 9 (Table 5.11-8 of the MEIR) at noise sensitive land uses. If the existing ambient noise levels equal or exceed these levels, mitigation is required to limit noise to the ambient noise level plus 5 dB.

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. However, these noise levels will not exceed those generated by adjacent existing or planned land uses.

Pursuant to Policy H-1-b of the Fresno General Plan, for purposes of City analyses of noise impacts, and for determining appropriate noise mitigation, a significant increase in ambient noise levels is assumed if the project causes ambient noise levels to exceed the following: (1) The ambient noise level is less than 60 db Ldn and the project increase noise levels by 5 dB or more; (2) The ambient noise level is 60-65 dB Ldn and the project increases noise levels by 3 dB or more; or, (3) The ambient noise level is greater than 65 dB Ldn and the project increases noise levels by 1.5 dB or more.

Short Term Noise Impacts

The construction of a project involves both short-term, construction related noise, and long term noise potentially generated by increases in area traffic, nearby stationary sources, or other transportation sources. The Fresno Municipal Code (FMC) allows for construction noise in excess of standards if it complies with the section below (Chapter 10, Article 1, Section 10-109 – Exemptions). It states that the provisions of Article 1 – Noise Regulations of the FMC shall not apply to:

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

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

Groundborne Vibrations and Groundborne Noise Impacts

The construction of the project could involve short-term, construction related to groundborne vibrations and groundborne noise. The FMC does not set standards for groundborne vibration. The MEIR for the Fresno General Plan references Caltrans standards to determine impacts.

Long Term Noise Impacts

The subject property is currently zoned RS-5, which allows for residential developments. The immediate vicinity consists of primarily residential users to the north and east, which have similar noise level requirements during the day. Although the project will create additional activity in the area, the project will be required to comply with all noise policies from the Fresno General Plan and noise ordinance from the FMC.

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 FMC.

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

| ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|---------------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|------------------|
| XIII. 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 proposed project will not induce substantial population growth in this area, given that the proposed project is a 13-unit planned development which is within the permitted density. The surrounding area is mostly developed as residential uses. The intensity of the proposed project was included in the Fresno General Plan. The impact shall be less than significant since the surrounding uses are also residential and given that the planned development is occurring at a scale and scope designated by the Fresno General Plan.

The proposed project will not displace any existing housing. The project will not result in displacement of any persons as there is no development on the subject property.

In conclusion, the proposed project will not result in any population 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 |
|---|---------------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|------------------|
| 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 |

The Department of Public Utilities has reviewed the proposed project and has determined that adequate sewer, water, and solid waste facilities are available subject to compliance with the conditions submitted by the Department of Public Utilities for this project. City police and fire protection services are also available to serve the proposed project. The FMFCD has provided comments and conditions for approval in the memo dated January 5, 2017. 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. Various departments and agencies have submitted conditions that will be required as conditions of approval for the proposed project. All conditions of approval must be complied with prior to occupancy. Any urban residential development occurring as a result of the proposed project will have an impact on the school district's

student housing capacity. Therefore, the developer will pay appropriate school fees at the time of building permits.

In conclusion, with MEIR mitigation measures incorporated, the project will not result in any public service 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 |
|--|---------------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|------------------|
| 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 would not significantly increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facilities will occur or be accelerated, and the project will not require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment.

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: | | | | |

| ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|---------------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|------------------|
| 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 proposed project did not require a Traffic Impact Study (TIS). Traffic Impact Studies assess the impacts of new development on existing and planned streets for project. In the City of Fresno, there are four Traffic Impact Zones; the proposed project is within Traffic Impact Zone (TIZ) II. In a TIZ II, a TIS shall be required for all development projected to generate 200 or more peak hour new vehicle trips. The proposed 13 unit project is projected to generate 124 average daily trips. Therefore, a TIS was not required.

Furthermore, the design of the proposed project, with conditions, has been evaluated and determined to be consistent with respect to compliance with City of Fresno standards, specification and policies. The project is not located near an airport, therefore it will not change air traffic levels. The proposed streets were reviewed by the Department of Public Works and will not create hazards. The Fire Department has conditioned the project 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.

In conclusion, the proposed project would not result in any transportation and traffic 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 |
|---|---------------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|------------------|
| 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 other similar uses.

In conclusion, with MEIR mitigation measures incorporated, 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 | |
| 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 | |

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

The City's groundwater aquifer has been documented by the State Department of Water Resources (Bulletin 118) to be critically over drafted, and has been designated a high priority basin for corrective action through the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA). The City has worked with existing ratepayers to develop a compliance plan for the proposed project. The SGMA compliance requirements for the proposed project will be applied as conditions of approval for water supply. The City has required the proposed project to comply with the SGMA requirements and provide a water supply plan to the Director of the Department of Public Utilities for approval.

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 |

| ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|---------------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|------------------|
| c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? | | | | X |

The proposed project is considered to be proposed at a size and scope which is neither a direct or indirect detriment to the quality of the environment through reductions in habitat, populations, or examples of local history (through either individual or cumulative impacts).

The proposed project does not have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment or reduce the habitat of wildlife species and will not threaten plant communities or endanger any floral or faunal species. Furthermore the project has no potential to eliminate important examples of major periods in history.

Therefore, as noted in preceding sections of this Initial Study, there is no evidence in the record to indicate that incremental environmental impacts facilitated by this project would be cumulatively significant. There is also no evidence in the record that the proposed project would have any adverse impacts directly, or indirectly, on human beings.

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

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

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

Exhibit D:
MEIR Mitigation Measure Monitoring Checklist

MEIR Mitigation Measure Monitoring Checklist for Environmental Assessment No. R-16-020/C-16-062/T-6160

March 3, 2017

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:

- A** - Incorporated into Project
- B** - Mitigated
- C** - Mitigation in Progress
- D** - Responsible Agency Contacted
- E** - Part of City-wide Program
- F** - Not Applicable

The timing of implementing each mitigation measure is identified in 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 |
|--------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|--------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|

Section 5.1 - Aesthetics:

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---------------------------------------|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| MM 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. Verification comments: | Prior to issuance of building permits | Public Works Department (PW) and Development & Resource Management Dept. (DARM) | X | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |

| MITIGATION MEASURE | WHEN IMPLEMENTED | COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY | A | B | C | D | E | F |
|--|---------------------------------------|------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Aesthetics (continued): | | | | | | | | |
| MM 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. Verification comments: | Prior to issuance of building permits | DARM. | | | | | | X |
| MM 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. Verification comments: | Prior to issuance of building permits | DARM | | | | | | X |
| MM 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 Verification comments: | Prior to issuance of building permits | 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 |
|--------------------|------------------|------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|--------------------|------------------|------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|

Aesthetics *(continued)*:

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---------------------------------------|------|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| MM AES-5: Materials used on building facades shall be non-reflective. Verification comments: | Prior to development project approval | DARM | X | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |

Section 5.3 - Air Quality:

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---------------------------------------|------|--|--|--|--|--|---|
| MM 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 NO ₂ and PM _{2.5} . 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. 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)*:

| | | | | | | | | |
|--|---------------------------------------|------|--|--|--|--|--|---|
| <p>MM 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><i>(continued on next page)</i></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

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

Air Quality *(continued)*:

| | | | | | | | | |
|--|---------------------------------------|----------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|---|
| MM AIR-2 <i>(continued from previous page)</i> : <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-diesel Utilize electric powered material handling equipment where feasible for the weight and volume of material to be moved. Verification comments: | <i>[see previous page]</i> | <i>[see previous page]</i> | | | | | | |
| MM 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 or newer regulatory criteria that may be adopted by the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD). 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)*:

| | | | | | | | | |
|--|---------------------------------------|------|--|--|--|--|--|---|
| <p>MM 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 regulatory criteria that may be adopted by the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD).</p> <p>Verification comments:</p> | Prior to development project approval | DARM | | | | | | X |
| <p>MM 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.</p> <p>Verification comments:</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

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

Biological Resources:

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|------|--|--|--|--|--|---|
| <p>MM 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 a 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> | Prior to development project approval and during the construction phase of the project | DARM | | | | | | X |
| <p>MM 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><i>(continued on next page)</i></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

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

Biological Resources *(continued):*

| | | | | | | | | |
|--|---------------------------------------|----------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|---|
| MM BIO-2 <i>(continued from previous page)</i> 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> | | | | | | |
| MM 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 <i>(continued on next page)</i> | 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 |
|--------------------|------------------|------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|--------------------|------------------|------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|

Biological Resources *(continued)*:

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|---------------------|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| <p>MM 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> | [see previous page] | [see previous page] | | | | | | |
| <p>MM 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><i>(continued on next page)</i></p> | Prior to development project approval and during construction activities | 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-4 <i>(continued from previous page)</i> : may continue in the vicinity of the nest only at the discretion of the biological monitor. Verification comments: | [see previous page] | [see previous page] | | | | | | |
| MM 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>i.e.</i> , CDFW and/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 | A | B | C | D | E | F |
|--------------------|------------------|------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|--------------------|------------------|------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|

Biological Resources *(continued)*:

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---------------------------------------|------|--|--|--|--|--|---|
| <p>MM 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 consultation with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) and the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), determination of mitigation strategy, and regulatory permitting to reduce impacts, shall be implemented as required for projects that remove riparian habitat and/or alter a streambed or waterway.</p> <p>Verification comments:</p> | Prior to development project approval | DARM | | | | | | X |
| <p>MM 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> | 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 |
|--------------------|------------------|------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|--------------------|------------------|------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|

Biological Resources *(continued)*:

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|------|--|--|--|--|--|---|
| <p>MM 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. .</p> <p>Verification comments:</p> | Prior to development project approval | DARM | | | | | | X |
| <p>MM BIO-9: In addition to regulatory agency permitting, Best Management Practices (BMPs) identified from a list provided by the USACE shall be incorporated into the design and construction phase of the project to ensure that no pollutants or siltation drain into a federally protected wetland. Project design features such as fencing, appropriate drainage and</p> <p><i>(continued on next page)</i></p> | 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):*

| | | | | | | | | |
|--|---------------------|---------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| MM BIO-9 <i>(continued from previous page):</i> 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] | | | | | | |
|--|---------------------|---------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|

Section 5.5 - Cultural Resources:

| | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|------|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| MM 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 <i>(continued on next page)</i> | Prior to commencement of, and during, construction activities | 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 |
|--------------------|------------------|------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|--------------------|------------------|------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|

Cultural Resources *(continued):*

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---------------------|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| <p>MM CUL-1 <i>(continued from previous page)</i></p> <p>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.</p> <p>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> | [see previous page] | [see previous page] | | | | | | |
| <p>MM 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.</p> <p>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><i>(continued on next page)</i></p> | Prior to commencement of, and during, construction activities | 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 |
|--------------------|------------------|------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|--------------------|------------------|------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|

Cultural Resources *(continued):*

| | | | | | | | |
|--|---------------------|---------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| <p>MM CUL-2 <i>(continued from previous page)</i></p> <p>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.</p> <p>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 to a City-approved institution or person who is capable of</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>(continued on next page)</i></p> | [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 |
|--------------------|------------------|------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|--------------------|------------------|------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|

Cultural Resources *(continued)*:

| | | | | | | | |
|--|---------------|---------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| <p>MM CUL-2 <i>(further continued from previous two pages)</i></p> <p>providing long-term preservation to allow future scientific study.</p> <p>If prehistoric resources are found during the field survey or literature review, the resources shall be inventoried using appropriate State record forms and submit the forms to the Southern San Joaquin Valley Information Center. The resources shall be evaluated for significance. If the resources are found to be significant, measures shall be identified by the qualified archaeologist. 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.</p> <p>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 an archaeological monitor. The monitoring period shall be determined by the qualified archaeologist. If additional prehistoric archaeological resources are found during excavation and/or construction activities, the procedure</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>(continued on next page)</i></p> | [see Page 14] | [see Page 14] | | | | | |
|--|---------------|---------------|--|--|--|--|--|

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)*:

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---------------|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| MM CUL-2 <i>(further continued from previous three pages)</i> identified above for the discovery of unknown resources shall be followed. Verification comments: | [see Page 14] | [see Page 14] | | | | | | |
| MM 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: 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 <i>(continued on next page)</i> | Prior to commencement of, and during, construction activities | 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 |
|--------------------|------------------|------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|--------------------|------------------|------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|

Cultural Resources *(continued):*

| | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| <p>MM CUL-3 <i>(continued from previous page)</i></p> <p>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.</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</p> <p><i>(continued on next page)</i></p> | <p><i>[see previous page]</i></p> | <p><i>[see previous page]</i></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):*

| | | | | | | | |
|--|---------------|---------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| <p>MM CUL-3 <i>(further continued from previous two pages)</i></p> <p>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.</p> <p>Verification comments:</p> | [see Page 17] | [see Page 17] | | | | | |
|--|---------------|---------------|--|--|--|--|--|

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>MM 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</p> <p><i>(continued on next page)</i></p> | Prior to commencement of, and during, construction activities | 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 |
|--------------------|------------------|------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|--------------------|------------------|------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|

Cultural Resources *(continued):*

| | | | | | | | |
|--|---------------------|---------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| <p>MM CUL-4 <i>(continued from previous page)</i></p> <p>likely descendent of the deceased Native American, who shall then serve as the consultant on how to proceed with the remains.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Verification comments:</p> | [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 |
|--------------------|------------------|------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|--------------------|------------------|------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|

Section 5.8 - Hazards and Hazardous Materials

| | | | | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------------|------|--|--|--|--|--|---|
| <p>MM HAZ-1: Re-designate the existing vacant land proposed for low density residential use, located northwest of the intersection of East Garland Avenue and North Dearing Avenue and within Fresno Yosemite International Airport Zone 1-RPZ, to Open Space.</p> <p>Verification comments:</p> | Prior to development approvals | DARM | | | | | | X |
| <p>MM 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.</p> <p>Verification comments:</p> | Prior to development approvals | DARM | | | | | | X |
| <p>MM HAZ-3: Re-designate the current area located within Fresno Yosemite International Airport Zone 5-Sideline northeast of the airport to Public Facilities-Airport or Open Space.</p> <p>Verification comments:</p> | Prior to development approvals | 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 |
|--------------------|------------------|------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|--------------------|------------------|------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|

Hazards and Hazardous Materials *(continued)*:

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| MM HAZ-4: Re-designate the current vacant lots located at the northeast corner of Kearney Boulevard and South Thorne Avenue to Public Facilities-Airport or Open Space. Verification comments: | Prior to development approvals | DARM | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | X |
| MM HAZ-5: Prohibit residential uses within Safety Zone 1 northwest of the Hawes Avenue and South Thorne Avenue intersection. Verification comments: | Prior to development approvals | DARM | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | X |
| MM HAZ-6: Establish an alternative Emergency Operations Center in the event the current Emergency Operations Center is under redevelopment or blocked. Verification comments: | Prior to redevelopment of the current Emergency Operations Center | Fresno Fire Department and Mayor/ City Manager's Office | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 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 |
|--------------------|------------------|------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|--------------------|------------------|------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|

Section 5.9 - Hydrology and Water Quality:

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|---|---|--|
| MM 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. Verification comments: | Prior to water demand exceeding water supply | Department of Public Utilities (DPU) | | | | X | X | |
| MM HYD-2: The City shall continue to be an active participant in the Kings Water Authority and the implementation of the Kings Basin IRWMP. Verification comments: | Ongoing | DPU | | | | | X | |
| MM HYD-5.1: 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 collection systems to less than significant. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implement the existing Storm Drainage Master Plan (SDMP) for collection systems in drainage areas where the amount of imperviousness is unaffected by the change in land uses. <p style="text-align: right;"><i>(continued on next page)</i></p> | Prior to exceedance of capacity of existing stormwater drainage facilities | Fresno Metropolitan Flood Control District (FMFCD), DARM, and PW | | | | 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)*:

| | | | | | | | | |
|--|---------------------|---------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| <p>HYD-5.1 <i>(continued from previous page)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. Implementation of the updated SDMP to provide stormwater collection systems that have sufficient capacity to convey the peak runoff rates from the areas of increased imperviousness. <p>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.</p> <p>Verification comments:</p> | [see previous page] | [see previous page] | | | | | | |
|--|---------------------|---------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|

Hydrology and Water Quality *(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>MM 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:</p> <p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. <p>Verification comments:</p> | Prior to exceedance of capacity of existing retention basin facilities | FMFCD, DARM, and PW | | | | 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)*:

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|---------------------|--|--|--|---|---|--|
| <p>MM 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> | Prior to exceedances of capacity of existing urban detention basin (stormwater quality) facilities | FMFCD, DARM, and PW | | | | 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)*:

| | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---------------------|--|--|--|---|---|--|
| <p>MM 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> | Prior to exceedance of capacity of existing pump disposal systems | FMFCD, DARM, and PW | | | | 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)*:

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|---------------------|--|--|--|---|---|--|
| <p>MM 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> <p>Verification comments:</p> | Prior to development approvals in the Southeast Development Area | FMFCD, DARM, and PW | | | | X | X | |
| | | | | | | | | |

Section 5.13 - Public Services:

| | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|------|--|--|--|---|---|--|
| <p>MM 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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Noise:</i> Barriers and setbacks on the fire department sites. • <i>Traffic:</i> Traffic devices for circulation and a “keep clear zone” during emergency responses. • <i>Lighting:</i> Provision of hoods and deflectors on lighting fixtures on the fire department sites. <p>Verification comments:</p> | During the planning process for future fire department facilities | DARM | | | | 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Public Services <i>(continued)</i> : | | | | | | | | |
| <p>MM 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"> • <i>Noise:</i> Barriers and setbacks on the police department sites. • <i>Traffic:</i> Traffic devices for circulation. • <i>Lighting:</i> Provision of hoods and deflectors on lighting fixtures on the Police Department sites. <p>Verification comments:</p> | During the planning process for future Police Department facilities | DARM | | | | X | X | |
| <p>MM 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 style="text-align: right;"><i>(continued on next page)</i></p> | During the planning process for future school facilities | DARM, local school districts, and the Division of the State Architect | | | | 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 |
|--------------------|------------------|------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|--------------------|------------------|------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|

Public Services *(continued)*:

| | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|----------------------------|--|--|--|--|---|--|
| MM PS-3 <i>(continued from previous page)</i> <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> | | | | | | |
| MM PS-4: As future parks and recreational facilities are planned, the City shall evaluate if specific environmental effects would occur. Typical impacts from parks and recreational facilities include noise, traffic, and lighting. Typical mitigation to reduce potential impacts from these 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 | |

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>MM PS-5: As future court, library, detention, and hospital facilities are planned, the appropriate agencies and DARM, when the City has jurisdiction, shall evaluate if specific environmental effects would occur. Typical impacts from court, library, detention, and hospital facilities include noise, traffic, and lighting. Typical mitigation to reduce these 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> | During the planning process for future detention, court, library, and hospital facilities | DARM, to the extent that agencies approving/constructing these facilities are subject to City of Fresno regulation | | | | | X | |
|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|---|--|

Section 5.15 - Utilities and Service Systems

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|-----|--|--|--|---|---|--|
| <p>MM USS-1: The City shall develop and implement a wastewater master plan update.</p> <p>Verification comments:</p> <p><i>(Continued on next page)</i></p> | Prior to wastewater conveyance and treatment demand exceeding 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)*:

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|-----|--|--|--|---|---|--|
| <p>MM USS-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:</p> <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. <p>Verification comments:</p> | Prior to exceeding existing wastewater treatment capacity | DPU | | | | X | X | |
| <p>MM USS-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.</p> <p><i>(Continued on next page)</i></p> | 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)*:

| | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|--|--|--|---|--|
| <p>MM USS-3 <i>(continued from previous page)</i>:</p> <p>After approximately the year 2025, the City shall construct the following improvements:</p> <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. <p>Verification comments:</p> | <i>[see previous page]</i> | <i>[see previous page]</i> | | | | | | |
| <p>MM USS-4: Prior to construction, a Traffic Control/Traffic Management Plan to address traffic impacts during construction of water and sewer facilities shall be prepared and implemented, subject to approval by the City (and Fresno County, when work is being done in unincorporated area roadways). The plan shall identify hours of construction and for deliveries, haul routes, access and parking restrictions, pavement markings and signage; and it shall include the</p> | Prior to construction of water and sewer facilities | PW for work in the City; PW and Fresno County Public Works when unincorporated area roadways are involved | | | | | X | |

Utilities and Service Systems *(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 |
|---|---|------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| MM USS-4 (continued from previous page): notification plan, and coordination with emergency service providers and schools. Verification comments: | [see previous page] | [see previous page] | | | | | | |
| MM 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. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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-REL and C07-REP. <p style="text-align: right;">(continued on next page)</p> | Prior to exceeding capacity within the existing wastewater collection system facilities | DPU | | | | | 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)*:

| | | | | | | | |
|--|----------------------------|----------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| <p>MM USS-5 <i>(continued from previous page)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • 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 <p><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 |
|--------------------|------------------|------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|--------------------|------------------|------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|

Utilities and Service Systems *(continued)*:

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---------------|--|--|--|---|---|--|
| MM USS-5 <i>(further continued from previous two pages):</i> to 36 inches in diameter. The associated project designations in the 2006 Wastewater Master Plan are CA1-REL and CA2-REP. Verification comments: | [see Page 35] | [see Page 35] | | | | | | |
| MM USS-6: Prior to exceeding capacity within the existing 28 pipeline segments shown in Figures 1 and 2 in MEIR 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. Verification comments: | Prior to exceeding capacity within the existing 28 pipeline segments shown in Figures 1 and 2 in Appendix J-1 of the MEIR | DPU | | | | X | X | |
| MM USS-7: Prior to exceeding existing water supply capacity, the City shall evaluate the water supply system and shall not approve additional development that would demand additional water until additional capacity is provided. By approximately the year 2025, the following capacity improvements shall be provided. <i>(Continued on next page)</i> | Prior to exceeding existing water supply 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)*:

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---------------------|---------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| <p>USS-7 <i>(continued from previous page)</i></p> <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. • 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. <p>Verification comments:</p> | [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)*:

| | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|-----|--|--|--|---|---|--|
| <p>MM 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.</p> <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. • 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. <p><i>(continued on next page)</i></p> | Prior to exceeding capacity within the existing water conveyance facilities | 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)*:

| | | | | | | | |
|--|---------------------|---------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| <p>MM USS-8 <i>(continued from previous page)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • 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> | [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)*:

| | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|-----|--|--|--|---|---|--|
| <p>MM 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> <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> | Prior to exceeding capacity within the existing water conveyance facilities | 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 - *Hydrology and Water Quality*

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----------------------|----------------------------------|--|--|--|---|--|--|
| <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 | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |

Utilities and Service Systems - *Biological Resources:*

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|---|--|--|
| <p>USS-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><i>(continued on next page)</i></p> | Prior to development approvals outside of highly urbanized areas | California Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), and USACE | | | | 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>MM USS-11 <i>(continued from previous page):</i></p> <p>(b) Where proposed activities could have an impact on areas verified by the USACE 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 CDFW, Section 404 and 401 permits would be obtained from the USACE and RWQCB 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.</p> <p>(c) Where proposed activities could have an impact on areas verified by the USACE 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 USACE. 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:</p> | [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):

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---------------|---------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| <p>MM USS-11 <i>(further continued from previous two pages)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 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. 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. <p style="text-align: right;"><i>(continued on next page)</i></p> | [see Page 42] | [see Page 42] | | | | | | |
|---|---------------|---------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|

Utilities and Service Systems - *Biological 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 | A | B | C | D | E | F |
|--|----------------------|------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| MM USS-11 <i>(further continued from previous three pages)</i> (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. 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. Or (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. Verification comments: | <i>[see Page 42]</i> | <i>[see Page 42]</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 - *Biological Resources* (continued):

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|---|
| <p>MM 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 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 CDFW/USFWS guidelines or protocols and shall be conducted at the time of year when the plants in question are identifiable.</p> <p>(b) Based on the results of the survey, prior to design approval, FMFCD shall coordinate with CDFW and/or implement a Section 7 consultation with USFWS, shall</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>(continued on next page)</i></p> | During FMFCD facility design and prior to initiation of ground disturbing activities in areas that support seasonal wetlands or vernal pools | California Department of Fish & Wildlife (CDFW) and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (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>MM USS-12 <i>(continued from previous page)</i></p> <p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • 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 CDFW 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> | [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):

| | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|----------------|--|--|--|--|--|---|
| MM USS-13: When FMFCD proposes to provide drainage service outside in areas that support seasonal wetlands or vernal pools: (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 survey to determine the presence of listed vernal pool crustaceans. <i>(continued on next page)</i> | During facility design and prior to initiation of ground disturbing activities in areas that support seasonal wetlands or vernal pools | 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>MM USS-13 <i>(continued from previous page)</i></p> <p>(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.</p> <p>(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.</p> <p>Verification comments:</p> | [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):

| | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|----------------|--|--|--|--|--|---|
| <p>MM USS-14: When FMFCD proposes to construct drainage facilities in an area where elderberry bushes may occur:</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> <p>Verification comments:</p> | During facility design and prior to initiation of construction activities | 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):

| | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|----------------|--|--|--|---|--|--|
| MM USS-15: Prior to ground disturbing activities during nesting season (March through July) for a FMFCD drainage facility 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 no n-breeding period (August through February), a nest survey is not necessary. Verification comments: | Prior to ground disturbing activities during nesting season (March through July) for a project that supports bird nesting habitat | CDFW and USFWS | | | | X | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| MM USS-16: When FMFCD proposes to construct drainage facilities in an area that supports burrowing owl nesting habitat: (a) FMFCD shall conduct a pre-construction breeding-season survey (approximately February 1 through August 31) of proposed project sites in suitable habitat (e.g., 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 <i>(continued on next page)</i> | Prior to, and during, the breeding season (approximately February 1 through August 31) of the same calendar year that construction is planned to begin | 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>MM USS-16 <i>(continued from previous page)</i></p> <p>above survey shall be valid only for the season when it is conducted</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 CDFW, 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</p> <p><i>(continued on next page)</i></p> | <p><i>[see previous page]</i></p> | <p><i>[see previous page]</i></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 - *Biological Resources* (continued):

| | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|--|---|--|--|
| <p>MM USS-16 <i>(further continued from previous two pages)</i></p> <p>burrows according to current CDFW protocol. Burrows shall be examined not more than 30 days before construction to ensure that no owls have recolonized the area of construction. For each burrow destroyed, a new burrow shall be created (by installing artificial burrows at a ratio of 2:1 on protected lands nearby).</p> <p>Verification comments:</p> | [see Page 51] | [see Page 51] | | | | | | |
| <p>MM USS-17: When FMFCD proposes to construct drainage facilities in the San Joaquin River corridor:</p> <p>(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.</p> <p>(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</p> <p><i>(continued on next page)</i></p> | 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):

| | | | | | | | | |
|--|---------------------|---------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| MM 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: | [see previous page] | [see previous page] | | | | | | |
|--|---------------------|---------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|

Utilities and Service Systems – Recreation / Trails:

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|--|---|--|--|
| MM 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> | Prior to final design approval of all elements of the FMFCD District Service Plan | DARM, PW, City of Clovis, and County of Fresno | | | | 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 – Recreation / Trails (continued):

| | | | | | | | | |
|--|---------------------|---------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| MM USS-18 (continued from previous page) (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. Verification comments: | [see previous page] | [see previous page] | | | | | | |
|--|---------------------|---------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|

Utilities and Service Systems – Air Quality:

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|---|--|--|
| MM USS-19: When District drainage facilities are constructed, FMFCD shall: (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> | During storm water drainage facility construction activities | Fresno Metropolitan Flood Control District and SJVAPCD | | | | X | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|---|--|--|

Utilities and Service Systems – Air Quality (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 |
|---|----------------------------|----------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| MM USS-19 <i>(continued from previous page)</i> (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 the California Air Resources Board), or be re-powered with an engine that meets this standard. Verification comments: | <i>[see previous page]</i> | <i>[see previous page]</i> | | | | | | |

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

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---------------------|--|--|--|---|---|--|
| MM 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. Verification comments: | Prior to exceeding capacity within the existing storm water drainage facilities | FMFCD, PW, and DARM | | | | 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 – Adequacy of Water Supply Capacity:

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|--------------|--|--|--|---|---|--|
| <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 demands 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> | Prior to exceeding existing water supply capacity | DPU and DARM | | | | X | X | |
| | | | | | | | | |

Utilities and Service Systems – Adequacy of Landfill Capacity:

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------------------|--------------|--|--|--|---|---|--|
| <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> | Prior to exceeding landfill capacity | DPU and DARM | | | | 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