

Environmental Assessment No. A-17-016 for the Parks Master Plan and associated Plan Amendment A-17-016

Prepared by the City of Fresno
Development and Resource Management Department
2600 Fresno St.
Fresno, CA 93721
November 14, 2017



CITY OF FRESNO

MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

The full Initial Study and the Master Environmental Impact Report SCH No. 2012111015 are on file in the Development and Resource Management Department, Fresno City Hall, 3rd Floor 2600 Fresno Street Fresno, California 93721 (559) 621-8277

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT NUMBER:

EA No. A-17-016

Notice of Intent was filed with:

FRESNO COUNTY CLERK 2221 Kern Street Fresno, California 93721

on

November 14, 2017

APPLICANT:

The City of Fresno
Development and Resource
Management Department
Development Services Division
2600 Fresno Street, Rm. 3065
Fresno, California 93721
Contact: Sophia Pagoulatos, Planning
Manager

PROJECT LOCATION:

All modifications under consideration fall within the City of Fresno General Plan Planning Area, which includes all areas within the City's current City limits and the areas within the current Sphere of Influence (SOI).

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The project is the adoption of the Fresno Parks Master Plan. The Parks Master Plan assesses the city-wide parks and open space system and provide strategies and recommendations to fund, maintain, improve, expand, secure, connect, partner, advocate and celebrate Fresno's parks. The PMP includes recommendations for improvements on existing parks. Although the PMP includes strategies to expand the park system, no specific park sites are proposed as a part of this plan. Adoption of Parks Master Plan would require amendments to the City of Fresno General Plan.

Plan Amendment No. A-17-016 proposes to amend the text of Chapter 5 of the General Plan, the Parks, Open Space and Schools Element, and POSS-1-a, Parkland Standard, to reflect the proposed Parks Master 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 not fully within the scope of the Master Environmental Impact Report (MEIR) prepared for the Fresno General Plan (SCH # 2012111015). Therefore, the Development and Resource Management Department proposes to adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration for this project.

With the project specific mitigation imposed, there is no substantial evidence in the record that this project may have additional significant, direct, indirect or cumulative effects on the environment that are significant and that were not identified and analyzed in the MEIR. After conducting a review of the adequacy of the MEIR pursuant to Public Resources Code, Section 21157.6(b)(1), the Development and Resource Management Department, as lead agency, finds that no substantial changes have occurred with respect to the circumstances under which the MEIR was certified and that no new

information, which was not known and could not have been known at the time that the MEIR was certified as complete has become available. The project is not located on a site which is included on any of the lists enumerated under Section 65962.5 of the Government Code including, but not limited to, lists of hazardous waste facilities, land designated as hazardous waste property, hazardous waste disposal sites and others, and the information in the Hazardous Waste and Substances Statement required under subdivision (f) of that Section.

Additional information on the proposed project, including the proposed environmental finding of a mitigated negative declaration, initial study and all documents and technical studies referenced in the initial study, as well as electronic copies of documents, may be obtained from the Development and Resource Management Department, Fresno City Hall, 2600 Fresno Street, Third Floor-North, Room 3065, Fresno, California 93721-3604. The Parks Master Plan document is available online at www.fresno.gov/parksplan. Please contact Sophia Pagoulatos at (559) 621-8061 for more information.

ANY INTERESTED PERSON may comment on the proposed environmental finding. Comments must be in writing and must state (1) the commenter's name and address; (2) the commenter'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. Comments may be submitted at any time between the publication date of this notice and close of business on **December 4, 2017**. Please direct all comments to Sophia Pagoulatos, City of Fresno Development and Resource Management Department, City Hall, 2600 Fresno Street, Third Floor-North, Room 3065, Fresno, California, 93721-3604; or by email, Sophia.Pagoulatos@fresno.gov; or by facsimile, (559) 498-1026. *Para información en español, comuníquese con Sophia Pagoulatos al teléfono (559) 621-8062*.

| PREPARED BY: Amber Piona, Planner II | SUBMITTED BY: |
|---|--|
| DATE: November 14, 2017 | Sophia Pagoulatos, Planning Manager DEVELOPMENT & RESOURCE MANAGEMENT DEPARTMENT |
| Attachments: | Exhibit A: Initial Study Impact Checklist and Initial Study (Appendix G) Exhibit B: Master Environmental Impact Report No. SCH No. 2012111015 General Plan Mitigation Monitoring Checklist Exhibit C: Project Specific Mitigation Monitoring Checklist |

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

Environmental Checklist Form for:

EA No. A-17-016

1. Project title:

Adoption of the City of Fresno-Parks Master Plan

2. Lead agency name and address:

<u>City of Fresno</u>
<u>Development and Resource Management Department</u>
<u>2600 Fresno Street</u>
Fresno, CA 93721

3. Contact person and phone number:

Sophia Pagoulatos, Planning Manager
City of Fresno
Development and Resource Management Dept.
(559) 621-8062

4. Project location:

The various recommendations included in the PMP apply to all of the land within the city's Sphere of Influence.

5. **Project sponsor's name and address:**

<u>City of Fresno</u>
<u>Development and Resource Management Department</u>
<u>2600 Fresno Street</u>
Fresno, CA 93721

- 6. **General & Community plan designation:** Various- located throughout the City
- 7. **Zoning:** Various- located throughout the City

8. **Description of project:**

The Fresno Parks Master Plan articulates a vision for improving Fresno's park and open space system based on robust community engagement and thorough analysis. The planning process began with a detailed needs assessment conducted by consultants, City of Fresno staff, residents, and stakeholders to evaluate Fresno's individual parks and the park system as a whole. This included examining the City's General Plan park land acreage goals, population growth, and demographic

Initial Study Impact Checklist and Initial Study EA No. A-17-016 November 14, 2017 Page 2 of 88

information as part of a comprehensive level of service evaluation. Mapping and analysis and their service areas revealed how well or inadequately each neighborhood is currently served by parks and recreation amenities. Recreational programs were also evaluated. The financial health of the park system was studied, including benchmarking Fresno's expenditures with comparable cities. Overall, from vision through recommendations, this parks master plan reflects priorities of Fresno community members, institutional leaders, and City Council members who have the common goal of wanting to see their park system thrive. The Parks Master Plan includes guidelines and programs that direct the maintenance and development of park facilities and programs.

Adoption of the Parks Master Plan also includes General Plan Amendment Application No. A-17-016 which will amend the text of Chapter 5 of the Fresno General Plan, the Parks, Open Space and Schools Element, as well as policy POSS-1-a Parkland Standard, to reflect the Parks Master Plan. The plan amendment will not include any land use changes to Figure LU-1, General Plan Land Use Map.

Key Findings and Strategies

From the analysis and needs assessment process, several findings emerged that characterize the challenges and opportunities for Fresno's park system.

- Maintenance: To address existing park system daily maintenance and repair operations, an increased annual funding of nearly \$5 million is needed, with an extra \$10,000-\$15,000 needed for each additional acre added to the park system (this does not include any capital improvement or lifecycle costs)
- Lifecycle Replacements: Deferred investment of approximately \$112 million is needed to adequately fund critical lifecycle replacement costs. If PMP recommended improvements of roughly \$50 million are made, lifecycle costs may be reduced to approximately \$80 million
- Park Acreage: Park land needs to increase by 1,113 acres to meet the General Plan overall level of service goals for Fresno's current population, and by 1,769 acres to meet recreation needs of Fresno's future population (year 2035)
- Poor Condition Parks: Fresno's park and open space system is dominated by parks in poor condition that suffer from lack of investment, lack of adequate maintenance, and public safety concerns due to inappropriate activities
- Park Deserts: Significant areas of the city have limited or no parks, deeming them deficient or "park deserts," especially notable in portions of Districts 1, 5, and 7

Initial Study Impact Checklist and Initial Study EA No. A-17-016 November 14, 2017 Page 3 of 88

- Limited Park Land in Urban Areas: There is insufficient park land to meet the needs of a growing Fresno, and a critical need for park development in higher density urbanized areas that have extremely limited land available for new park development
- Parks are Highly Valued: The community values its parks and recreational programs, especially for kids and seniors
- Limited Resources: PARCS staff operate as best they can with the limited available resources

In addition, feedback from stakeholder meetings, public workshops in each council district, and extensive dialogue with City Staff helped identify top priorities and strategies for improving Fresno's park and open space system.

Improve What You Have

Fresno's park and open space system is an extremely valuable asset that requires adequate funding. This means accounting for total cost of ownership – including routine maintenance, planned lifecycle replacements, and strategic enhancements. Factoring these costs into capital park improvement plans so that Fresno's existing park and open space system can better meet the needs of the community it serves. Financial realities are such that new park development will be heavily scrutinized unless associated maintenance and lifecycle costs are addressed. This PMP targets the following parks for improvements, organized by parks recommended for strategic enhancements, or improvements that change user experience by offering a new amenity, and parks that should be re-master planned and completely redeveloped as a brand new park.

Parks Recommended for Strategic Enhancements

Al Radka

Carozza (Basin G)

Einstein El Capitan Emerald

First and Bullard (Basin O)

Frank H. Ball* Highway City

Hinton Large Orchid

Parks Recommended for Re-master Plan/Redevelopment

Barstow and Del Mar (Basin F)

Bigby-Villa Dickey Eaton Plaza Fink-White Granny's Holman Kearny Lafayette

Mary Ella Brown Mayor/Tupman Initial Study Impact Checklist and Initial Study EA No. A-17-016 November 14, 2017 Page 4 of 88

Radio
Reed Discovery Center
Robinson
Romain
Rotary West (Basin BE)
Safety
Selma Layne
Vinland

Quigley Riverbottom Spano Stallion Park Ted C. Wills University

In addition, potential State of California funding available through the 2018 parks bond measure can be directed toward repairing and improving existing parks (note, maintenance and operations costs are not eligible bond expenditures).

Close the Gaps

In addition to improving the existing park and open space system, critical gaps in the system have been identified through this park master planning process that must be addressed.

Strategic approaches for closing these gaps include:

- Capitalize on existing infrastructure and opportunities for partnership by expanding joint-use site agreements at both school and basin sites when possible
- Target park renovation by prioritizing parks in areas with park acreage deficiency and/or concentrations of poor condition parks
- Designate "flagship" or priority parks in each of Fresno's Council Districts so that quality parks are found throughout the city
- Concentrate resources in fewer, higher quality aquatic facilities that offer more value and reduce operating costs
- Implement urban greening strategies to improve the public realm, especially in urbanized, park deficient areas
- Acquire land through purchase or repurpose of City property and build new parks in existing urbanized neighborhoods

Secure the Parks

The poor condition of many parks combined with concentrations of homeless populations in need of social services exacerbate public safety concerns and reduce the effectiveness of a park to serve its intended use. Staffing of parks, improved maintenance, attractive entries and perimeters, and the natural surveillance that

Initial Study Impact Checklist and Initial Study EA No. A-17-016 November 14, 2017 Page 5 of 88

results from park activation and community programming, are some examples of strategies for keeping parks safe.

Recommendation Highlights

Overarching goals for Fresno's park and open space system include fund, maintain, improve, expand, secure, connect, partner, advocate, and celebrate. Chapter 9, "Goals and Recommendations" of the Parks Master Plan outlines a comprehensive list of recommendations organized by these goals categories. From this comprehensive list, the select recommendations have been highlighted.

- 1. Employ a business planning approach to the financial management of Fresno's park and open space system that accounts for total cost of ownership and adequately funds new parks, maintenance, and ongoing operations including the following strategies:
 - Increase investment in assets, including costs for lifecycle replacement and maintenance
 - Increase Fresno's annual maintenance and operations budget to align with standard state funding levels
- 2. First prioritize funding for maintenance and existing park improvements, then prioritize budget for land acquisition
- Expand maintenance funding and support, including implementing a work order management system, employing a system approach to contracting services, and expanding full time equivalent (FTE) staffing
- 4. Increase shade elements, including trees and built structures, in all park and open space areas, particularly those with high recreation value such as seating, picnic, and play areas
- 5. Identify facilities that do not meet current community needs because they are underused, unpopular, or outdated and inaccessible, and strategically convert them into facilities that the community has identified as a priority
- 6. Target expansion of Fresno's park, open space and trails in existing urbanized, high need, "park-poor" areas
- 7. Provide a diverse range of staffed programming to encourage positive, active use of parks throughout the course of the day, with particular emphasis on programming at parks with security concerns
- 8. Provide neighborhood park amenities within ½ mile distance from all Fresno residences

Initial Study Impact Checklist and Initial Study EA No. A-17-016 November 14, 2017 Page 6 of 88

- Maintain joint-use agreements and establish new, long term joint-use agreements with Fresno, Washington, Sanger and Central Unified School Districts that maximize availability of site use during non-school hours
- 10. Continue to partner with Fresno Metropolitan Flood Control District (FMFCD) to maximize recreational opportunities at ponding basins through expanded seasonal access, redesign, grading, and amenity development
- Continue to collaborate with agencies and organizations working to maintain, develop and enhance the San Joaquin River Parkway and nearby riverfront land and habitat
- 12. Encourage local community advocates and organizations working in the areas of public health, wellness, education, recreation, arts, community development, and environmental issues to support and advocate for Fresno parks
- 13. Designate "flagship" or priority parks in of Fresno's Council Districts to direct funding towards so that quality parks can be found throughout the city and can become a source of local park pride
- 14. Conduct a system-wide re-branding of Fresno's park and open space system, including strong online and off-site efforts, which are developed in conjunction with funding initiatives

Building on Other Plans

The 2017 PMP builds on a foundation of plans, studies and ordinances. The most relevant of these are summarized here.

Master Plan for Parks & Recreation (1989)

The 1989 Parks Master Plan guided Fresno's park development for 25 years before being superseded by the new General Plan. It provides a profile of the Fresno community at that time, establishes park and recreation facility standards and policies, and establishes 17 park planning areas, with proposed new parks and park improvements in each.

General Plan (2014)

The General Plan outlines a long-range vision for the physical development of the city, with an emphasis on infill development. The Plan's Parks, Open Space and School (POSS) Element analyzes Fresno's parks and recreation facilities and establishes goals and policies for future development of the parks and recreation system. The General Plan features:

Initial Study Impact Checklist and Initial Study EA No. A-17-016 November 14, 2017 Page 7 of 88

- Classification of park types and calculation of existing "city park space"/ "city park land;"
- Level of Service (LOS) goal to provide 5 acres of city park space per 1,000 residents, including 3 acres of community, neighborhood and pocket parks and 2 acres of regional parks, greenways and trails;
- Parks and Open Space map indicating locations and service areas of existing and potential future parks.

The 2017 PMP is the basis for General Plan amendment, Plan Amendment Application A-17-016, which amends the text of the POSS Element to include the following addition to the text:

Of Special Note, Parks Master Plan Update on December 14, 2017

On December 14, 2017, the City of Fresno adopted the Fresno Parks Master Plan (PMP) which was an update to the previously adopted 1989 Parks Master Plan. In comparison to this chapter of the General Plan, the Fresno Parks Master Plan provides updated data and system overview, revised park classifications, additional goals, recommendations and strategies, and new design guidelines that support and enhance the objectives and policies found in this chapter. As a result, policy POSS-1-a has been revised and the PMP park classifications are to take precedence over the park classifications in this chapter which means that the goal of 2 acres/1,000 residents is to be achieved through Regional Parks, Open Space/Natural Areas, and Special Use Parks/Facilities.

Policy POSS-1-a has been revised to reflect that the goal of 2 acres/1,000 residents will be achieved through Regional Parks, Open Space/Natural Areas and Special Use Parks/ Facilities, and that trails acreage will no longer be counted toward that goal.

Park Classification System and Park-Type Requirements

Fresno's park classification system outlines and defines all park-types that make up the city's parks and open space system. The PMP recommends that all Fresno parksand open space areas shall meet the following park-type requirements as defined by the 2017 Parks Master PlanPark Classification System. In cases where parks and open space areas were created before the 2017 Park Classification System was established, the City of Fresno should prioritize upgrading all sites and facilities to meet the 2017 established park-type definitions. In addition, all existing and future park-types should adhere to the guidelines for design, maintenance and operations established in the 2017 Parks Master Plan, including measures for crime

Initial Study Impact Checklist and Initial Study EA No. A-17-016 November 14, 2017 Page 8 of 88

prevention through environmental design (CPTED), and Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) standards to ensure that Fresno's park and open space areas are safe and accessible for users of various ages and abilities.

Park Type: Pocket Park

LOS Goal: 3 Acres per 1,000 residents

Size: 0.5 acres (parks less than 0.5 acres to be grandfathered in)

Serving Radius: Less than 1/4 mile

Serving Population: A smaller portion of a specific neighborhood

Function/Purpose: Pocket parks are small, comfortable, inviting open spaces that can serve a variety of functions but, due to their limited size, typically do not provide a wide range of recreational activities. They should be designed to allow people to engage in active or passive activity, and be sociable places. Pocket Parks are especially valuable in dense urban areas with limited open space resources. They must be accessible and provide program or amenity elements that draw neighbors, such as a small event space, play area, tot lot, picnic table, benches, or shade structure. These small spaces should be efficiently designed to get as much amenity value as possible, but they are not intended to have the level of service or range of recreational activities offered at a Neighborhood or Community Park.

Access and Siting: Pocket Parks must be physically and visually accessible to the surrounding neighborhood, clearly marked with a sign, and linked to the neighborhood with a sidewalk, path or trail. These parks must have safe pedestrian access and meet ADA requirements for accessibility. Vehicular access and parking are not required. The parks may be surrounded by commercial buildings, residential lots, neighborhood streets or trails.

Unique Features: These parks are typically funded, designed, constructed and maintained as a common area within a Homeowner's Association (HOA) or Community Facilities District (CFD), or paid for by Developer Impact Fees.

Typical Amenities and Facilities: Due to small size, limited programming elements are on site. However, at least one of the following amenity features is required at a Pocket Park: small event space, play area, play element, tot lot, bench, picnic area, shade element, water feature, and/or landscape elements. These facilities have staffing and maintenance requirements.

Park Type: Neighborhood Park
LOS Goal: 3 acres per 1,000 residents

Initial Study Impact Checklist and Initial Study EA No. A-17-016 November 14, 2017 Page 9 of 88

Size: 2 - 10 acres (though determined by use and facilities, not size alone)

Serving Radius: ½ mile (or 6 blocks)

Serving Population: 10,000 – 15,000 people

Function/Purpose: Neighborhood Parks contribute to a distinct neighborhood identity and serve as a recreational and social focal point for the surrounding neighborhood. These parks provide options for both active and passive uses, with a majority of space dedicated to active use. They should have a multi-purpose room or hall.

Access and Siting: Neighborhood Parks are located on a local neighborhood or collector street (not an active intersection), adjacent to a trail or other open space, and linked to the surrounding neighborhood by sidewalks. If possible these parks should be located next to an elementary school with active portions of the park located away from homes to reduce noise impacts. If near an arterial street, a visually pleasing natural or artificial barrier should be provided for safety. These parks must have safe pedestrian access and meet ADA standards for accessibility. Traffic calming features are encouraged around the park. The park must be clearly marked with signage (entry, directional, and regulation as needed), be visually accessible to the surrounding neighborhood, and have amenities that meet ADA requirements for accessibility. Parking may or may not be included. If parking is provided it should account for fewer than 10 cars including spots meeting ADA requirements. Trail linkages to other parks and adjacencies to bicycle routes are encouraged.

Unique Features: Neighborhood Parks must have one signature amenity which may include a playground, spray ground park, sport court, shade structure, or custom element that meets unique demographic needs of the local neighborhood. Given the intention that Neighborhood Parks primarily serve the local neighborhood population, there is an emphasis on direct neighborhood involvement in the park planning process of Neighborhood Parks.

Typical Amenities and Facilities: Neighborhood Parks should include a multipurpose room, center or hall, restroom and drinking fountain facilities. These sites may include small event space, play areas, play elements, benches, picnic areas, shade elements, water features, loop trails, security lighting, and landscape elements that enhance the park identity, use or experience. These facilities have staffing and maintenance requirements.

Park Type: Community Park

LOS Goal: 3 Acres per 1,000 residents

Size: 10 – 40+ acres

Serving Radius: Up to 4 miles

Serving Population: 50,000 – 80,000 people

Initial Study Impact Checklist and Initial Study EA No. A-17-016 November 14, 2017 Page 10 of 88

Function/Purpose: Community Parks are intended to service multiple neighborhoods, meet active and passive recreational needs of a larger community, and preserve unique landscape and open space features. They provide space for members of the community to congregate for area-wide functions or programs outdoors on within a community center building. These parks are typically larger and more amenity rich than Neighborhood Parks, but are smaller than Regional Parks. They should provide recreational opportunities for a variety of ages and host significant, unique amenities with community appeal.

Access and Siting: Community Parks are located on collector and/or arterial streets with a minimal number of residences abutting the park site. Parks must be surrounded by sidewalks when possible and adjacencies to school, trails, open spaces or other municipal facilities are encouraged. If near an arterial street, provide a visually pleasing natural or artificial barrier for safety. These parks must have safety pedestrian access. Traffic calming features are encouraged within and surrounding the park. Park must be clearly marked with signage (entry, directional, and regulation as needed), be visually accessible to the surrounding neighborhood, and have amenities that meet ADA requirements for accessibility. Parking should be sufficient to support amenities and include spots that meet ADA requirements, but goal is to maximize usable park space and employ highly efficient parking design. Trail linkages to other parks and adjacencies to bicycle routes are highly encouraged.

Unique Features: Community Parks often contain facilities for specific recreational purposes, including athletic fields, swimming pools, tennis courts, sport courts, extreme sports amenities, recreation center, loop trails, picnic areas, picnic shelters, shade structures, pavilions, large turfed and landscaped areas and playgrounds or spraygrounds. Sports fields and sport complexes are typical. Community center buildings are at the heart of these parks. Sites may include one or more revenue facility (such as a pool, sports complex, pavilion, etc.). Other signature amenities may include a custom element that meets demographic needs of the neighborhood, unique public art, and courtyard or plaza space. Community Parks may include special program services or activities such as sports programs, day camps, aquatics, arts or education activities, and senior activities. Partnerships with community groups, clubs or schools are highly encouraged. Unique park identity should be strengthened through signage and integrated color schemes.

Typical Amenities and Facilities: Community center buildings with a gym or meeting room are typical of a Community Park. In addition to active use, passive outdoor recreation activities may include meditation, quiet reflection, or wildlife watching. Landscape components that enhances park theme and use experience are encouraged. Community Parks must include permanent restroom, drinking fountains, security lighting, and lighted sport field/courts. These facilities have staffing and

Initial Study Impact Checklist and Initial Study EA No. A-17-016 November 14, 2017 Page 11 of 88

maintenance requirements.

Park Type: Regional Park

LOS Goal: 2 acres per 1,000 residents

Size: 40-1,000+ acres (can be less than 40 acres if site provides a unique regional

serving opportunity, i.e. river access, etc.) **Serving Radius**: $\frac{1}{2}$ hour drive (or 1 – 4+ miles)

Serving Population: 100,00 +/- people

Function/Purpose: Regional Parks serve the entire city of Fresno and surrounding communities. They provide active and passive recreation opportunities, and unique public facilities for use by the greater Fresno area.

Access and Siting: Regional Parks are large parcels typically sited in areas to preserve natural, cultural or historic resources on site. These parks must be accessible by public roads with capacity to handle larger amounts of traffic and adequate parking demand. Traffic calming measures are encouraged within and surrounding the park. Directional and regulatory signage to enhance user experience and strengthen park identity should be easily found throughout the park. Regional Parks should be linked to pedestrian and bicycle trail systems and public transportation when possible.

Unique Features: Regional Parks often contain unique facilities with scenic, athletic or cultural value including athletic fields, sports complex, concessions, retail, boating facilities, camping, conservation/wildlife viewing, fishing, art center, amphitheater, zoo, gardens, nature areas, and interpretive signage and trails. These unique features may have unique staffing and maintenance requirements. Regional Parks are usually dominated by natural resource based amenities. These parks and associated facilities can promote tourism and economic development, enhance the economic vitality for the region, and include revenue facilities to offset operational costs. Strengthening unique park identity through signage and integrated color schemes is encouraged.

Typical Amenities and Facilities: Typical amenities and facilities can include all of those found in a Neighborhood or Community Park, with active and passive recreation opportunities, and programming for a variety of ages. Enhanced landscape elements, public restrooms, drinking fountains, and security lighting are all typical. These facilities have staffing and maintenance requirements.

Initial Study Impact Checklist and Initial Study EA No. A-17-016 November 14, 2017 Page 12 of 88

Park Type: Special Use Park/Facility

LOS Goal: 2 acres per 1,000 residents

Size: Varies

Serving Radius: Varies

Function/Purpose: Special Use Parks include spaces that do not fall within a typical park-type and usually serve a single purpose. These sites can be either stand-alone (i.e. not located within a Pocket Park, Neighborhood Park, Community Park, Regional Park, Greenbelt/Trail, or Open Space/Natural Area) or may be located within another park (typically found at Community or Regional Parks).

Access and Siting: Special Use Parks must be accessible by public roads with capacity to handle anticipated traffic and adequate parking demand. Traffic calming measures are encouraged within and surrounding the park. Directional and regulatory signage to enhance user experience and strengthen park identity should be easily found throughout the park. These sites should be linked to pedestrian and bicycle trail systems and public transportation when possible.

Unique Features: Special Use Parks may include historic, cultural, or socially significant sites with educational value such as vista points, historic areas, commercial zones, plazas, performing arts venues, arboretums, specialized gardens, theaters, and amphitheaters. These sites may also include outdoor recreation facilities such as aquatic parks, pools, disk golf, skateboard, bike/BMX facilities. These unique features may have unique staffing and maintenance requirements.

Typical Amenities and Facilities: Varies

Park Type: Open Space/Natural Areas

LOS Goal: 2 acres per 1,000 residents

Size: Varies

Serving Radius: Varies **Serving Population**: Varies

Function/Purpose: Open Space/Natural Areas serve the entire city of Fresno and surrounding communities. These sites are undeveloped areas (such as lands under

Initial Study Impact Checklist and Initial Study EA No. A-17-016 November 14, 2017 Page 13 of 88

powerlines, around bodies of water, etc.), and contain natural resources that can be managed for recreation or natural resources that can be managed for recreation or natural resource conservation purposes such as protecting wildlife habitat, water quality, endangered species, etc.. These areas can provide opportunities for nature based, unstructured, low-impact recreational opportunities like walking or nature viewing.

Access and Siting: These sites must be accessible to the public and are often sited in undeveloped areas with natural resource value. May be linked to pedestrian and bicycle trail systems and public transportation when possible.

Unique Features: These sites may include trails, wildlife viewing areas, mountain biking, disc golf, interpretation and education facilities. When appropriate, areas may include kiosks or restroom and drinking fountain facilities. These unique features may have unique staffing and maintenance requirements.

Typical Amenities and Facilities: These areas typically do not include enhanced landscape design, though sustainable design principles may be employed and accent planting may be used at focal points such as entry areas or on-site facilities.

Strategies for New Parks

Even as Fresno focuses on the need to maintain and improve its existing parks, the City must also provide new park land to keep pace with growth. The 2014 General Plan established new level of service goals for the City to achieve 3 acres of community and neighborhood parks per 1,000 residents, along with 2 acres per 1,000 of regional park land. Fresno falls short of these standards today. How can the City begin to close the gap, while our population continues to grow?

The Parks Master Plan does not identify sites for future parks. At a high level, the Parks Master Plan lays out a strategy for the City to development new parks. These tools are intended to help the City go further with limited resources, while maximizing the value of new parks for current and future residents.

Focus of this Environmental Assessment for Purposes of CEQA:

The Parks Master Plan is a strategic document that provides guidelines that direct the future maintenance and development of park facilities and programs in Fresno. Individual project details including precise project locations, project timing, material types, equipment used and construction drawings are not currently available. When specific individual project are implemented, the City will conduct site-specific CEQA analysis as necessary. Implementation under the Parks Master Plan is required to comply with the goals and policies of the General Plan, Development Code and other

Initial Study Impact Checklist and Initial Study EA No. A-17-016 November 14, 2017 Page 14 of 88

regulatory documents.

9. Surrounding land uses and setting:

Various- located throughout the City

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

<u>Development and Resource Management Department, Building & Safety Services Division; Department of Public Works; Department of Public Utilities; County of Fresno, Department of Community Health; City of Fresno Fire Department; Fresno Metropolitan Flood Control District; San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District, Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO)</u>

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

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

Using a list provided by the Native American Heritage Commission, notification letters were sent informing tribes of the project pursuant to A.B. 52, on October 2, 2017. No tribe requested consultation in regards to this project.

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

Initial Study Impact Checklist and Initial Study EA No. A-17-016 November 14, 2017 Page 15 of 88

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.

| Aesthetics | ☐ Agriculture and Forestry Resources | ☐ Air Quality |
|------------------------------------|--|---|
| Biological Resources | ☐ Cultural Resources | ☐ Geology /Soils |
| Greenhouse Gas Emissions | Hazards & Hazardous Materials | ☐ Hydrology/Water Quality |
| Land Use/Planning | ☐ Mineral Resources | □ Noise |
| Population /Housing | ☐ Public Services | ☐ Recreation |
| Transportation/Traffic | ☐ Tribal Cultural Resources | ☐ Utilities/Service Systems |
| 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.
- _X 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

Initial Study Impact Checklist and Initial Study EA No. A-17-016 November 14, 2017 Page 16 of 88

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.

| | NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared. | |
|----|---|---|
| | I find that the proposed project is a subseque but that it MAY have a significant effect or examined in the MEIR, and an ENVIRON required to analyze the potentially significant equirement to PRC Section 21157.1(d) and CEQ | the environment that was not MENTAL IMPACT REPORT is effects not examined in the MEIR |
| So | phia Pagoulatos, Planning Manager | 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

Initial Study Impact Checklist and Initial Study EA No. A-17-016 November 14, 2017 Page 17 of 88

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.

Initial Study Impact Checklist and Initial Study EA No. A-17-016 November 14, 2017 Page 18 of 88

- 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.

Initial Study Impact Checklist and Initial Study EA No. A-17-016 November 14, 2017 Page 19 of 88

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

a and b. No Impact. The General Plan identifies six locations along the San Joaquin River bluffs as scenic vistas. Distant views of highly valued features such as the San Joaquin River, the foothills of the Sierra Nevada mountain range, and the Downtown Fresno skyline are provided within the plan area can could be considered scenic vistas. The Parks Master Plan recommends partnerships to connect and enhance the San Joaquin River Parkway, but does not propose specific site improvements that could impact the scenic vista points along the San Joaquin River bluffs.

According to the California Department of Transportation map of the State Scenic Highways, Fresno County has one officially designated State Scenic Highways, located east of the Planning Area along State Route 180 from Alta Main Canal near Minkler to the Kings Canyon National Park boundary (Caltrans 2017). There are also two eligible State Scenic Highways, the nearest along State Route 168 east of the City of Clovis. The Parks Master Plan is a strategic document that provides guidelines to direct the

Initial Study Impact Checklist and Initial Study EA No. A-17-016 November 14, 2017 Page 20 of 88

future maintenance and development of park facilities and programs in Fresno. Park and open space improvements and future new parks will be limited to the planning area and will not affect these scenic resources.

- **c.** Less than Significant. Implementation of the Parks Master Plan would include improvements proposed for the parks and open space system. These improvements would change the appearance of both existing parks and the area surrounding future park facilities. The General Plan includes the following policies regarding visual character of parks:
 - **POSS-3** Ensure that park and recreational facilities make the most efficient use of land; that they are designed and managed to provide for the entire Fresno community; and that they represent positive examples of design and energy conservation.
 - **POSS-3-d** Sidewalks to Connect Neighborhoods. Sidewalks should be designed for internal neighborhood circulation, and to connect neighborhoods to other residential areas, parks, community trails, shopping, and major streets.
 - **POSS-3-f** Park Design Guidelines. Create, maintain and apply park design guidelines, with provisions for appropriate amenities for each park type, which may include:...
 - Using topography to create interesting an visually appealing spaces and forms
 - Use of waterways as a key design influence, a focus of restoration, and an opportunity to provide for public enjoyment of views
 - Reflecting the agricultural and horticultural heritage of the site or area
 - Connecting with the surrounding areas in a way that encourages expanded pedestrian activity
 - Create individual places within a park that respond to the needs of a broad range of park users, from youth to the elderly
 - Creating places of delight that engage the senses...

D-6-a Consult with neighboring populations, including non-English speaking groups, to inform the architecture, landscape, programming, and interior design of Cityowned facilities such a parks, offices, street lighting, and other visible features.

Proposed future facilities are not anticipated to adversely affect the visual character of the planning area. Subsequent environmental review for individual proposals regarding improvements on existing parks and the development of future parks facilities will be required based on site-specific characteristics, and will evaluate the proposed Initial Study Impact Checklist and Initial Study EA No. A-17-016 November 14, 2017 Page 21 of 88

developments' potential to impact the visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. As a result the adoption of the Parks Master Plan would not substantially degrade the visual character of the city and the impact would be less than significant.

d. No Impact. The Parks Master Plan proposes improvements to existing parks and the future development of new parks, which could include public facility development in the vicinity of existing residential development. Facility development in the vicinity of existing residential development is a potential source of light or glare that could adversely affect the nighttime views in the area. The existing mitigation measures within MEIR SCH No. 2012111015 for the Fresno General Plan, Mitigation Measure Monitoring Checklist that address lighting systems for public facilities will be employed to mitigate that impact.

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

Mitigation Measures:

 The proposed project shall implement and incorporate the aesthetics-related mitigation measures as identified in the attached Master Environmental Impact Report No. (MEIR) SCH No.2012111015 Fresno General Plan Mitigation Monitoring Checklist dated November 14, 2017.

| ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|--------------|
| II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES: In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the 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: | | | | |

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

Initial Study Impact Checklist and Initial Study EA No. A-17-016 November 14, 2017 Page 24 of 88

Background

The California Department of Conservation, Division of Land Resource Protection established the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP) in 1982. The FMMP produces maps and statistical data used for analyzing impacts on California's agricultural resources. Agricultural land is rated according to soil quality and irrigation status. The best quality land is called Prime Farmland with additional categories. including Farmland of Statewide Importance, Unique Farmland, and Farmland of Local Importance Based on the FMMP, there are approximately 9,550 acres of Prime Farmland, approximately 2,911 acres of Unique Farmland, and approximately 2,355 acres of Farmland of Statewide Importance for a total of approximately 14,816 acres within the Planning Area (Division of Land Resource Protection 2017). Based on existing farmland data received from the Fresno County Assessor's Office Land Use Codes that was provided by City staff, there is a total of approximately 11,714 acres that have agricultural operations (City of Fresno 2014a, 5.2-11). With the implementation of the General Plan and Development Code, the approximately 15,903 acres of FMMPdesignated farmland and approximately 11,714 acres of existing farmland are anticipated to be converted to uses other than agriculture. This conversion is a significant impact on agricultural resources, and was already considered in the General Plan MEIR and overridden with findings of overriding consideration.

- **a b. Less than Significant.** The Parks Master Plan is a strategic document that provides guidelines that direct the future maintenance and development of park facilities and programs in Fresno. No existing parks are sited on FMMP-designated farmland or land under Williams Act contract, and therefore none of the suggested site improvements will cause the conversion of farmland or conflict with a Williams Act contract. Although no specific sites are currently proposed for the development of future parks beyond those already identified in the Fresno General Plan, it is possible that development may occur on lands currently under Williamson Act contract or result in the conversion of FMMP-designated farmland. Subsequent environmental review for individual proposals for future parks facilities will be required based on site-specific characteristics, and will evaluate the proposed developments' potential to conflict with agricultural zoning or a Williamson Act contract at the time of proposed development. The adoption of the Parks Master Plan would therefore have a less than significant impact on either the conversion of farmland or Williams Act contracts.
- **c d. No Impact**. The City of Fresno does not have any forest land or timberland, and therefore the proposed project will not conflict with any forest land or timberland production or result in any loss of forest land.
- e. Less than Significant. The Parks Master Plan is a strategic document that provides guidelines that direct the future maintenance and development of park facilities and

Initial Study Impact Checklist and Initial Study EA No. A-17-016 November 14, 2017 Page 25 of 88

programs in Fresno. It is possible that the development of future park facilities may involve changes to the environment that cause the conversion of farmland. Individual project details including precise project locations, project timing, material types, equipment used and construction drawings are not currently available. When specific individual project are implemented, the City will conduct site-specific CEQA analysis as necessary. Implementation under the Parks Master Plan is required to comply with the goals and policies of the General Plan, Development Code and other regulatory documents.

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

| ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|--------------|
| III. AIR QUALITY - Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations Would the project: | | | | |
| a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan (e.g., by having potential emissions of regulated criterion pollutants which exceed the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control Districts (SJVAPCD) adopted thresholds for these pollutants)? | | | X | |
| b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? | | | Х | |
| 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 | |

Initial Study Impact Checklist and Initial Study EA No. A-17-016 November 14, 2017 Page 27 of 88

| ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|--------------|
| d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. | | | | х |
| e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? | | | | Х |

Background

Ambient air quality has basically remained unchanged since approval of the MEIR. The proposed project is located within the San Joaquin Valley Air Basin (SJVAB), managed by the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD). Both the State of California and the federal government have established health-based Ambient Air Quality Standards (AAQS) for six criteria air pollutants: carbon monoxide (CO), ozone (O_3) , nitrogen dioxide (NO_2) , sulfur dioxide (SO_2) , lead (Pb), and suspended particulate matter $(PM_{2.5}$ and $PM_{10})$. The SJVAB is designated as non-attainment for O_3 and $PM_{2.5}$ for State standards.

The SJVAB is comprised of approximately 25,000 square miles and covers all of seven counties including Fresno, Kings, Madera, Merced, San Joaquin, Stanislaus and Tulare, and the western portion of an eighth, Kern. The SJVAB is defined by the Sierra Nevada mountains in the east (8,000 to 14,000 feet in elevation), the Coast Ranges in the west (averaging 3,000 feet in elevation), and the Tehachapi mountains in the south (6,000 to 8,000 feet in elevation). The valley is topographically flat with a slight downward gradient to the northwest. The valley opens to the sea at the Carquinez Straits where the San Joaquin-Sacramento Delta empties into San Francisco Bay. An aerial view of the SJVAB would simulate a "bowl" opening only to the north. These topographic features restrict air movement through and out of the basin.

Air quality monitoring stations are located throughout the nation and maintained by the local air districts and state air quality regulating agencies. Data collected at permanent monitoring stations are used by the EPA to identify regions as "attainment" or "nonattainment" depending on whether the regions meet the requirements stated in the applicable National Air Quality Standards (NAAQS). Nonattainment areas are imposed with additional restrictions as required by the EPA. In addition, different classifications of

Initial Study Impact Checklist and Initial Study EA No. A-17-016 November 14, 2017 Page 28 of 88

attainment, such as marginal, moderate, serious, severe, and extreme, are used to classify each air basin in the state on a pollutant-by-pollutant basis. The classifications are used as a foundation to create air quality management strategies to improve air quality and comply with the NAAQS. The SJVAB's attainment status for each of the criteria pollutants for Fresno County is listed in Table 1.

SJVAB Air Quality Attainment Status for Fresno County

| Pollutant | State | Federal |
|-------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|
| Ozone (1-hour) | Severe/Nonattainment | Standard Revoked |
| Ozone (8-hour) | Nonattainment | Extreme Nonattainment |
| PM ₁₀ | Nonattainment | Attainment (Maintenance) |
| PM _{2.5} | Nonattainment | Nonattainment |
| Carbon Monoxide | Attainment | Attainment (Maintenance) |
| Nitrogen Dioxide | Attainment | Unclassified/Attainment |
| Lead | Attainment | Unclassified/Attainment |
| Sulfur Dioxide | Attainment | Unclassified |
| Sulfates | Attainment | No Federal Regulation |
| Hydrogen Sulfide | Unclassified | No Federal Regulation |

Source: California Air Resources Board 2017.

Impacts and Mitigation Measures

The Parks Master Plan is a strategic document that provides guidelines for maintenance of the existing parks and open space system and the future development of park facilities and programs in Fresno. Due to the nature of operational park activities, including walking, ball games and use of playground equipment, the primary impact to air quality standards would most likely occur as a result of construction activities.

a. Less than Significant. The MEIR identified two tests to determine if a proposed project conflicts or obstructs the applicable air quality plans. First, if development proposed by the General Plan exceeds the growth projections used in the applicable attainment plan, it would produce a potentially significant impact. Second, if the project includes goals, policies, and development standards that are in conflict with the development related control measures in the attainment plans, the project would be potentially significant. Under these tests, it was determined that implementation of the General Plan would be consistent with applicable Air Quality Plans.

Initial Study Impact Checklist and Initial Study EA No. A-17-016 November 14, 2017 Page 29 of 88

Implementation of the Parks Master Plan would not induce growth, either directly or indirectly. The Parks Master Plan includes an assessment of the City of Fresno's park and open space system, examining the City's General Plan park land acreage goals, population growth, and demographic information as part of a comprehensive level of service evaluation. The Parks Master Plan does not include goals, policies, or development standards that are in conflict with the development-related control measures in the attainment plans. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in new or more significant population growth impacts than were analyzed and described in the MEIR.

b. Less than Significant.

Short-Term Construction Emissions.

As identified in the MEIR for the General Plan, construction activities associated with implementing the Parks Master Plan would cause temporary adverse effects on local air quality. Construction activities such as earthmoving, construction vehicle traffic and wind blowing over exposed earth would generate exhaust emissions and fugitive particulate matter emissions that affect local and regional air quality. Construction activities are also a source of organic gas emissions. Solvents in adhesives, non-waterbased paints, thinners, some insulating materials, and caulking materials would evaporate into the atmosphere and would participate in the photochemical reaction that creates urban ozone. Asphalt used in paving is also a source of organic gases immediately after its application. Construction dust could affect local air quality at various times during construction of the project. The dry, windy climate of the area during the summer months creates a high potential for dust generation when, and if, underlying materials are exposed to the atmosphere. The effects of construction activities would be increased dustfall and locally elevated levels of particulate matter downwind of construction activity. The MEIR states that future individual projects that exceed project level significance thresholds after accounting for Rule 9510 reductions would be required to implement additional mitigation measures to reduce significant emissions. As identified in the MEIR for the General Plan, compliance with Rule 9510 would contribute to a reduction of construction related emissions to reduce emissions to a less than significant level. MEIR mitigation measures have been implemented to mitigate construction-related air quality impacts. With implementation of mitigation measures, the proposed project would not result in any new or more significant construction-related air quality impacts than were described in the MEIR and this impact would be less than significant.

Long-Term Operational Emissions

Initial Study Impact Checklist and Initial Study EA No. A-17-016 November 14, 2017 Page 30 of 88

The Parks Master Plan is a strategic document that provides guidelines for maintenance of the existing parks and open space system and the future development of park facilities and programs in Fresno. Individual project details including precise project locations, project timing, material types, equipment used and construction drawings are not currently available. When specific individual project are implemented, the City will conduct site-specific CEQA analysis as necessary. Implementation under the Parks Master Plan is required to comply with the goals and policies of the General Plan, Development Code and other regulatory documents.

Future development associated with the Parks Master Plan would contribute to the significant regional and local air quality impacts identified in the General Plan MEIR, including the long-term project-related emissions associated with the ozone precursor reactive organic gases (ROG) and particulate matter.

The MEIR identified comprehensive policies, ordinances, and regulations that would mitigate project impacts that would reduce criteria pollutant emissions, however, implementation of the General Plan would exceed the SJVAPCD project level thresholds of significance for ROG, NOx, PM10 and PM2.5.

Future development projects associated with the Parks Master Plan would also be subject to the existing policies, ordinances, and regulations identified in the General Plan MEIR. Therefore, the proposed project's regional air quality impacts would be less than the impact identified in the MEIR and would not result in any new or worsening air quality impacts.

c - e. Less than Significant. CEQA defines a cumulative impact as two or more individual effects, which when considered together, are considerable or which compound or increase other environmental impacts. The air quality attainment plans describe and evaluate the future projected emissions sources in the Basin and set forth a strategy to meet both state and federal Clean Air Act planning requirements and federal ambient air quality standards. Therefore, the attainment plans are relevant plans for a CEQA cumulative impacts analysis. The MEIR concluded that implementation of the General Plan would be consistent with air quality attainment plans, but would exceed SJVAPCD air emissions thresholds resulting in a potentially significant impact. The Parks Master Plan is a strategic document that provides guidelines for maintenance of the existing parks and open space system and the future development of park facilities and programs in Fresno. Future development associated with the Parks Master Plan would contribute to the significant regional and local air quality impacts identified in the General Plan MEIR, including the long-term project-related emissions associated with the ozone precursor reactive organic gases (ROG) and particulate matter. Individual project details including precise project locations, project timing, material types, equipment used and construction drawings are not currently available. When

Initial Study Impact Checklist and Initial Study EA No. A-17-016 November 14, 2017 Page 31 of 88

specific individual project are implemented, the City will conduct site-specific CEQA analysis as necessary. Implementation under the Parks Master Plan is required to comply with the goals and policies of the General Plan, Development Code and other regulatory documents.

d and e. No Impact. Sensitive receptors are facilities that house or attract children, the elderly, and people with illnesses or others who are especially sensitive to the effects of air pollutants. Hospitals, schools, convalescent facilities, and residential areas are examples of sensitive receptors.

The MEIR identified a variety of pollutant or toxic air emissions, such as diesel exhaust and stationary source TAC emissions. However, Parks Master Plan is a strategic document that provides guidelines to direct the future maintenance and development of park facilities and programs in Fresno and the determination of localized pollutant concentrations requires project specific information that is not currently available. Therefore, the determination of impacts associated with the General Plan and the proposed project would be based on implementation of MEIR mitigation measures to ensure that future development projects would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. Any future development proposal with the potential to expose sensitive receptors (including residential areas) or the general public to substantial levels of toxic air contaminants would be deemed to have a significant impact. This would apply to locating sensitive receptors near existing sources of toxic air contaminants, as well as locating sources of toxic air contaminants near existing sensitive receptors. With implementation of these mitigation measures as identified in the MEIR, the Parks Master Plan would not result in any new or more significant health risk impacts than were described in the General Plan MEIR and this impact would be less than significant.

During construction, the various diesel-powered vehicles and equipment in use on-site would create localized odors. These odors would be temporary and are not likely to be noticeable for extended periods of time beyond the project site. As with all projects within the City, proposals of a new odor source would require an applicant to demonstrate that the proposed facility includes odor controls within its design and through implementation of odor management practices to reduce odors to a less than significant level. The General Plan MEIR provided a mitigation measure to reduce this impact. When the measure is implemented by the proposed project, the project would not result in odor impacts that are greater than those identified in the MEIR and this impact would be less than significant.

In conclusion, with MEIR mitigation measures incorporated, the proposed project is fully within the scope of the Fresno General Plan and would not result in any air quality environmental impacts beyond those analyzed in MEIR SCH No. 2012111015.

Initial Study Impact Checklist and Initial Study EA No. A-17-016 November 14, 2017 Page 32 of 88

Mitigation Measures

1. The proposed project shall implement and incorporate the air quality resourcesrelated mitigation measures as identified in the attached Master Environmental Impact Report No. (MEIR) SCH No.2012111015 Fresno General Plan Mitigation Monitoring Checklist dated November 14, 2017.

| 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 |

Initial Study Impact Checklist and Initial Study EA No. A-17-016 November 14, 2017 Page 34 of 88

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

Background

Central California is a unique biological enclave with a rich diversity of flora and fauna. This region's climate, soils, hydrology and geographic isolation fostered resident species found nowhere else on earth. Through agricultural, rural residential and urban development, these species and their habitats are being diminished and marginalized.

Approximately 63 percent of the City of Fresno's 106,027-acre Planning Area consists of previous disturbed urban/developed areas containing industrial, commercial, and residential development and associated roads and infrastructure. About 32 percent of the Planning Area contains previous disturbed agricultural lands, orchards, pasture, and row and field crops located predominately along the outer boundaries of the Planning Area. Undeveloped and undisturbed areas with native vegetation occur within the remaining 5 percent of the Planning Area (City of Fresno 2014a, 5.4-3). The San Joaquin River corridor along the northern border of the Planning Area provides a

Initial Study Impact Checklist and Initial Study EA No. A-17-016 November 14, 2017 Page 35 of 88

concentrated riparian plant and animal sanctuary. The area is a sensitive environment hosting a diversity of wildlife, fish, and plan species and contains the last remnants of a true riparian environment (City of Fresno 2011, 32). The San Joaquin River corridor is the only wildlife movement corridor in Fresno; open space and recreational use areas lack the substantive linkages necessary to be considered part of a wildlife movement corridor (City of Fresno 2014a, 5.4-40). In addition to the San Joaquin River there are several canals that traverse the SOI that provide opportunities for both vegetation and wildlife, however such opportunities are limited (City of Fresno 2011, 32).

- a d. No Impact. The majority of the habitat within the Planning Area consists of urban areas characterized disturbed land and development. Improvements proposed within existing park space would not result in significant impacts to species identified as a candidate, sensitive or special-status species, impact riparian habitats, federally protected wetlands, or interfere substantially with the movement of migratory wildlife. However, the development of new parks, depending on location, could potentially impact species identified as a candidate, sensitive or special-status species, impact riparian habitats, federally protected wetlands, or interfere with the movement of migratory wildlife. The Parks Master Plan is a strategic document that provides quidelines that direct the future maintenance and development of park facilities and programs in Fresno. Individual project details including precise project locations, project timing, material types, equipment used and construction drawings are not currently available. When specific individual project are implemented, the City will conduct sitespecific CEQA analysis as necessary. Implementation under the Parks Master Plan is required to comply with the goals and policies of the General Plan, Development Code and other regulatory documents. The General Plan MEIR identified mitigation measures for biological resources that would reduce potential impacts on species identified as a candidate, sensitive or special-status species, riparian habitats, federally protected wetlands, and the movement of migratory wildlife. The measures within the General Plan MEIR Mitigation Measure Monitoring Checklist for biological resources will be employed to ensure that these impacts are less than significant.
- **e. Less than Significant.** Urban greening forms one of the major goals of the Parks Master Plan. Implementation of the Parks Master Plan would include the introduction of more trees into the project area overall, however it is possible that proposed improvements or new park facilities may impact existing trees. Future development would be required to comply with Article 2 of Section 13 of the City of Fresno Municipal Code. Therefore, potential conflict to the City's public tree ordinance would be less than significant.
- **f. No Impact**. There are no Habitat Conservation Plans (HCPs), Natural Community Conservation Plans (NCCPs) or other adopted local, regional or state HCP within the

Initial Study Impact Checklist and Initial Study EA No. A-17-016 November 14, 2017 Page 36 of 88

Planning Area. Therefore, development will not result in any impacts to an adopted HCP or NCCP.

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

Mitigation Measures

 The proposed project shall implement and incorporate the biological resourcesrelated mitigation measures as identified in the attached Master Environmental Impact Report No. (MEIR) SCH No.2012111015 Fresno General Plan Mitigation Monitoring Checklist dated November 14, 2017.

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

Initial Study Impact Checklist and Initial Study EA No. A-17-016 November 14, 2017 Page 38 of 88

| ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|--------------|
| i) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in PRC section 5020.1(k), or, | | | | Х |
| 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 |

Background

Cultural resources include prehistoric-era archaeological sites, historic-era archaeological sites, traditional cultural properties, sites of religious and cultural significance, and historical buildings, structures, objects, and sites. The importance or significance of a cultural resource is in part described by the context in which it originated or developed. National Park Service Bulletin 16a describes a historic context as "information about historic trends and properties grouped by an important theme in prehistory or history of a community, state, or the nation during a particular period of time" (NPS 1997). A context links an existing property to important historic trends and this allows a framework for determining the significance of a property.

In California, historians have divided the past into broad categories based on climate models, archaeological dating and written histories. Paleontologists divide time into much larger segments, with defined and named periods of time shortening in timespan as the modern era is reached.

Initial Study Impact Checklist and Initial Study EA No. A-17-016 November 14, 2017 Page 39 of 88

Current geological maps indicate that the Planning Area consists of Quaternary alluvium with two primary surficial deposits: 1) Pleistocene non-marine (Riverbank Formation) and 2) Quaternary non-marine fan deposits, both of which have high potential sensitivity (City of Fresno 2014a, 5.5-14). Farming activities and previous structural development have disturbed the soils through much of the Planning Area; however future development that requires excavation or construction in previously undisturbed soils could impact paleontological resources.

a – e. No Impact. Implementation of the Fresno Parks Master Plan would involve construction activities which would include ground disturbance, both in the renovation of existing parks and the potential development of future parks.

Therefore, due to the ground disturbing activities that will occur as a result of the project, the measures within the General Plan MEIR 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. Improvements and future park facilities may have the potential to impact historic resources, depending on individual site locations and resources. Subsequent environmental review for individual proposals for future parks facilities will be required based on site-specific characteristics, and will evaluate the proposed developments' potential to impact cultural resources

Using a list provided by the Native American Heritage Commission, notification letters were sent informing tribes of the project pursuant to A.B. 52, on October 2, 2017. No traditional cultural resources were identified through the A.B. 52 process. Therefore this project will have no impact on tribal cultural resources.

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

Mitigation Measures

 The proposed project shall implement and incorporate the cultural resourcesrelated mitigation measures as identified in the attached Master Environmental Impact Report No. (MEIR) SCH No.2012111015 Fresno General Plan Mitigation Monitoring Checklist dated November 14, 2017.

| ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|--------------|
| VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS Would the project: | | | | |
| a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: | | | | |
| i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42. | | | | X |
| ii) Strong seismic ground shaking? | | | | Х |
| iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? | | | | Х |
| iv) Landslides? | | | | Х |
| b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? | | | | Х |

Initial Study Impact Checklist and Initial Study EA No. A-17-016 November 14, 2017 Page 41 of 88

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

Background

Fresno has no known active earthquake faults, and is not in any Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zones (California Geologic Survey 2007). The immediate Fresno area has extremely low seismic activity levels, although shaking may be felt from earthquakes whose epicenters lie to the east, west, and south. Known major faults are over 50 miles distant and include the San Andreas Fault, Coalinga area blind thrust fault(s), and the Long Valley, Owens Valley, and White Wolf/Tehachapi fault systems. The most serious threat to Fresno from a major earthquake in the Eastern Sierra would be flooding that could be caused by damage to dams on the upper reaches of the San Joaquin River.

Fresno is classified by the State as being in a moderate seismic risk zone, Category "C" or "D," depending on the soils underlying the specific location being categorized and that location's proximity to the nearest known fault lines (California Geologic Survey

Initial Study Impact Checklist and Initial Study EA No. A-17-016 November 14, 2017 Page 42 of 88

2003). All new structures are required to conform to current seismic protection standards in the California Building Code.

The highly erodible face of the San Joaquin River bluff, and small areas of expansive clay in the northeastern portion of the city's Sphere of Influence, are the only unstable soil conditions known to exist in the City. Despite long-term overdrafting of groundwater that has lowered the static groundwater level under Fresno by as much as 100 feet over the past century, surface subsidence has not been noted in the vicinity of the city; this is probably due to the geologic strata underlying the city, which features layers of clay and hardpan interleaved with alluvial sand and gravel layers.

a – e. No Impact. Compliance with the following Fresno General Plan Objective and Policies were deemed to reduce potential impacts for infrastructure and development projects subsequent to the General Plan:

Objective NS-2. Minimize risk of property damage or personal injury posed by geologic and seismic risks.

Policy NS-2-a. Seismic Protection. Ensure seismic protection is incorporated into new and existing construction, consistent with the Fresno Municipal Code.

Policy NS-2-a. Soil Analysis Requirement. Identify areas with potential geologic and/or soils hazards, and require development in these areas to conduct a soil analysis and mitigation plan by a registered civil engineer (or engineering geologist specializing in soil geology) prior to allowing on-site drainage or disposal for wastewater, storm runoff, or swimming pool/spa water.

Policy NS-2-c. Landfill Areas. Require proposed land uses on or near landfill areas to be designed and maintained to comply with California Code of Regulations, Title 27, Section 21190, Post Closure Land Use.

The General Plan MEIR includes an analysis of geologic and soils in the Fresno Sphere of Influence. Subsequent development complying with the above policies, the California Building Code, and draining provisions (overseen by the City and Fresno Metropolitan Flood Control District review of grading, paving, and infrastructure plans) are deemed to have less than significant potential seismic and geologic impacts. No addition mitigation was required at the MEIR level.

The Parks Master Plan is a strategic document that provides guidelines that direct the future maintenance and development of park facilities and programs in Fresno. Subsequent environmental review for individual proposals for future parks facilities will be required based on site-specific characteristics, and will evaluate the proposed developments' environmental impacts under CEQA as necessary. No adverse

Initial Study Impact Checklist and Initial Study EA No. A-17-016 November 14, 2017 Page 43 of 88

environmental effects related to topography, soils or geology are expected as a result of the adoption of the Parks Master Plan. Therefore impacts are less than significant.

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

Initial Study Impact Checklist and Initial Study EA No. A-17-016 November 14, 2017 Page 44 of 88

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

Background

Greenhouse gases are present in the atmosphere naturally, are released by natural sources, or are formed from secondary reactions taking place in the atmosphere. The gases that are widely seen as the principal contributors to human-induced global climate change are:

- Carbon dioxide (CO2);
- Methane (CH4);
- Nitrous oxide (N2O);
- Hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs);
- Perfluorocarbons (PFCs); and
- Sulfur Hexafluoride (SF6).

Over the last 200 years, humans have caused substantial quantities of greenhouse gases to be released into the atmosphere. These extra emissions are increasing GHG concentrations in the atmosphere and enhancing the natural greenhouse effect, which is believed to be causing global warming. While manmade GHGs include naturally-

Initial Study Impact Checklist and Initial Study EA No. A-17-016 November 14, 2017 Page 45 of 88

occurring GHGs such as CO2, CH4, and N2O, some gases, like HFCs, PFCs, and SF6 are completely new to the atmosphere.

Certain gases, such as water vapor, are short-lived in the atmosphere. Others remain in the atmosphere for significant periods of time, contributing to climate change in the long term. Water vapor is excluded from the list of GHGs above because it is short-lived in the atmosphere and its atmospheric concentrations are largely determined by natural processes, such as oceanic evaporation.

These gases vary considerably in terms of Global Warming Potential (GWP), which is a concept developed to compare the ability of each GHG to trap heat in the atmosphere relative to another gas. The GWP is based on several factors, including the relative effectiveness of a gas to absorb infrared radiation and length of time that the gas remains in the atmosphere ("atmospheric lifetime"). The GWP of each gas is measured relative to CO2, the most abundant greenhouse gas; the definition of GWP for a particular greenhouse gas is the ratio of heat trapped by one unit mass of the GHG to the ratio of heat trapped by one unit mass of CO2 over a specified time period. Greenhouse gas emissions are typically measured in terms of pounds or tons of "CO2 equivalents" (CO2e).

City of Fresno General Plan and Development Code

The City's General Plan includes guiding and implementing policies that would reduce greenhouse gas emissions associated with development in the City. The policies relate to design and development principals, support for alternate modes of transportation, transportation improvements, habitat conservation, and water conservation (City of Fresno 2014a, 5.7-26 to 5.7-41). The measures are detailed on pages 5.7-23 through 5.7-41 of the MEIR.

City of Fresno Greenhouse Gas Reduction Plan

The City's Greenhouse Gas Reduction Plan was created as part of the General Plan and includes strategies to reduce per capita greenhouse gas emissions to 1990 levels by 2020 The following policies from the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Plan would be applicable to the proposed project.

New Discretionary Development Approval Process to Determine Consistency with Greenhouse Gas Reduction Plan

1. Review General Plan Policies listed in the GHG Plan to determine applicability to the project.

Initial Study Impact Checklist and Initial Study EA No. A-17-016 November 14, 2017 Page 46 of 88

- 2. Incorporate design features or mitigation measures into the project as needed to demonstrate consistency.
 - a. Street and pedestrian design complies with complete streets concepts.
 - b. Review project against Development Code for mandatory design features required for the project.
 - c. Consider alternative energy generation (solar) if appropriate for the project and site. (The State is working towards zero net energy development that will require increasing efficiency and self-generation over time).
 - d. Review water conservation building and landscape design features for compliance with City water conservation standards.
- 3. Implement project design features suitable for the development type and location.
 - a. Projects within core/center areas and BRT corridors should meet minimum density and design requirements to ensure pedestrian and transit orientation is met.
 - b. Maintain and enhance connections to regional bikeways and trail system.
- 4. Complete the latest version of the Fresno Green Residential or Non-Residential Checklist
 - a. Meet the Fresno Green checklist point requirements.
 - b. Alternatively, meet the U.S. Green Building Council's Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) Programs, or qualify for Build It Green's GreenPoint rating system for residential building.

New Discretionary Development requiring a General Plan Amendment

- 1. Comply with all of the measures listed above for ministerial and discretionary projects.
- Ensure that change in land use designation would not result in a significant increase in GHG emissions compared to the existing designation (would require a GHG technical study to quantify GHG emissions and benefits of project design features).

Initial Study Impact Checklist and Initial Study EA No. A-17-016 November 14, 2017 Page 47 of 88

- Projects currently designated for residential or commercial development that increase development densities and intensities and comply with all other relevant General Plan policies and City design standards are considered to have less than significant GHG impacts.
- 4. Emissions from stationary sources for new industrial projects are not considered in the significance determination; however, emissions from motor vehicles trips generated by the project and energy efficiency of the building are considered.
- 5. Projects that propose decreases in development densities or intensities requiring a General Plan will require analysis to determine the impacts on the General Plan land use strategy and must identify mitigation measures to reduce greenhouse gas emissions beyond those required by regulation if needed.

a and b. Less than Significant. Individual projects incrementally contribute toward the potential for global climate change on a cumulative basis in concert with all other past, present, and probable future projects. While individual projects are unlikely to measurably affect global climate change, each of these projects incrementally contributes toward the potential for global climate change on a cumulative basis, in concert with all other past, present, and probable future projects.

Greenhouse gas emissions associated with the implementation of the Parks Master Plan would occur over the short term from construction activities associated with future development. Construction emissions would consist primarily of emissions from equipment exhaust. There would also be long-term regional emissions associated with the project through vehicle trips, energy consumption, and water consumption.

The MEIR analyzed the potential greenhouse gas emissions that would result from buildout of the General Plan, including construction emissions. In addition, a Greenhouse Gas Reduction Plan was created as part of the General Plan, which includes strategies to reduce per capita greenhouse gas emissions to 1990 levels by 2020. The plan demonstrates that even though the City would have increased growth, the per capita emission rates would be reduced through 2020. The General Plan policies would continue to provide greenhouse gas reductions beyond 2020 since they would apply to all development that would occur, however, the amount of local reductions needed beyond 2020 is uncertain pending adoption of state targets for future years. As such, the MEIR concluded that cumulative greenhouse gas impacts related to growth under the General Plan would be significant and unavoidable.

The Parks Master Plan is a strategic document that provides guidelines that direct the future maintenance and development of park facilities and programs in Fresno. Implementation of the Parks Master Plan will include improvements to existing park

Initial Study Impact Checklist and Initial Study EA No. A-17-016 November 14, 2017 Page 48 of 88

facilities and development of new parks. Individual project details including precise project locations, project timing, material types, equipment used and construction drawings are not currently available. When specific individual projects are implemented, the City will conduct site-specific CEQA analysis as necessary.

The MEIR included an evaluation of the General Plan and greenhouse gas Reduction Plan's compliance with AB 32 and the Scoping Plan. It was determined that the General Plan includes numerous policies that support state efforts to reduce greenhouse gases as detailed in the Scoping Plan. No General Plan policies were identified that conflict with or obstruct Scoping Plan strategies. The Scoping Plan future year inventories include growth projected for development throughout the State, including Fresno. The MEIR considered this impact less than significant. The proposed project would be required to be consistent with the policies listed in the General Plan and Greenhouse Gas Reduction Plan. All proposed projects are required to demonstrate consistency with the City of Fresno's Greenhouse Gas Reduction Plan. The Parks Master Plan would not conflict with the State goal of reducing greenhouse gas emissions and would not conflict with the AB 32 Scoping Plan. Future projects implementing the Parks Master Plan would be subject to all applicable permit and planning requirements in place or adopted by the City of Fresno. Therefore, the proposed project would be consistent with the plans and policies adopted for the purpose of reducing greenhouse gas emissions. The proposed project would not result in new or more severe significant impacts related to greenhouse gas emission nor conflict with plans adopted for the purpose of reducing greenhouse gas emissions.

In conclusion, the project will not result in any greenhouse gas 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? | | | Х | |
| 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? | | | Х | |
| 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 | | |

Initial Study Impact Checklist and Initial Study EA No. A-17-016 November 14, 2017 Page 50 of 88

| 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 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? | | | | Х |
| g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? | | | Х | |
| 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 | |

Background

Under the California Code of Regulations, hazardous materials are defined as substances with certain physical properties that could pose a substantial present or future hazard to human health or the environment when improperly handled, disposed,

Initial Study Impact Checklist and Initial Study EA No. A-17-016 November 14, 2017 Page 51 of 88

or otherwise managed. Hazardous materials have one or more of the following properties:

Toxicity - causes human health effects

Ignitability - has the ability to burn

Corrosivity - causes burns or damages/degrades materials

Reactivity - causes explosions or generates toxic gases

A hazardous waste is any hazardous material that is discarded, abandoned, or slated to be recycled. The criteria that define a material as hazardous also define a waste as hazardous. If improperly handled, hazardous materials and hazardous waste can result in public health hazards through being released into the soil or groundwater or through airborne releases in vapors, fumes, or dust. Soil and groundwater having concentrations of hazardous constituents higher than specific regulatory levels must be handled and disposed of as hazardous waste when excavated or pumped from an aquifer. The California Code of Regulations, Title 22, Sections 66261.20-24 contains technical descriptions of toxic characteristics that could cause soil or groundwater to be classified as hazardous waste. The contaminated areas in Fresno are largely associated with leaking underground storage tanks and are predominately clustered south of Downtown, near the Fresno Yosemite International Airport and Palm Bluffs Corporate Center, and along the Union Pacific Railroad Tracks (City of Fresno 2014b, 9-32).

a – c. Less than Significant Impact. The Parks Master Plan is a strategic document that provides guidelines for maintenance of the existing parks and open space system and for the future development of park facilities and programs in Fresno. Implementation of the Parks Master Plan will not involve the development of land uses or facilities typically associated with the storage, use, disposal, or generation of hazardous materials or wastes. Routine maintenance activities occurring within recreational facilities may involve the occasional use of hazardous materials. Potentially toxic or hazardous compounds associated with the maintenance activities typical consist of readily available solvents, cleaning compounds, paint, herbicides, and pesticides. These compounds are regulated by federal and state laws mandating the proper transport, use, and storage of hazardous materials in accordance with product labeling. Facilities that regularly handle or store hazardous materials in quantity are required to prepare Hazardous Materials Business Plans and are subject to monitoring and reporting requirements mandated by state law.

Construction activities associated with the implementation of the Parks Master Plan would involve the use of hazardous material including diesel fuel, gasoline, oil and grease. To reduce potential project-specific impacts, Best Management Practices would

Initial Study Impact Checklist and Initial Study EA No. A-17-016 November 14, 2017 Page 52 of 88

be implemented for construction activities to minimize impacts to the environment and public health. Transport, storage and disposal of any hazardous materials would be subject to federal, state and local regulations. Temporary storage tanks necessary to store fuel and/or other flammable or combustible liquids required on project sites during construction would also be regulated through the applicable federal, state and local regulations. Therefore, impacts are considered less than significant.

- d. Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. According to the California Department of Toxic Substances Control and the California Water Resources Control Board there are a number of sites in the City of Fresno that are on the Cortese list of hazardous materials sites (DTSC 2017). The Parks Master Plan is a strategic document that provides guidelines for maintenance of the existing parks and open space system and for the future development of park facilities and programs in Fresno. It is possible that new park facilities may be located on or near hazardous materials sites. In order to mitigate this potential impact, when future projects are developed the attached project specific mitigation measures shall be implemented.
- **e. Less than Significant.** There are three airports land use plan areas located within the City of Fresno, the Fresno-Yosemite International Airport (FYI) Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, the Fresno Chandler Executive Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, and the Sierra Sky Park Land Use Policy Plan. Each of these plans contains separate airport analyses and control strategies that conform to FAA protocols. These plans restrict land uses according to potential safety hazards from aircraft operations. Individual project details including precise project locations, project timing, material types, equipment used and construction drawings are not currently available. When specific individual projects are implemented, the City will conduct site-specific CEQA analysis as necessary. Should future projects implementing the Parks Master Plan be proposed in airport land use plan areas, those projects will be required to conform to the land use restrictions of the airport's land use compatibility plan.
- **f. No Impact.** There are no private airstrips within the Planning Area. As a result, this project would have no impact.
- **g and h. Less than Significant.** Although the exact individual locations for proposed future recreational facilities that would be implemented as part of the Parks Master Plan are currently unknown, any proposed facility would be subject to compliance with emergency access standards and requirements specified by the State Fire Code and the City's Development Code.

Although the City of Fresno is proximate to high and very high fire hazard designated areas, the city is largely categorized as little/no threat or moderate fire hazard, which is largely attributed to the paved areas. Some small areas along the San Joaquin River

Initial Study Impact Checklist and Initial Study EA No. A-17-016 November 14, 2017 Page 53 of 88

Bluffs area in northern Fresno are prone to wildfires due to the relatively steep terrain/vegetation, and these areas are classified as high fire hazard area (City of Fresno 2011, 34). Recreational and park facilities are general characterized by large expanses of greenways, fields and turf. Structure construction would be limited, and it is likely that the majority of structures would be constructed within areas of existing residential development, and would therefore not subject people or structures to potential hazards from wildland fire. Recreational areas promoting access to open space, including the San Joaquin River Bluffs area, would not involve gathering places for public crowds or other mass congregations of people. Therefore impacts related to wildland fire hazards are considered less than significant.

Individual project details including precise project locations, project timing, material types, equipment used and construction drawings are not currently available. When specific individual project are implemented, the City will conduct site-specific CEQA analysis as necessary. Implementation under the Parks Master Plan is required to comply with the goals and policies of the General Plan, Development Code and other regulatory documents.

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

Mitigation Measures

1. The proposed project shall implement and incorporate the hazards and hazardous material related mitigation measures as identified in the attached Project Specific Mitigation Monitoring Checklist dated November 14, 2017.

| 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? | | | Х | |
| b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)? | | | X | |
| c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site? | | | X | |

| ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|--------------|
| d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site? | | | X | |
| e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff? | | | X | |
| f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality? | | | Х | |
| 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? | | | | Х |
| h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows? | | | X | |

Initial Study Impact Checklist and Initial Study EA No. A-17-016 November 14, 2017 Page 56 of 88

| 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? | | | | Х |
| j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow? | | | | Х |

Background

The City of Fresno is located in the alluvial fans of numerous foothills streams and creeks that drain the western slope of the Sierra Nevada foothills. These streams include Big Dry Creek, Alluvial Drain, Pup Creek, Dog Creek, Redbank Creek, Mud Creek, and Fancher Creek. Numerous smaller, unnamed drainage courses also drain into the Planning Area from the rural areas east of the Planning Area.

Fresno is one of the largest cities in the United States still relying 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.

The adverse groundwater conditions of limited supply and compromised quality have been well-documented by planning, environmental impact report and technical studies over the past 20 years including the Master Environmental Impact Report (MEIR) No. SCH No. 2012111015 for the General Plan, the MEIR 10130 for the Fresno General Plan, Final EIR No.10100, Final EIR No.10117, and Final EIR No. SCH 95022029 (Fresno Metropolitan Water Resource Management Plan), et al. These conditions include water quality degradation due to DBCP, arsenic, iron, and manganese concentrations; low water well yields; limited aquifer storage capacity and recharge

Initial Study Impact Checklist and Initial Study EA No. A-17-016 November 14, 2017 Page 57 of 88

capacity; and, intensive urban or semi-urban development occurring upgradient from the Fresno Metropolitan Area.

In response to the need for a comprehensive long-range water supply and distribution strategy, the General Plan recognizes the Kings Basin's Integrated Regional Water Management Plan, Fresno-Area Regional Groundwater Management Plan, and City of Fresno Metropolitan Water Resource Management Plan and cites the findings of the City of Fresno 2010 Urban Water Management Plan. The purpose of these management plans is to provide safe, adequate, and dependable water supplies to meet the future needs of the Kings Basin regions and the Fresno-Clovis metropolitan area in an economical manner; protect groundwater quality from further degradation and overdraft; and, provide a plan of reasonably implementable measures and facilities.

The 2016 Urban Water Management Plan illustrates the City of Fresno's goals to achieve a 'water balance' between supply and demand while decreasing reliance upon and use of groundwater. To achieve these goals the City is implementing a host of strategies, including:

Intentional groundwater recharge through reclamation at the City's groundwater recharge facility at Leaky Acres (located northwest of Fresno-Yosemite international Airport), refurbish existing streams and canals to increase percolation, and recharge at Fresno Municipal Flood Control District's (FMFCD) storm water basins;

Increase use of existing surface water entitlements from the Kings River, United States Bureau of Reclamation and Fresno Irrigation District for treatment at the Northeast Storm Water Treatment Facility (NESWTF) and construct a new Southeast Storm Water Treatment Facility (SESWTF); and

Recycle wastewater at the Fresno-Clovis Regional Wastewater Reclamation Facility (RWRF) for treatment and re-use for irrigation, and to percolation ponds for groundwater recharge. Further actions include the General Plan, Policy RC-6-d to prepare, adopt and implement a City of Fresno Recycled Water Master Plan.

The City of Fresno has adopted a key objective of balancing its groundwater operations by 2025. Groundwater is replenished mainly by natural recharge and subsurface flows; however the major component of this objective is the use of treated surface water from existing entitlements. The City is entitled to 60,000 acre feet from the Bureau of Reclamation and 85,000 acre feet from the Kings River annually. Use of treated surface water from the NESWTF has increased from 100 percent dependence on groundwater in 2004 to 28,347 acre feet per year (af/yr) in 2015. Increases in surface water use effectively reduced groundwater use from 156,487 af/yr in 2000 to 83,360 af/yr in 2015

Initial Study Impact Checklist and Initial Study EA No. A-17-016 November 14, 2017 Page 58 of 88

(City of Fresno 2016, 4-2). By 2025, with the addition of recycled water from the RWRF, groundwater use will drop to 53,500 af/yr, with 25,000 af/yr from recycled water and 123,000 af/yr from treated surface water.

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 Urban Water Management Plan, Fresno-Area Regional Groundwater Management Plan, and City of Fresno Metropolitan Water Resource Management Plan and the applicable mitigation measures of approved environmental review documents will address the issues of providing an adequate, reliable, and sustainable water supply for the project's urban domestic and public safety consumptive purposes.

a – f. No Impact. In accordance with the provisions of the Fresno General Plan and MEIR mitigation measures, project specific water supply and distribution requirements must assure than an adequate source of water is available to serve the project. There currently is a water connection fee program to support the development of water supply, treatment, conveyance and recharge facilities. In accordance with the provisions of the Fresno General Plan and the MEIR mitigation measures, project specific water supply and distribution requirements must assure than an adequate source of water is available to serve the project.

The Parks Master Plan is a strategic document that provides guidelines that direct the future maintenance and development of park facilities and programs in Fresno. Individual project details including precise project locations, project timing, material types, equipment used and construction drawings are not currently available. When specific individual project are implemented, the City will conduct site-specific CEQA analysis as necessary. Implementation under the Parks Master Plan is required to comply with the goals and policies of the General Plan, Development Code and other regulatory documents.

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, City of Fresno Metropolitan Water Resource Management Plan and the applicable MEIR mitigation measures will address the issues of providing an adequate, reliable, and sustainable water supply.

Initial Study Impact Checklist and Initial Study EA No. A-17-016 November 14, 2017 Page 59 of 88

- **g. No Impact.** The Parks Master Plan will not involve the development of housing, therefore the project not place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area map. (City of Fresno 2011).
- h. Less than Significant. Within the Planning Area there are places that are subject to the 100-year frequency flood zone, primarily along the San Joaquin River below the bluffs. Additionally areas are in the vicinity of the Fresno Yosemite International Airport, the Southeast Development Area near Redbank Creek Dam, adjacent to Highway 180 east of Clovis Avenue, and within an industrial area east of SR-99, south of California Avenue and north of Jensen Avenue. The Parks Master Plan is a strategic document that provides guidelines that direct the future maintenance and development of park facilities and programs in Fresno. Individual project details including precise project locations, project timing, material types, equipment used and construction drawings are not currently available. When specific individual projects are implemented, the City will conduct site-specific CEQA analysis as necessary.
- i j. No Impact. Official Statewide Tsunami Inundation Maps, coordinated by California Office of Emergency Services (Cal OES), are developed for all populated areas at risk to tsunamis in California. According to Cal OES' MY HAZARD website and Official Statewide Tsunami Inundation Maps, the Planning Area is located outside a tsunami hazard zone (OES 2017; California Geologic Survey 2017).

A seiche is a "standing" wave oscillating in a body of water. This phenomenon occurs in large bodies of water such as bays and lakes. A seiche may occur in any semi- or fully-enclosed body of water. They can be caused by strong winds and earthquakes. There are no bodies of water capable of producing a seiche in the Planning Area. No impacts related to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow are expected to occur within the Planning Area.

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

Mitigation Measures:

1. The proposed project shall implement and incorporate the hydrology related mitigation measures as identified in the attached MEIR Mitigation Monitoring Checklist dated November 14, 2017.

Initial Study Impact Checklist and Initial Study EA No. A-17-016 November 14, 2017 Page 60 of 88

| 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? | | | | Х |
| 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? | | | | Х |

a and c. No Impact. The Parks Master Plan is a strategic document that provides guidelines that direct the future maintenance and development of park facilities and programs in Fresno. Implementation of the Parks Master Plan would provide community facilities and programs serving local and regional community members. Park facilities are designed to generally increase social interactions amongst City residents as well as visitors. Projects implementing the Parks Master Plan will not physical divide established communities.

There are no Habitat Conservation Plans (HCPs), Natural Community Conservation Plans (NCCPs) or other adopted local, regional or state HCP involving the planning area. Therefore, development will not result in any impacts to an adopted HCP or NCCP.

Initial Study Impact Checklist and Initial Study EA No. A-17-016 November 14, 2017 Page 61 of 88

b. Less than Significant. The project includes a proposed amendment to the Fresno General Plan, Plan Amendment Application A-17-016, which amends the text of the POSS Element to include the following addition to the text:

Of Special Note, Parks Master Plan Update on December 14, 2017

On December 14, 2017, the City of Fresno adopted the Fresno Parks Master Plan (PMP) which was an update to the previously adopted 1989 Parks Master Plan. In comparison to this chapter of the General Plan, the Fresno Parks Master provides updated data and system overview, revised park classifications, additional goals, recommendations and strategies, and new design guidelines that support and enhance the objectives and policies found in this chapter. As a result, policy POSS-1-a has been revised and the PMP park classifications are to take precedence over the park classifications in this chapter which means that the goal of 2 acres/1,000 residents is to be achieved through Regional Parks, Open Space/Natural Areas, and Special Use Parks/Facilities.

Policy POSS-1-a has been revised to reflect that the goal of 2 acres/1,000 residents will be achieved through Regional Parks, Open Space/Natural Areas and Special Use Parks/ Facilities, and that trails acreage will no longer be counted toward that goal. Although this amendment represents a change to the General Plan, it is in keeping with the following land use policies, objectives and goals of the General Plan:

Fresno General Plan Goal 7. 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.

Fresno General Plan 14. Provide a network of safe well-maintained parks, open spaces, athletic facilities, and walking and biking trails connecting the city's districts and neighborhoods to attract and retain a broad range of individuals, benefit the health of residents, and provide the level of public amenities required to encourage and support development of higher density urban living and transit use.

These goals are supported by General Plan objectives and policies, including:

POSS-1 Provide an expanded, high quality and diversified park system, allowing for varied recreation opportunities for the entire Fresno community.

POSS-1-b Parks Implementation Planning. Conduct ongoing planning to implement park policies established in this General Plan and continue to strive for well-maintained and fully accessible playgrounds with accessible amenities throughout the city.

Initial Study Impact Checklist and Initial Study EA No. A-17-016 November 14, 2017 Page 62 of 88

- Keep an up-to-date inventory of existing and planned parks, including locations mapped on the Parks and Open Space Diagram;
- Plan for acquiring new parkland designated in the General Plan, as shown in Figure POSS-1;
- Establish a standard protocol for working with new development to arrange for parkland acquisition and dedication;
- Establish a protocol for working with established neighborhoods to provide needed parks, including the fostering of neighborhood and district associations to help plan, acquire, improve and care for public parks, and coordinating new City service facilities to provide new open space;
- Establish detailed design, construction, and maintenance standards;
- Prepare an assessment of the recreation needs of existing and future residents;
- Create an action plan defining priorities, timeframes, and responsibilities;
- Adopt and implement a comprehensive financing strategy for land acquisition, park development, operations and maintenance;
- Identify opportunities for siting and suing existing or planned park space as passive "purple pipe" waste water storage, treatment, and conservation areas that also provide scenic and/or recreational opportunities; and
- Update the Parks Master Plan.

POSS-1-c Public Input in Park Planning. Continue to provide opportunities for public participation in the planning and development of park facilities and in creation of social, cultural, and recreational activities in the community.

POSS-1-d Additional Parkland in Certain Areas. Strive to obtain additional parkland of sufficient size to adequately serve underserved neighborhood areas and along BRT corridors in support of new and intense residential and mixed use infill development

• Identify, where appropriate, joint use opportunities in siting parks with other City service facility needs.

POSS-2 Ensure that adequate land, in appropriate locations, is designated and acquired for park and recreation uses in infill and growth areas.

Initial Study Impact Checklist and Initial Study EA No. A-17-016 November 14, 2017 Page 63 of 88

POSS-2-b Park and Recreation Priorities. Use the following priorities and guidelines in acquiring and developing parks and recreation facilities:

- Acquire and develop neighborhood park space in existing developed neighborhoods that are deficient of such space and in areas along BRT corridors that are designated as priorities for encouraging new mixed-use transit-oriented development;
- Provide accessible recreation facilities in established neighborhoods with emphasis on those neighborhoods currently underserved by recreation facilities:
- Improve established neighborhood parks with emphasis on those neighborhoods with the greatest need;
- Acquire and develop neighborhood and community parks in new Development Areas;
- Recognize community parks as a special need in areas that lack these facilities or are planned for transit supportive urban densities and explore all potential sources of revenue to secure and develop appropriate sites including joint use facilities;
- Develop new special purpose parks, such as outdoor gym equipment, natural resource based trail parks, equestrian centers, dog parks, and amphitheaters, as well as alternative recreation facilities, such as community recreation centers, passive wildlife observation park, cultural heritage and diversity park, military veterans memorial park, and universal access open space park; and
- Acquire and develop park and open space in established neighborhoods and Development Areas, prioritizing existing neighborhoods with the greatest deficiencies, so that all residents have access to park or open space within one-half mile of their residence. Develop these facilities to be fully accessible to individuals with disabilities as required by law.

POSS-3 Ensure that park and recreational facilities make the most efficient use of land; that they are designed and managed to provide for the entire Fresno community; and that they represent positive examples of design and energy conservation.

POSS-4 Pursue sufficient and dedicated funding for parks acquisition, operations, and maintenance.

Initial Study Impact Checklist and Initial Study EA No. A-17-016 November 14, 2017 Page 64 of 88

The Parks Master Plan strategies and recommendations are in line with the above Parks, Open Space and Schools policies and objectives. Therefore the project's impact is less than significant.

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

Initial Study Impact Checklist and Initial Study EA No. A-17-016 November 14, 2017 Page 65 of 88

| 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? | | | | Х |
| 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? | | | | Х |

Background

The California Geological Survey conducted a study of the Fresno Production-Consumption Region in 1999 to analyze the mineral resources in the area. According to that study, the principal area for mineral resources is located in and immediately adjacent to the Planning Area along the San Joaquin River Corridor (California Geologic Survey 1999). These materials are removed via surface mining operations. These areas have been and are designated as Open Space, and the activities continue to require conditional use permits. The City anticipates that these uses will continue until the resources are substantially removed, and it is no longer economically feasible to mine the areas. To further ensure less than significant impacts to mineral resources occur, the General Plan includes an objective and policies to conserve aggregate mineral resource

a and b. No Impact. The Parks Master Plan proposes a vision for improving Fresno's parks and open space system. The plan includes recommendations regarding the strategic enhancement and/or redevelopment of existing parks within the parks and open space system. The Parks Master Plan lays out strategies to increase the park acreage in Fresno, but does not propose specific sites for parks. The MEIR considered To further ensure less than significant impacts to mineral resources occur during the implementation of the proposed project, the City of Fresno.

Initial Study Impact Checklist and Initial Study EA No. A-17-016 November 14, 2017 Page 66 of 88

Objective RC-10: Conserve aggregate mineral resources within the Planning Area, as identified by the Division of Mines and Geology, and allow for responsible extraction to meet Fresno's needs.

Policy RC-10-a: Meet Future Needs. Adopt land use and resource protection regulations that support mining of the high-quality, close-to-market aggregate resources to meet the needs of the Fresno Production-Consumption Region.

Policy RC-10-b: Zoning in San Joaquin Riverbottom. Maintain zoning consistent with on-going mineral extraction in the San Joaquin Riverbottom that also allows multiple open space uses in conformance with State law and the City's Surface Mining Ordinance.

Policy RC-10-c: Processing-Mining Link. Accommodate only those mineral processing activities in the San Joaquin Riverbottom that are associated and colocated with mining operations when such industrial activities will sunset with the mining operation and do not stimulate unplanned growth or conversion of multiuse open space to urban uses.

Policy RC-10-d: Manage MRZ-2 Areas. Prohibit land uses and development projects that preclude mineral extraction in potential high-quality mineral resource areas designated MRZ-2 by the California Department of Conservation Division of Mines and Geology.

Policy RC-10-e.Existing Permits. Honor surface mining permits approved by Fresno County upon annexation, provided that the mining operation is in compliance with the terms of its current permit(s) and State law. Require new permit application in the event of noncompliance, permit expiration, or permit revocation, and ensure compliance with law or regulations.

Policy RC-10-f. Cooperate on Uniform Criteria. Work with Fresno County, Madera County and the City of Clovis to develop uniform criteria applicable to existing, new, and altered mineral extraction sites in the San Joaquin Riverbottom.

There are no known mineral resources of significant value within the project area (California Geologic Survey 1999). The proposed project will not result in the loss of availability of either known mineral source that would be valuable to the region or state, nor would it result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site.

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? | | | Х | |
| c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? | | | Х | |
| d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? | | | X | |
| e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? | | | X | |

Initial Study Impact Checklist and Initial Study EA No. A-17-016 November 14, 2017 Page 68 of 88

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

Background

In developed areas of the community, noise conflicts often occur when a noise sensitive land use is located adjacent to a noise generator. Noise in these situations frequently stems from on-site operations, use of outdoor equipment, uses where large numbers of people assemble, and vehicular traffic. Some land uses, such as residential dwellings 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 sources of substantial noise that affect the City of Fresno and its residents are transportation-related and consist of major streets and regional highways; airport operations at the Fresno Yosemite International, Fresno-Chandler Executive, and the Sierra Sky Park Airports; and railroad operations along the BNSF Railway and the Union Pacific Railroad lines. The General Plan Noise Element establishes 65 dBA Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) as the standard for desirable maximum average exterior noise levels.

a – d. Less than Significant.

Short Term Noise Impacts

The construction of projects implementing the Parks Master Plan would involve short-term, construction-related noise as well as groundborne vibration. Pursuant to the Fresno General Plan MEIR, as set forth by Chapter 10, Article 1, Section 10-109-Exemptions, 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

Initial Study Impact Checklist and Initial Study EA No. A-17-016 November 14, 2017 Page 69 of 88

work takes place between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 10:00 p.m. on any day except Sunday.

Thus, although development activities associated with building-out of the of the Planning Area could potentially result in temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity (City of Fresno 2014a), construction activity would be exempt from the City of Fresno's noise regulation, as long as such activity is conducted with an appropriate construction permit and during the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 10:00 p.m., excluding Sunday. Therefore, short-term construction impacts associated with the exposure of person to or the generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local General Plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies would be less than significant.

Long Term Impacts

The General Plan sets a maximum average outdoor standard of 65 dBA for sensitive uses. Implementation of the Parks Master Plan would include improvements on existing parks and the future development of new parks. Operation of Parks Master Plan projects, including ball fields, play structures, and other city park recreation activities, would not be likely to generate ground borne vibration or ground borne noise. However, construction activities may result in vibration and ground borne noise. It is possible that larger recreational facilities, including regional parks or special use parks that have facilities that would attract large groups of people for outdoor events may have noise impacts that exceed the General Plan outdoor standard.

The Parks Master Plan is a strategic document that provides guidelines that direct the future maintenance and development of park facilities and programs in Fresno. Individual project details including precise project locations, project timing, material types, equipment used and construction drawings are not currently available. When specific individual projects are implemented, the City will conduct site-specific CEQA analysis as necessary. Implementation under the Parks Master Plan is required to comply with the goals and policies of the General Plan, Development Code and other regulatory documents. Therefore, long term impacts associated with the exposure of persons to or the generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local General Plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies would be less than significant.

e. Less than Significant. There are three airports land use plan areas located within the City of Fresno, the Fresno-Yosemite International Airport (FYI) Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, the Fresno Chandler Executive Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, and the Sierra Sky Park Land Use Policy Plan. Each of these plans contains separate airport analyses and control strategies that conform to FAA protocols. These plans

Initial Study Impact Checklist and Initial Study EA No. A-17-016 November 14, 2017 Page 70 of 88

restrict land uses according to potential noise impacts from aircraft operations. Individual project details including precise project locations, project timing, material types, equipment used and construction drawings are not currently available. When specific individual projects are implemented, the City will conduct site-specific CEQA analysis as necessary. Should future projects implementing the Parks Master Plan be proposed in an airport land use plan area, those projects will be required to conform to the land use restrictions of the airport's land use compatibility plan.

f. No Impact. There are no private airstrips within the Planning Area or within two miles of a public airport or a private airstrip. Therefore this project will not result in any impacts related to airport uses.

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

Initial Study Impact Checklist and Initial Study EA No. A-17-016 November 14, 2017 Page 71 of 88

| 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? | | | Х | |
| c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? | | | X | |

Background

The Fresno General Plan projects a population 780,600 by the year 2035. The General Plan is anticipated to accommodate up to approximately 425,000 additional persons for a total of 970,000 persons within the Planning Area by the buildout year of 2056. In addition, the General Plan area is projected to accommodate approximately 145,000 additional housing units for a total of approximately 332,000 units by the buildout year of 2056.

a. No Impact. The Parks Master Plan is a strategic document that provides guidelines that direct the future maintenance and development of park facilities and programs in Fresno. Implementation of the proposed Parks Master Plan would not result in the construction of new homes or businesses and would not facilitate the extension of infrastructure or other indirect means of inducing substantial population growth. Therefore the proposed project will have no impact on population growth in the area.

Initial Study Impact Checklist and Initial Study EA No. A-17-016 November 14, 2017 Page 72 of 88

b – c. Less than Significant Impact. The Parks Master Plan is a strategic document that provides guidelines that direct the future maintenance and development of park facilities and programs in Fresno. It is not the intent of the Parks Master Plan to propose the development of park facilities on sites that would cause displacement of either existing housing or substantial numbers of people. Individual project details including precise project locations, project timing, material types, equipment used and construction drawings are not currently available. When specific individual project are implemented, the City will conduct site-specific CEQA analysis as necessary. Implementation under the Parks Master Plan is required to comply with the goals and policies of the General Plan, Development Code and other regulatory documents. Therefore the proposed project will have a less than significant impact on population growth in the area.

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: | | | | |
| i) Fire protection? | | | X | |
| ii) Police protection? | | | X | |
| iii) Drainage and flood control? | | | Х | |
| iv) Parks? | | | X | |
| v) Schools? | | | X | |
| vi) Other public services? | | | | X |

i - vi. Less than Significant.

Fire Facilities

The Parks Master Plan would not involve residential development and would not result in an increased population. Implementation of the Parks Master Plan is not likely to result in a significant addition to the current number of calls for emergency services, nor decreased response times. Future new structures would be constructed to fire protection measures and compliant will all State and local codes. Therefore impacts

Initial Study Impact Checklist and Initial Study EA No. A-17-016 November 14, 2017 Page 74 of 88

related to the provision of fire protection and emergency medical services are considered less than significant. For wildland fire hazards see the Hazards and Hazardous Materials discussion above.

Police facilities

The Parks Master Plan would not involve residential development and would not result in an increased population. Implementation of the Parks Master Plan is not likely to result in significant numbers of additional calls or decreased response times for police protection services. The Parks Master Plan proposes strategies to increase the parks security, which is expected to support current police protection services and reduce the incidences of vandalism at park facilities. In addition, site design for future proposed facilities will incorporate the best available practices of Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED). Therefore impacts are considered less than significant.

Drainage and Flood Control

Implementation of the Parks Master Plan would involve park improvements and new parks. The development of park facilities could include an increase in impermeable surfaces and thus impact drainage and flood control public services. For discussion of drainage and flood control impacts see the Hydrology and Water Quality discussion above.

School facilities

The Parks Master Plan would not involve residential development and would not result in an increased population. The City has joint use agreements with Fresno Unified School District and Central Unified School District for access to districts facilities. The Parks Master Plan proposes expanding these agreements and developing future parks in conjunction with schools to provide supplemental recreational facilities. Implementation of the Parks Master Plan is not likely to result in a significant change to the existing school system. Therefore impacts are considered less than significant.

Parks

The Parks Master Plan would not involve residential development and would not result in an increased population. Implementation of the Parks Master Plan is expected to improve or maintain the City's standard for park land dedication (3 acres/1000 residents of pocket, neighborhood and community parks). Implementation is also expected to improve accessibility to park and recreation facilities and services within Fresno communities. Therefore, impacts are considered less than significant. See also the Recreation discussion below.

Initial Study Impact Checklist and Initial Study EA No. A-17-016 November 14, 2017 Page 75 of 88

Other facilities

The Parks Master Plan is expected to have no impact on hospitals or library services within the city of Fresno. Therefore impacts are considered to have no impact on other public facilities.

In conclusion, the proposed project is fully within the scope of the Fresno General Plan and would not result in any public services environmental impacts beyond those analyzed in MEIR SCH No. 2012111015.

Initial Study Impact Checklist and Initial Study EA No. A-17-016 November 14, 2017 Page 76 of 88

| 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 | |

- a. Less than Significant Impact. The Parks Master Plan is a strategic document that provides guidelines that direct the future maintenance and development of park facilities and programs in Fresno. As proposed, recreational improvements identified by the Master Plan would include improvements to existing facilities and parks, as well as the construction of additional facilities and parks, and strategies for expanded recreational programs. Proposed new facilities, improvements, program expansions and administrative strategies would be constructed based on City-defined level of service standards defined in the Parks Master Plan. The Parks Master Plan outlines the funding needs of Fresno's parks and open space system, emphasizing the total cost of ownership, and proposing strategies to provide adequate funding for the system. Implementation of the Parks Master Plan would not increase the use of existing recreational facilities such that physical deterioration would occur or be accelerated. The project would not increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities. Therefore, impacts are considered less than significant.
- **b.** Less Than Significant Impact. Implementation of the Parks Master Plan would include improvements to existing facilities and parks, as well as the construction of additional facilities and parks, and strategies for expanded recreational programs. As

Initial Study Impact Checklist and Initial Study EA No. A-17-016 November 14, 2017 Page 77 of 88

discussed throughout this document, the construction of these facilities has the potential to result in adverse physical effects on the environment. Individual project details including precise project locations, project timing, material types, equipment used and construction drawings are not currently available. When specific individual project are implemented, the City will conduct site-specific CEQA analysis as necessary. Therefore, impacts are considered less than significant.

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

| ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|--------------|
| XVI. TRANSPORTATION/ TRAFFIC Would the project: | | | | |
| a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths and mass transit? | | | X | |
| b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways? | | | | X |
| c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that result in substantial safety risks? | | | Х | |

Initial Study Impact Checklist and Initial Study EA No. A-17-016 November 14, 2017 Page 79 of 88

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

a. Less Than Significant.

Transit

The Parks Master Plan supports transit, recommending that new parks be located in areas with public transit, including Bus Rapid Transit corridors. However, improvements proposed by the Parks Master Plan are not anticipated to significantly affect transit performance or operations.

Bicycles/Pedestrians

The City does not have adopted standards for bicycle and pedestrian facility performance. Although the General Plan calls for the adoption of multi-modal level of service standards, this has yet to be implemented. The General Plan emphasizes the need for multi-modal connectivity and the parks and open space system:

MT-6 Establish a networks of multi-purpose pedestrian and bicycle paths, as well as limited access trails to link residential areas to local and regional open spaces and recreation areas and urban Activity Centers to enhance Fresno's recreation amenities and alternative transportation options.

Initial Study Impact Checklist and Initial Study EA No. A-17-016 November 14, 2017 Page 80 of 88

MT-6-a Link Residences to Destinations. Design a pedestrian and bicycle path network that links residential areas with Activity Centers, such as parks and recreation facilities, educational institutions, employment centers, cultural sites, and other focal points of the city environment.

MT-6-c Link Paths and Trails and Recreation Facilities. Strive to provide path or trail connections to recreational facilities, including parks and community centers where appropriate, and give priority to pathway improvements within neighborhoods characterized by lower vehicle ownership rates and lower per capita rates of parks and public open space.

The Parks Master Plan supports the General Plan's goals and policies through recommendations, including developing trails, greenways, parkways and other green connections linking neighborhoods to the citywide and regional parks system. New and refurbished existing parks would be designed to support and enhance any nearby bicycle infrastructure Improvements proposed by the Parks Master Plan are not anticipated to negatively impact bicycle or pedestrian operations.

Streets/Vehicles

Vehicle level of service (LOS) is defined in terms of a letter grade ranging from A to F, with LOS A as the best level of operation (free-flowing conditions), and LOS F as the worst level of operation (excessive delays, long vehicle queues, and intolerable conditions). The City of Fresno maintains a peak-hour LOS standard of D or better for all roadways outside of identified Activity Center and Bus Rapid Transit Corridor districts (City of Fresno 2014b, 4-29). The Parks Master Plan is a strategic document that provides guidelines that direct the future maintenance and development of park facilities and programs in Fresno. As proposed, recreational improvements identified by the Master Plan would include improvements to existing facilities and parks, as well as the construction of additional facilities and parks, and strategies for expanded recreational programs.

Implementation of the Parks Master Plan would involve improvements to existing recreational facilities as well as the development of new parks and open space facilities with the Planning Area. Although some facilities may be used by out-of-town visitors and other non-resident users, it is anticipated that community members will be the primary users of park facilities and improvements proposed by the Parks Master Plan. Pocket Parks and Neighborhood Park facilities would be associated with local residents and are not anticipated to generate volumes of traffic, or increases in traffic in relation to existing traffic loads and capacity of existing streets. However the development of larger facilities, including Community, Regional or Special Use Parks may include improvements, amenities and specialized facilities and public events that would result in

Initial Study Impact Checklist and Initial Study EA No. A-17-016 November 14, 2017 Page 81 of 88

use by non-residents and may include special events that draw large crowds. Development of these types of facilities has the potential to result in increases to traffic volumes, vehicle trips, or congestion. Individual project details including precise project locations, project timing, material types, equipment used and construction drawings are not currently available. When specific individual projects are implemented, the City will conduct site-specific CEQA analysis as necessary. Implementation under the Parks Master Plan is required to comply with the goals and policies of the General Plan, Development code, and other regulatory documents. Streets/Vehicles

- **b. No Impact.** The passage of A.B. 2419 in 1996 allowed counties to opt out of the California Congestion Management Program. In 1997, the Fresno COG Policy Board rescinded the Fresno County Congestion Management Program. Therefore this project will not impact a county congestion management program.
- **c f. Less than Significant**. There are three airport land use plan areas located within the City of Fresno, the Fresno-Yosemite International Airport (FYI) Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, the Fresno Chandler Executive Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, and the Sierra Sky Park Land Use Policy Plan. Each of these plans contains separate airport analyses and control strategies that conform to FAA protocols. These plans restrict land uses according to potential impacts from aircraft operations.

Individual project details including precise project locations, project timing, material types, equipment used and construction drawings are not currently available. When specific individual projects are implemented, the City will conduct site-specific CEQA analysis as necessary. Should future projects implementing the Parks Master Plan be proposed in an airport land use plan area, those projects will be required to conform to the land use restrictions of the airport's land use compatibility plan. During the entitlement process, any proposed routes or modifications to existing routes of ingress and egress for proposed recreational facilities would be evaluated for emergency access and parking impacts, and be subject to consistency with State and City-required standards, as defined by the Development Code and General Plan. Site-specific consistency with these standards and regulations would be verified during the entitlement process.

The Parks Master Plan is in keeping with the City of Fresno's the Active Transportation Plan (ATP). The ATP's active transportation network of pedestrian and bicycle facilities were developed to promote connectivity to park and open space facilities.

In conclusion, the proposed project would not result in any transportation/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. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS Would the project: | | | | |
| a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board? | | | Х | |
| 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? | | | Х | |

Initial Study Impact Checklist and Initial Study EA No. A-17-016 November 14, 2017 Page 83 of 88

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

a – g. Less than Significant. Implementation of the Parks Master Plan would not result in an increase in residential population or number of dwelling units. However, proposed parks may include restroom facilities, resulting in the creation of sewage and utilizing additional wastewater treatment capacity. It is not anticipated that the new facilities would generate sufficient volumes of sewage to require the construction of new wastewater treatment facilities. Proposed improvements to existing parks and the development of new parks have the potential to impact water usage and storm drainage, as well.

There are three landfills that serve Fresno County, American Avenue Landfill, Clovis Landfill and Coalinga Landfill, which are scheduled to close in 2013, 2047 and 2029, respectively. As of 2014, the City of Fresno is also achieving a 71 percent diversion rate for solid waste, with a Zero Waste goal by 2025 (City of Fresno 2014b, 6-28). Proposed projects would be required to meet federal, state and local solid waste regulation.

Initial Study Impact Checklist and Initial Study EA No. A-17-016 November 14, 2017 Page 84 of 88

The Parks Master Plan is a strategic document that provides guidelines that direct the future maintenance and development of park facilities and programs in Fresno. Individual project details including precise project locations, project timing, material types, equipment used and construction drawings are not currently available. When specific individual project are implemented, the City will conduct site-specific CEQA analysis as necessary. Implementation under the Parks Master Plan is required to comply with the goals and policies of the General Plan, Development Code and other regulatory documents.

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

Initial Study Impact Checklist and Initial Study EA No. A-17-016 November 14, 2017 Page 86 of 88

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.

Initial Study Impact Checklist and Initial Study EA No. A-17-016 November 14, 2017 Page 87 of 88

References

- California Air Resources Board. 2017. "Area Designation Maps: State and Local." Accessed October 18, 2017. http://www.arb.ca.gov/desig/adm/adm.htm
- California Department of Conservation, Division of Land Resource Protection [Divisino of Land Resource Protection]. 2016. "Rural Land Mapping Edition: Fresno County Important Farmland 2014, Sheet 2 of 2." Accessed October 20, 2017, http://www.conservation.ca.gov/dlrp/fmmp/Pages/Fresno.aspx.
- California Department of Conservation, California Geologic Survey [California Geologic Survey]. 2003. "Earthquake Shaking Potential for California." Accessed October 19, 2017. http://www.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/rghm/psha. . 2017. "Official Tsunami Inundation Maps." Accessed October 20, http://www.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/geologic_hazards/Tsunami/Inundation_Maps #Interactive. ___. 2007. Special Publication 42: Fault-Rupture Hazard Zones in California: Alguist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act. Sacramento: California Department of Conservation. . 1999. Update of Mineral Land Classification: Aggregate Materials in the Fresno Production-Consumption Region (parts of Fresno and Madera counties). California. Sacramento: California Department of Conservation. California Department of Transportation [Caltrans]. 2017. "California Scenic Highway Mapping System." Accessed October 20. http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/16_livability/scenic_highways/index.htm. California Environmental Protection Agency, California Department of Toxic Substances
- California Environmental Protection Agency, California Department of Toxic Substances Control [DTSC]. 2017 "EnviroStor." Accessed October 19. https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/.
- California Office of Emergency Services [OES]. 2015. "MyHazards" Accessed October 20, 2017. http://myhazards.caloes.ca.gov/.

| City of Fresno. 2016. 2015 Urban Water Management Plan. Fresno: City of Fresno. |
|---|
| 2014a. Fresno General Plan MEIR. Fresno: City of Fresno. |
| 2014b. <i>General Plan</i> . Fresno: City of Fresno. |
| 2011. Map Atlas: Existing Conditions Report. Fresno: City of Fresno. |

Initial Study Impact Checklist and Initial Study EA No. A-17-016 November 14, 2017 Page 88 of 88

- Department of the Interior, National Park Service [NPS]. 1997. Accessed October 20, 2017. http://www.nps.gov/nr/publications/bulletins/nrb16a.
- Federal Emergency Management Agency [FEMA]. 2009. "FEMA Flood Map Service Center" Accessed October 20, 2017. https://msc.fema.gov/portal.
- Fresno County, Airport Land Use Commission [ALUC]. 2000. Fresno-Chandler Downtown Airport Land Use Policy Plan. Fresno: Fresno County of Governments.
 _____. 2012. Fresno Yosemite International Airport Compatibility Land Use Plan. Fresno: Fresno County of Governments.
 _____. 2000. Sierra Sky Park Land Use Policy Plan. Fresno: Fresno County of Governments.

EXHIBIT B

MEIR Mitigation Measure Monitoring Checklist for Environmental Assessment No. A-17-016 Conducted for Plan Amendment Application No. A-17-016 for the adoption of the Active Transportation Plan November 14, 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 | Α | В | С | D | E | F |
|--|---------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Aesthetics: | | | | | | | | |
| AES-1. Lighting systems for street and parking areas shall include shields to direct light to the roadway surfaces and parking areas. Vertical shields on the light fixtures shall also be used to direct light away from adjacent light sensitive land uses such as residences. 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 | Α | В | С | D | E | F |
|---|---------------------------------------|---------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Aesthetics (continued): | | | | | | | | |
| AES-2: Lighting systems for public facilities such as active play areas shall provide adequate illumination for the activity; however, low intensity light fixtures and shields shall be used to minimize spillover light onto adjacent properties. | Prior to issuance of building permits | DARM. | X | | | | | |
| Verification comments: | | | | | | | | |
| AES-3: Lighting systems for non-residential uses, not including public facilities, shall provide shields on the light fixtures and orient the lighting system away from adjacent properties. Low intensity light fixtures shall also be used if excessive spillover light onto adjacent properties will occur. Verification comments: | Prior to issuance of building permits | DARM | Х | | | | | |
| 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

| MITIGATION MEASURE | WHEN IMPLEMENTED | COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY | Α | В | С | D | Е | F |
|--|---|---------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Aesthetics (continued): | | | | | | | | |
| AES-5: Materials used on building facades shall be non-reflective. | Prior to development | DARM | Х | | | | | |
| Verification comments: | project approval | | | | | | | |
| Air Quality: | | | | | | | | |
| AIR-1: Projects that include five or more heavy-duty truck deliveries per day with sensitive receptors located within 300 feet of the truck loading area shall provide a screening analysis to determine if the project has the potential to exceed criteria pollutant concentration based standards and thresholds for NO2 and PM2.5. If projects exceed screening criteria, refined dispersion modeling and health risk assessment shall be accomplished and if needed, mitigation measures to reduce impacts shall be included in the project to reduce the impacts to the extent feasible. Mitigation measures include but are not limited to: | Prior to development project approval | DARM | | | | | | X |
| 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: | | | | | | | | |

A - Incorporated into Project

B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process

D - Responsible Agency Contacted

E - Part of City-Wide Program

| MITIGATION MEASURE | WHEN IMPLEMENTED | COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY | Α | В | С | D | E | F |
|--|---|---------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Air Quality (continued): | | | | | | | | |
| 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: | Prior to development project approval | DARM | | | | | | X |
| 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. | | | | | | | | |
| (continued on next page) | | | | | | | | |

A - Incorporated into Project

B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process

D - Responsible Agency Contacted

E - Part of City-Wide Program

| MITIGATION MEASURE | WHEN IMPLEMENTED | COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY | Α | В | С | D | E | F |
|---|---|---------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Air Quality (continued): | | | | | | | | |
| AIR-2 (continued from previous page) 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: | [see previous page] | [see previous page] | | | | | | |
| AIR-3: Require developers proposing projects on ARB's list of projects in its Air Quality and Land Use Handbook (Handbook) warranting special consideration to prepare a cumulative health risk assessment when sensitive receptors are located within the distance screening criteria of the facility as listed in the ARB Handbook. Verification comments: | Prior to development project approval | DARM | | | | | | X |

A - Incorporated into Project

B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in ProcessD - Responsible Agency Contacted

E - Part of City-Wide Program

| MITIGATION MEASURE | WHEN IMPLEMENTED | COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY | Α | В | С | D | E | F |
|--|---|---------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Air Quality (continued): | | | | | | | | |
| AIR-4: Require developers of projects containing sensitive receptors to provide a cumulative health risk assessment at project locations exceeding ARB Land Use Handbook distance screening criteria or newer criteria that may be developed by the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD). Verification comments: | Prior to development project approval | DARM | X | | | | | |
| 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. 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

| MITIGATION MEASURE | WHEN IMPLEMENTED | COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY | Α | В | С | D | Ε | F |
|---|---|---------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Biological Resources: | | | | | | | | |
| 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. Verification comments: | Prior to development project approval | DARM | X | | | | | |
| 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 (continued on next page) | Prior to development project approval | DARM | Х | | | | | |

A - Incorporated into Project

B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process

D - Responsible Agency Contacted

E - Part of City-Wide Program

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

A - Incorporated into Project

B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process

D - Responsible Agency Contacted

E - Part of City-Wide Program

| MITIGATION MEASURE | WHEN IMPLEMENTED | COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY | Α | В | С | D | E | F |
|--|--|---------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Biological Resources (continued): | | | | | | | | |
| BIO-3 (continued from previous page): | [see previous page] | [see previous page] | | | | | | |
| 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. | | 7 0 1 | | | | | | |
| Verification comments: | | | | | | | | |
| 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 (continued on next page) | 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

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

A - Incorporated into Project

B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process

D - Responsible Agency Contacted

E - Part of City-Wide Program

| MITIGATION MEASURE | WHEN IMPLEMENTED | COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY | Α | В | С | D | Е | F |
|--|---|---------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Biological Resources (continued): | | | | | | | | |
| BIO-6: Project impacts that occur to riparian habitat may also result in significant impacts to streambeds or waterways protected under Section 1600 of Fish and Wildlife Code and Section 404 of the CWA. CDFW and/or USACE consultation, determination of mitigation strategy, and regulatory permitting to reduce impacts, as required for projects that remove riparian habitat and/or alter a streambed or waterway, shall be implemented. Verification comments: | Prior to development project approval | DARM | X | | | | | |
| 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. 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

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

| MITIGATION MEASURE | WHEN IMPLEMENTED | COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY | Α | В | С | D | E | F |
|---|---|---------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Biological Resources (continued): | | | | | | | | |
| BIO-9 (continued from previous page): | [see previous | [see previous | | | | | | |
| incorporating detention basins shall assist in ensuring project- related impacts to wetland habitat are minimized to the greatest extent feasible. | page] | page] | | | | | | |
| Verification comments: | | | | | | | | |
| Cultural Resources: | 1 | • | | | | | | |
| 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. | Prior to commencement of, and during, construction activities | DARM | X | | | | | |
| If the resources are determined to be unique historical resources as defined under Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines, measures shall be identified by the monitor and | | | | | | | | |
| (continued on next page) | | | | | | | | |

A - Incorporated into Project

B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process

D - Responsible Agency Contacted

E - Part of City-Wide Program

| MITIGATION MEASURE | WHEN IMPLEMENTED | COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY | Α | В | С | D | E | F |
|---|---|---------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Cultural Resources (continued): | | | | | | | | |
| CUL-1 (continued from previous page) | [see previous | [see previous | | | | | | |
| 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. | page] | page] | | | | | | |
| 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-germ preservation to allow future scientific study. | | | | | | | | |
| Verification comments: | | | | | | | | |
| 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. | Prior to commencement of, and during, construction activities | DARM | X | | | | | |
| 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 | | | | | | | | |
| (continued on next page) | | | | | | | | |

A - Incorporated into Project

B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process

D - Responsible Agency Contacted

E - Part of City-Wide Program

| MITIGATION MEASURE | WHEN IMPLEMENTED | COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY | Α | В | С | D | Ε | F |
|--|---------------------|---------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Cultural Resources (continued): | | | | | | | | |
| CUL-2 (continued from previous page) | [see previous | [see previous | | | | | | |
| 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. | page] | page] | | | | | | |
| If the resources are determined to be unique prehistoric archaeological resources as defined under Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines, mitigation measures shall be identified by the monitor and recommended to the Lead Agency. Appropriate measures for significant resources could include avoidance or capping, incorporation of the site in green space, parks, or open space, or data recovery excavations of the finds. No further grading shall occur in the area of the discovery until the Lead Agency approves the measures to protect these resources. Any prehistoric archaeological artifacts recovered as a result of mitigation shall be provided | | | | | | | | |
| (continued on next page) | | | | | | | | |

A - Incorporated into Project

B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process

D - Responsible Agency Contacted

E - Part of City-Wide Program

| MITIGATION MEASURE | WHEN IMPLEMENTED | COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY | Α | В | С | D | E | F |
|---|---------------------|---------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Cultural Resources (continued): | | | | | | | | |
| CUL-2 (further continued from previous two pages) | [see Page 14] | [see Page 14] | | | | | | |
| to a City-approved institution or person who is capable of providing long-term preservation to allow future scientific study. | | | | | | | | |
| 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. | | | | | | | | |
| 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 (continued on next page) | | | | | | | | |

A - Incorporated into Project

B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process

D - Responsible Agency Contacted

E - Part of City-Wide Program

| MITIGATION MEASURE | WHEN IMPLEMENTED | COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY | Α | В | С | D | Е | F |
|--|---|---------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Cultural Resources (continued): | | | | | | | | |
| CUL-2 (further continued from previous three pages) | [see Page 14] | [see Page 14] | | | | | | |
| excavation and/or construction activities, the procedure identified above for the discovery of unknown resources shall be followed. | | | | | | | | |
| Verification comments: | | | | | | | | |
| 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: | Prior to commencement of, and during, construction activities | DARM | X | | | | | |
| If unique paleontological/geological resources are not found during either the field survey or literature search, excavation and/or construction activities can commence. In the event that unique paleontological/geological resources are discovered during excavation and/or construction activities, construction shall stop in the immediate vicinity of the find and a qualified paleontologist shall be consulted to determine whether the resource requires further study. The qualified paleontologist shall make recommendations to the City on the measures that shall be implemented to protect the discovered | | | | | | | | |
| (continued on next page) | | | | | | | | |

A - Incorporated into Project

B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process

D - Responsible Agency Contacted

E - Part of City-Wide Program

| MITIGATION MEASURE | WHEN IMPLEMENTED | COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY | Α | В | С | D | E | F |
|---|---------------------|---------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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. | [see previous page] | [see previous page] | | | | | | |
| If unique paleontological/geological resources are found during the field survey or literature review, the resources shall be inventoried and evaluated for significance. If the resources are found to be significant, mitigation measures shall be identified by the qualified paleontologist. Similar to above, appropriate mitigation measures for significant resources could include avoidance or capping, incorporation of the site in green space, parks, or open space, or data recovery excavations of the finds. In addition, appropriate mitigation for excavation and construction activities in the vicinity of the (continued on next page) | | | | | | | | |

A - Incorporated into Project

B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process

D - Responsible Agency Contacted

E - Part of City-Wide Program

| MITIGATION MEASURE | WHEN IMPLEMENTED | COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY | Α | В | С | D | E | F |
|--|---|---------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Cultural Resources (continued): | | | | | | | | |
| CUL-3 (further continued from previous two pages) | [see Page 16] | [see Page 16] | | | | | | |
| 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. | | | | | | | | |
| Verification comments: | | | | | | | | |
| 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 | Prior to commencement of, and during, construction activities | DARM | X | | | | | |
| (continued on next page) | | | | | | | | |

A - Incorporated into Project

B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process

D - Responsible Agency Contacted

E - Part of City-Wide Program

| MITIGATION MEASURE | WHEN IMPLEMENTED | COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY | Α | В | С | D | E | F |
|--|---------------------|---------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Cultural Resources (continued): | | | | | | | | |
| CUL-4 (continued from previous page) likely descendent of the deceased Native American, who shall then serve as the consultant on how to proceed with the remains. Pursuant to PRC Section 5097.98(b), upon the discovery of | [see previous page] | [see previous page] | | | | | | |
| Native American remains, the landowner shall ensure that the immediate vicinity, according to generally accepted cultural or archaeological standards or practices, where the Native American human remains are located is not damaged or disturbed by further development activity until the landowner has discussed and conferred with the most likely descendants regarding their recommendations, if applicable, taking into account the possibility of multiple human remains. The landowner shall discuss and confer with the descendants all reasonable options regarding the descendants' preferences for treatment. | | | | | | | | |
| Verification comments: | | | | | | | | |

A - Incorporated into Project

B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process

D - Responsible Agency Contacted

E - Part of City-Wide Program

| MITIGATION MEASURE | WHEN IMPLEMENTED | COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY | Α | В | С | D | E | F |
|---|--------------------------------|---------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Hazards and Hazardous Materials | | | | | | | | |
| HAZ-1: Re-designate the existing vacant land proposed for low density residential located northwest of the intersection of East Garland Avenue and North Dearing Avenue and located within Fresno Yosemite International Airport Zone 1-RPZ, to Open Space. | Prior to development approvals | DARM | | | | | | X |
| Verification comments: | | | | | | | | |
| HAZ-2: Limit the proposed low density residential at (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. Verification comments: | Prior to development approvals | DARM | | | | | | x |
| HAZ-3: Re-designate the current area within Fresno Yosemite International Airport Zone 5-Sideline located northeast of the airport to Public Facilities-Airport or Open Space. Verification comments: | Prior to development approvals | DARM | | | | | | X |

Hazards and Hazardous Materials (continued):

A - Incorporated into Project

C - Mitigation in Process

E - Part of City-Wide Program

B - Mitigated

D - Responsible Agency Contacted

| MITIGATION MEASURE | WHEN IMPLEMENTED | COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY | Α | В | С | D | E | F |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| HAZ-4: Re-designate the current vacant lots at the northeast corner of Kearney Boulevard and South Thorne Avenue to Public Facilities-Airport or Open Space. Verification comments: | Prior to development approvals | DARM | | | | | | X |
| 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 | | | | | | х |
| 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 | | | | | | X |

A - Incorporated into Project

B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process

D - Responsible Agency Contacted

E - Part of City-Wide Program

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

| MITIGATION MEASURE | WHEN IMPLEMENTED | COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY | Α | В | С | D | E | F |
|--|---------------------|---------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Hydrology and Water Quality (continued): | | | | | | | | |
| 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. | [see previous page] | [see previous page] | | | | | | |
| Require developments that increase site imperviousness to install, operate, and maintain FMFCD approved on-site detention systems to reduce the peak runoff rates resulting from the increased imperviousness to the peak runoff rates that will not exceed the capacity of the existing stormwater collection systems. Verification comments: | | | | | | | | |

A - Incorporated into Project

B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process

D - Responsible Agency Contacted

E - Part of City-Wide Program

| MITIGATION MEASURE | WHEN IMPLEMENTED | COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY | Α | В | С | D | E | F |
|---|--|---------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Hydrology and Water Quality (continued): | | | | | | | | |
| HYD-5.2: The City and partnering agencies shall implement the following measures to reduce the impacts on the capacity of existing or planned storm drainage Master Plan retention basins to less than significant: 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: | Prior to exceedance of capacity of existing retention basin facilities | FMFCD, DARM, and PW | X | | | | X | |
| Increase the size of the retention basin through the purchase of more land or deepening the basin or a combination for planned retention basins. | | | | | | | | |
| Increase the size of the emergency relief pump capacity required to pump excess runoff volume out of the basin and into adjacent canal that convey the stormwater to a disposal facility for existing retention basins. | | | | | | | | |
| Require developments that increase runoff volume to install, operate, and maintain, Low Impact Development (LID) measures to reduce runoff volume to the runoff volume that will not exceed the capacity of the existing retention basins. | | | | | | | | |
| Verification comments: | | | | | | | | |

A - Incorporated into Project

B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process

D - Responsible Agency Contacted

E - Part of City-Wide Program

| MITIGATION MEASURE | WHEN IMPLEMENTED | COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY | Α | В | С | D | Ε | F |
|--|---|---------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Hydrology and Water Quality (continued): | | | | | | | | |
| 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. | Prior to exceedance of capacity of existing urban | FMFCD, DARM, and PW | X | | | | X | |
| 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: | detention basin (stormwater quality) facilities | | | | | | | |
| 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. | | | | | | | | |
| Verification comments: | | | | | | | | |

A - Incorporated into Project

B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process

D - Responsible Agency Contacted

E - Part of City-Wide Program

| MITIGATION MEASURE | WHEN IMPLEMENTED | COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY | Α | В | С | D | Ε | F |
|--|---|---------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Hydrology and Water Quality (continued): | | | | | | | | |
| 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. 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-update. Verification comments: | Prior to exceedance of capacity of existing pump disposal systems | FMFCD, DARM, and PW | | | | | X | |

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

| MITIGATION MEASURE | WHEN IMPLEMENTED | COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY | Α | В | С | D | E | F |
|--|---|---------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| HYD-5.5: The City shall work with FMFCD to develop and adopt an update to the SDMP for the Southeast Development Area that is 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. | Prior to development approvals in the Southeast Development Area | FMFCD, DARM, and PW | | | | | X | |
| Verification comments: | | | | | | | | |
| Public Services: | | | | | | | | |
| PS-1: As future fire facilities are planned, the fire department shall evaluate if specific environmental effects would occur. Typical impacts from fire facilities include noise, traffic, and lighting. Typical mitigation to reduce these impacts includes: | During the planning process for future fire department | DARM | | | | | X | |
| Noise: Barriers and setbacks on the fire department sites. | facilities | | | | | | | |
| Traffic: Traffic devices for circulation and a "keep clear zone" during emergency responses. | | | | | | | | |
| Lighting: Provision of hoods and deflectors on lighting fixtures on the fire department sites. | | | | | | | | |
| Verification comments: | | | | | | | | |

Public Services (continued):

A - Incorporated into Project

B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process

D - Responsible Agency Contacted

E - Part of City-Wide Program

| MITIGATION MEASURE | WHEN IMPLEMENTED | COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY | Α | В | С | D | E | F |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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: Noise: Barriers and setbacks on the police department sites. Traffic: Traffic devices for circulation. Lighting: Provision of hoods and deflectors on lighting fixtures on the fire department sites. Verification comments: | During the planning process for future Police Department facilities | DARM | | | | | X | |
| 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: (continued on next page) | During the planning process for future school facilities | DARM, local school districts, and the Division of the State Architect | | | | | X | |

Public Services (continued):

A - Incorporated into Project

B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process

D - Responsible Agency Contacted

E - Part of City-Wide Program

| MITIGATION MEASURE | WHEN IMPLEMENTED | COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY | Α | В | С | D | Е | F |
|--|---|---------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| PS-3 (continued from previous page) Noise: Barriers and setbacks placed on school sites. Traffic: Traffic devices for circulation. Lighting: Provision of hoods and deflectors on lighting fixtures for stadium lights. Verification comments: | [see previous page] | [see previous page] | | | | | | |
| PS-4: As future parks and recreational facilities are planned, the City shall evaluate if specific environmental effects would occur. Typical impacts from school facilities include noise, traffic, and lighting. Typical mitigation to reduce potential impacts from park and recreational facilities includes: Noise: Barriers and setbacks placed on school sites. Traffic: Traffic devices for circulation. Lighting: Provision of hoods and deflectors on lighting fixtures for outdoor play area/field lights. Verification comments: | During the planning process for future park and recreation facilities | DARM | x | | | | | |

Public Services (continued):

A - Incorporated into Project

B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process

D - Responsible Agency Contacted

E - Part of City-Wide Program

| MITIGATION MEASURE | WHEN IMPLEMENTED | COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY | Α | В | С | D | E | F |
|---|---|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| PS-5: As future detention, court, library, and hospital facilities are planned, the appropriate agencies shall evaluate if specific environmental effects would occur. Typical impacts from court, library, and hospital facilities include noise, traffic, and lighting. Typical mitigation to reduce potential impacts includes: Noise: Barriers and setbacks placed on school sites. Traffic: Traffic devices for circulation. Lighting: Provision of hoods and deflectors on outdoor lighting fixtures Verification comments: | During the planning process for future detention, court, library, and hospital facilities | DARM, to the extent that agencies constructing these facilities are subject to City of Fresno regulation | | | | | X | |
| Utilities and Service Systems | | | | | | | | |
| USS-1: The City shall develop and implement a wastewater master plan update. Verification comments: | Prior to wastewater conveyance and treatment demand | DPU | | | | | X | |

Utilities and Service Systems (continued):

A - Incorporated into Project

B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process

D - Responsible Agency Contacted

exceeding capacity

E - Part of City-Wide Program

| MITIGATION MEASURE | WHEN IMPLEMENTED | COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY | Α | В | С | D | E | F |
|--|---|---------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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: • Construct an approximately 70 MGD expansion of the | Prior to exceeding existing wastewater treatment capacity | DPU | | | | | X | |
| Regional Wastewater Treatment and Reclamation Facility and obtain revised waste discharge permits as the generation of wastewater is increased. | | | | | | | | |
| Construct an approximately 0.49 MGD expansion of the North Facility and obtain revised waste discharge permits as the generation of wastewater is increased. | | | | | | | | |
| Verification comments: | | | | | | | | |
| 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. After (continued on next page) | Prior to exceeding existing wastewater treatment capacity | DPU | | | | | X | |

A - Incorporated into Project

B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process

D - Responsible Agency Contacted

E - Part of City-Wide Program

| MITIGATION MEASURE | WHEN IMPLEMENTED | COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY | Α | В | С | D | E | F |
|---|---|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Utilities and Service Systems (continued): | | | | | | | | |
| USS-3 (continued from previous page) | [see previous | [see previous | | | | | | |
| approximately the year 2025, the City shall construct the following improvements: | page] | page] | | | | | | |
| Construct an approximately 24 MGD wastewater treatment facility within the Southeast Development Area and obtain revised waste discharge requirements as the generation of wastewater is increased. | | | | | | | | |
| Construct an approximately 9.6 MGD expansion of the Regional Wastewater Treatment and Reclamation Facility and obtain revised waste discharge permits as the generation of wastewater is increased. | | | | | | | | |
| Verification comments: | | | | | | | | |
| USS-4: 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 uncorporated area roadways). The plan shall identify access and parking restrictions, pavement markings and signage, and hours of construction and for deliveries. It shall include haul routes, the notification plan, and coordination with emergency service providers and schools. | Prior to construction of water and sewer facilities | PW for work in the City; PW and Fresno County Public Works and Planning when unincorporated area roadways are involved | | | | | X | |
| Verification comments: | | | | | | | | |

A - Incorporated into Project

B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process

D - Responsible Agency Contacted

E - Part of City-Wide Program

| MITIGATION MEASURE | WHEN IMPLEMENTED | COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY | Α | В | С | D | Е | F |
|---|---|---------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Utilities and Service Systems (continued): | | | | | | | | |
| USS-5 : Prior to exceeding capacity within the existing wastewater collection system facilities, the City shall evaluate the wastewater collection system and shall not approve additional development that would generate additional wastewater and exceed the capacity of a facility until additional capacity is provided. By approximately the year 2025, the following capacity improvements shall be provided. | Prior to exceeding capacity within the existing wastewater collection system facilities | DPU | | | | | X | |
| 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. | | | | | | | | |
| Marks Avenue Trunk Sewer: This facility shall be improved between Clinton Avenue and Kearney Boulevard. Approximately 12,150 feet of new sewer main shall be installed. The size of the new sewer main shall range from 33 inches to 60 inches in diameter. The associated project designations in the 2006 Wastewater Master Plan are CM1-REP and CM2-REP. | | | | | | | | |
| (continued on next page) | | | | | | | | |

A - Incorporated into Project

B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process

D - Responsible Agency Contacted

E - Part of City-Wide Program

| MITIGATION MEASURE | WHEN IMPLEMENTED | COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY | Α | В | С | D | E | F |
|---|---------------------|---------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Utilities and Service Systems (continued): | | | | | | | | |
| USS-5 (continued from previous page) North Avenue Trunk Sewer: This facility shall be improved between Polk and Fruit Avenues and also between Orange and Maple Avenues. Approximately 25,700 feet of new sewer main shall be installed. The size of the new sewer main shall range from 48 inches to 66 inches in diameter. The associated project designations in the 2006 Wastewater Master Plan are CN1-REL1 and CN3-REL1. | [see previous page] | [see previous page] | | | | | | |
| Ashlan Avenue Trunk Sewer: This facility shall be improved between Hughes and West Avenues and also between Fruit and Blackstone Avenues. Approximately 9,260 feet of new sewer main shall be installed. The size of the new sewer main shall range from 24 inches to 36 inches in diameter. The associated project designations in the 2006 Wastewater Master Plan are CA1-REL and CA2-REP. Verification comments: | | | | | | | | |

A - Incorporated into Project

B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process

D - Responsible Agency Contacted

E - Part of City-Wide Program

| MITIGATION MEASURE | WHEN IMPLEMENTED | COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY | Α | В | С | D | Е | F |
|---|---|---------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Utilities and Service Systems (continued): | | | | | | | | |
| USS-6: Prior to exceeding capacity within the existing 28 pipeline segments shown in Figures 1 and 2 in Appendix J-1, the City shall evaluate the wastewater collection system and shall not approve additional development that would generate additional wastewater and exceed the capacity of one of the 28 pipeline segments until additional capacity is provided. Verification comments: | Prior to exceeding capacity within the existing 28 pipeline seg- ments shown in Figures 1 and 2 in Appendix J-1 of the MEIR | DPU | | | | | X | |
| USS-7: Prior to exceeding existing water supply capacity, the City shall evaluate the water supply system and shall not approve additional development that demand additional water until additional capacity is provided. By approximately the year 2025, the following capacity improvements shall be provided. | Prior to exceeding existing water supply capacity | DPU | | | | | X | |
| 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. | | | | | | | | |
| (continued on next page) | | | | | | | | |

A - Incorporated into Project

B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process

D - Responsible Agency Contacted

E - Part of City-Wide Program

| MITIGATION MEASURE | WHEN IMPLEMENTED | COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY | Α | В | С | D | E | F |
|--|---|---------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Utilities and Service Systems (continued): | | | | | | | | |
| USS-7 (continued from previous page) | [see previous | [see previous | | | | | | |
| 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. | page] | page] | | | | | | |
| Construct an approximately 20 MGD surface water treatment facility in the southwest portion of the City, in accordance with Chapter 9 and Figure 9-1 of the 2014 Metro Plan Update. | | | | | | | | |
| Verification comments: | | | | | | | | |
| USS-8: Prior to exceeding capacity within the existing water conveyance facilities, the City shall evaluate the water conveyance system and shall not approve additional development that would demand additional water and exceed the capacity of a facility until additional capacity is provided. The following capacity improvements shall be provided by approximately 2025. | Prior to exceeding capacity within the existing water conveyance facilities | DPU | | | | | X | |
| Construct 65 new groundwater wells, in accordance with Chapter 9 and Figure 9-1 of the 2014 Metro Plan Update. | | | | | | | | |
| (continued on next page) | | | | | | | | |

A - Incorporated into Project

B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process

D - Responsible Agency Contacted

E - Part of City-Wide Program

| MITIGATION MEASURE | WHEN IMPLEMENTED | COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY | Α | В | С | D | E | F |
|--|------------------|---------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Utilities and Service Systems (continued): | | | | | | | | |
| USS-8 (continued from previous page) | [see previous | [see previous | | | | | | |
| 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. | page] | page] | | | | | | |
| Construct a 3.0 million gallon potable water reservoir (Reservoir T3) near the intersection of Temperance and Dakota Avenues, in accordance with Chapter 9 and Figure 9-1 of the 2014 Metro Plan Update. | | | | | | | | |
| Construct a 3.0 million gallon potable water reservoir (Reservoir T4) in the Downtown Planning Area, in accordance with Chapter 9 and Figure 9-1 of the 2014 Metro Plan Update. | | | | | | | | |
| Construct a 4.0 million gallon potable water reservoir (Reservoir T5) near the intersection of Ashlan and Chestnut Avenues, in accordance with Chapter 9 and Figure 9-1 of the 2014 Metro Plan Update. | | | | | | | | |
| Construct a 4.0 million gallon potable water reservoir (Reservoir T6) near the intersection of Ashlan Avenue and Highway 99, in accordance with Chapter 9 and Figure 9-1 of the 2014 Metro Plan Update. | | | | | | | | |
| (continued on next page) | | | | | | | | |

WILL

A - Incorporated into Project

B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process

D - Responsible Agency Contacted

E - Part of City-Wide Program

| MITIGATION MEASURE | WHEN IMPLEMENTED | COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY | Α | В | С | D | Е | F |
|---|---|---------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Utilities and Service Systems (continued): | | | | | | | | |
| USS-8 (continued from previous two pages) | [see Page 37] | [see Page 37] | | | | | | |
| 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. | | | | | | | | |
| Verification comments: | | | | | | | | |
| 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. | Prior to exceeding capacity within the existing water conveyance facilities | DPU | | | | | х | |
| (continued on next page) | | | | | | | | |

A - Incorporated into Project

B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process

D - Responsible Agency Contacted

E - Part of City-Wide Program

| MITIGATION MEASURE | WHEN IMPLEMENTED | COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY | Α | В | С | D | Е | F |
|---|-----------------------|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Utilities and Service Systems (continued): | | | | | | | | |
| USS-9 (continued from previous page) | [see previous | [see previous | | | | | | |
| Construct a 4.0 million gallon potable water reservoir (SEDA Reservoir 1) within the northern part of the Southeast Development Area. | page] | page] | | | | | | |
| Construct a 4.0 million gallon potable water reservoir (SEDA Reservoir 2) within the southern part of the Southeast Development Area. | | | | | | | | |
| 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. | | | | | | | | |
| Verification comments: | | | | | | | | |
| Utilities and Service Systems - Hydrology and Water Quality | | | | | | | | |
| 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. | During the dry season | Fresno Irrigation District (FID) | | | | | | X |
| Verification comments: | | | | | | | | |

A - Incorporated into Project

B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process

D - Responsible Agency Contacted

E - Part of City-Wide Program

| MITIGATION MEASURE | WHEN IMPLEMENTED | COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY | Α | В | С | D | E | F |
|--|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Utilities and Service Systems - Biological Resources: | | | | | | | | |
| USS-11: When FMFCD proposes to provide drainage service outside of urbanized areas: (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. | Prior to development approvals outside of highly urbanized areas | California Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), and USACE | | | | | | X |
| (b) Where proposed activities could have an impact on areas verified by the Corps as jurisdictional wetlands or waters of the U.S. (urban and rural streams, seasonal wetlands, and vernal pools), FMFCD shall obtain the necessary Clean Water Act, Section 404 permits for activities where fill material shall be placed in a wetland, obstruct the flow or circulation of waters of the United States, impair or reduce the reach of such waters. As part of FMFCD's Memorandum of Understanding with CDFG, Section 404 and 401 permits would be obtained from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and from the (continued on next page) | | | | | | | | |

A - Incorporated into Project

B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process

D - Responsible Agency Contacted

E - Part of City-Wide Program

| MITIGATION MEASURE | WHEN IMPLEMENTED | COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY | Α | В | С | D | Ε | F |
|---|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Utilities and Service Systems - Biological Resources (con | inued): | | | | | | | |
| USS-11 (continued from previous page) | [see previous | [see previous | | | | | | |
| Regional Water Quality Control Board for any activi involving filling of jurisdictional waters). At a minimum, meet "no net loss policy," the permits shall requi replacement of wetland habitat at a 1:1 ratio. | 0 | page] | | | | | | |
| (c) Where proposed activities could have an impact of areas verified by the Corps as jurisdictional wetlands waters of the U.S. (urban and rural streams, season wetlands, and vernal pools), FMFCD shall submit ar implement a wetland mitigation plan based on the wetland acreage verified by the U.S. Army Corps Engineers. The wetland mitigation plan shall be prepared by a qualified biologist or wetland scientification, and shall include the following or equally effective elements: | or al d e of e st | | | | | | | |
| Specific location, size, and existing hydrology ar soils within the wetland creation area. | d | | | | | | | |
| ii. Wetland mitigation techniques, seed source planting specifications, and required buff setbacks. In addition, the mitigation plan share ensure adequate water supply is provided to the created wetlands in order to maintain the proper | er all e | | | | | | | |
| (continued on next pag | e) | | | | | | | |

A - Incorporated into Project

B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process

D - Responsible Agency Contacted

E - Part of City-Wide Program

| | MITIGATION MEASURE | WHEN IMPLEMENTED | COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY | Α | В | С | D | Е | F |
|--------|---|---------------------|---------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Utilit | ies and Service Systems - Biological Resources (continue | ed): | | | | | | | |
| USS | 6-11 (continued from previous two pages) | [see Page 41] | [see Page 41] | | | | | | |
| | 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. | | | | | | | | |
| (d) | A monitoring plan shall be developed and implemented by a qualified biologist to monitor results of any on-site wetland restoration and creation for five years. The monitoring plan shall include specific success criteria, frequency and timing of monitoring, and assessment of whether or not maintenance activities are being carried out and how these shall be adjusted if necessary. | | | | | | | | |
| | (continued on next page) | | | | | | | | |

A - Incorporated into Project

B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process

D - Responsible Agency Contacted

E - Part of City-Wide Program

| MITIGATION MEASU | IRE | WHEN IMPLEMENTED | COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY | Α | В | С | D | E | F |
|--|--|--|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Utilities and Service Systems - Biologic | cal Resources (continue | ed): | | | | | | | |
| USS-11 (continued from previous three p | pages) | [see Page 41] | [see Page 41] | | | | | | |
| If monitoring reveals that success met, remedial habitat creation or designed and implemented by a consubject to five years of monitoring a | restoration should be qualified biologist and | | | | | | | | |
| Or | | | | | | | | | |
| (e) In lieu of developing a mitigation parchase, or creation could purchase mitigation credit approved Mitigation Bank. | of wetlands, FMFCD | | | | | | | | |
| Verification comments: | | | | | | | | | |
| MM USS-12: When FMFCD proposes service outside in areas that support service outside in areas that support service outside in areas that support services. (a) During facility design and prior to disturbing activities in areas that wetlands or vernal pools, FMFC preliminary rare plant assessment. determine the likelihood on wheth site could support rare plants. If it is project site would not support rare plants. | seasonal wetlands or initiation of ground at support seasonal CD shall conduct a The assessment will her or not the project is determined that the | During 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 |
| (CC | эпшпией отг пехт раде) ———————————————————————————————————— | | | | | | | | |

A - Incorporated into Project

B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process

D - Responsible Agency Contacted

E - Part of City-Wide Program

| MITIGATION MEASURE | WHEN IMPLEMENTED | COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY | Α | В | С | D | Ε | F |
|---|------------------|---------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Utilities and Service Systems - Biological Resources (continue | ed): | | | | | | | |
| USS-12 (continued from previous page) | [see previous | [see previous | | | | | | |
| action is required. However, if the project site has the potential to support rare plants; then a rare plant survey shall be conducted. Rare plant surveys shall be conducted by qualified biologists in accordance with the most current CDFG/USFWS guidelines or protocols and shall be conducted at the time of year when the plants in question are identifiable. | page] | page] | | | | | | |
| (b) Based on the results of the survey, prior to design approval, FMFCD shall coordinate with CDFG and/or implement a Section 7 consultation with USFWS, shall determine whether the project facility would result in a significant impact to any special status plant species. Evaluation of project impacts shall consider the following: | | | | | | | | |
| The status of the species in question (e.g., officially listed by the State or Federal Endangered Species Acts). | | | | | | | | |
| The relative density and distribution of the on-site occurrence versus typical occurrences of the species in question. | | | | | | | | |
| (continued on next page) | | | | | | | | |

A - Incorporated into Project

B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process

D - Responsible Agency Contacted

E - Part of City-Wide Program

| MITIGATION MEASURE | WHEN IMPLEMENTED | COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY | Α | В | С | D | Е | F |
|--|---|---------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Utilities and Service Systems - Biological Resources (continue | ed): | | | | | | | |
| USS-12 (continued from previous two pages) | [see Page 44] | [see Page 44] | | | | | | |
| The habitat quality of the on-site occurrence relative to historic, current or potential distribution of the population. | | | | | | | | |
| (c) Prior to design approval, and in consultation with the CDFG and/or the USFWS, FMFCD shall prepare and implement a mitigation plan, in accordance with any applicable State and/or federal statutes or laws, that reduces impacts to a less than significant level. | | | | | | | | |
| Verification comments: | | | | | | | | |
| USS-13: When FMFCD proposes to provide drainage service outside in areas that support seasonal wetlands or vernal pools: | During facility design and prior to initiation of ground | CDFW and USFWS | | | | | | X |
| (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. | disturbing activities in areas that support seasonal wetlands or | | | | | | | |
| (continued on next page) | vernal pools | | | | | | | |

A - Incorporated into Project

B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process

D - Responsible Agency Contacted

E - Part of City-Wide Program

| | MITIGATION MEASURE | WHEN IMPLEMENTED | COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY | Α | В | С | D | Ε | F |
|---------|--|---------------------|---------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Utiliti | es and Service Systems - Biological Resources (continue | ed): | | | | | | | |
| USS | 3-13 (continued from previous page) | [see previous | [see previous | | | | | | |
| (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. | page] | page] | | | | | | |
| (c) | If fairy shrimp are found to be present within vernal pools or other areas of inundation to be impacted by the implementation of storm drainage facilities, FMFCD shall mitigate impacts on fairy shrimp habitat in accordance with the USFWS requirements of the Programmatic Biological Opinion. This shall include on-site or off-site creation and/or preservation of fairy shrimp habitat at ratios ranging from 3:1 to 5:1 depending on the habitat impacted and the choice of on-site or off-site mitigation. Or mitigation shall be the purchase of mitigation credit through an accredited mitigation bank. | | | | | | | | |
| Veri | fication comments: | | | | | | | | |

A - Incorporated into Project

B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process

D - Responsible Agency Contacted

E - Part of City-Wide Program

| MITIGATION MEASURE | WHEN IMPLEMENTED | COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY | Α | В | С | D | E | F |
|--|---|---------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Utilities and Service Systems - Biological Resources (continu | ed): | | | | | | | |
| USS-14: When FMFCD proposes to construct drainage facilities in an area where elderberry bushes may occur: (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. (b) FMFCD shall avoid and protect all potential identified VELB habitat where feasible. (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. Verification comments: | 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

| MITIGATION MEASURE | WHEN IMPLEMENTED | COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY | A | В | С | D | E | F |
|--|---|---------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Utilities and Service Systems - Biological Resources (continue | ed): | | | | | | | |
| USS-15: Prior to ground disturbing activities during nesting season (March through July) for a project that supports bird nesting habitat, FMFCD shall conduct a survey of trees. If nests are found during the survey, a qualified biologist shall assess the nesting activity on the project site. If active nests are located, no construction activities shall be allowed within 250 feet of the nest until the young have fledged. If construction activities are planned during the 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 |
| USS-16: When FMFCD proposes to construct drainage facilities in an area that supports bird 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 (levee and canal berms, open grasslands with suitable burrows) during the same calendar year that construction is planned to begin. If phased construction procedures are planned for the proposed project, the results of the above survey shall be valid only for the season when it is conducted. (continued on next page) | Prior to ground disturbing activities during nesting season (March through July) for a project that supports bird nesting habitat | CDFW and USFWS | | | | | | X |

A - Incorporated into Project

B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process

D - Responsible Agency Contacted

E - Part of City-Wide Program

| MITIGATION MEASURE | WHEN IMPLEMENTED | COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY | Α | В | С | D | Е | F |
|---|---------------------|---------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Utilities and Service Systems - Biological Resources (continue | ed): | | | | | | | |
| (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. | [see previous page] | [see previous page] | | | | | | |
| Based on approval by CDFG, pre-construction and pre-breeding season exclusion measures may be implemented to preclude burrowing owl occupation of the project site prior to project-related disturbance. Burrowing owls can be passively excluded from potential nest sites in the construction area, either by closing the burrows or placing one-way doors in the burrows according to current CDFG protocol. Burrows shall be examined not more than 30 days before construction to ensure that no owls have recolonized the area of construction. (continued on next page) | | | | | | | | |

A - Incorporated into Project

B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process

D - Responsible Agency Contacted

E - Part of City-Wide Program

| MITIGATION MEASURE | WHEN IMPLEMENTED | COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY | Α | В | С | D | Е | F |
|--|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Utilities and Service Systems - Biological Resources (continue | ed): | | | | | | | |
| USS-16 (continued from previous two pages) For each burrow destroyed, a new burrow shall be created (by installing artificial burrows at a ratio of 2:1 on protected lands nearby. | [see Page 49] | [see Page 49] | | | | | | |
| Verification comments: USS-17: When FMFCD proposes to construct drainage facilities in the San Joaquin River corridor: (a) FMFCD shall not conduct instream activities in the San Joaquin River between October 15 and April 15. If this is not feasible, FMFCD shall consult with the National Marine Fisheries Service and CDFW on the appropriate measures to be implemented in order to protect listed salmonids in the San Joaquin River. (b) Riparian vegetation shading the main—channel that is removed or damaged shall be replaced at a ratio and quantity sufficient to maintain the existing shading of the | During instream activities conducted between October 15 and April 15 | National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), CDFW, and Central Valley Flood Protection Board (CVFPB) | | | | | | x |
| channel. The location of replacement trees on or within (continued on next page) | | | | | | | | |

A - Incorporated into Project

B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process

D - Responsible Agency Contacted

E - Part of City-Wide Program

| MITIGATION MEASURE | WHEN IMPLEMENTED | COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY | Α | В | С | D | Е | F |
|--|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Utilities and Service Systems / Biological Resources (continue | rd): | | | | | | | |
| 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: 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: | Prior to final design approval of all elements of the District Services 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

| MITIGATION MEASURE | WHEN IMPLEMENTED | COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY | Α | В | С | D | E | F |
|--|--|------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Utilities and Service Systems - Recreation / Trails (continued): | : | | | | | | | |
| USS-18 (continued from previous page) | [see previous | [see previous | | | | | | |
| (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. | page] | page] | | | | | | |
| (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: | | | | | | | | |
| Utilities and Service Systems – <i>Air Quality</i> : | | | | | | | | |
| USS-19: When District drainage facilities are constructed, FMFCD shall: | During storm water drainage | Fresno Metropolitan | | | | | | Х |
| (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. | facility construction activities | Flood Control District and SJVAPCD | | | | | | |
| (continued on next page) | | | | | | | | |

A - Incorporated into Project

B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process

D - Responsible Agency Contacted

E - Part of City-Wide Program

| | MITIGATION MEASURE | WHEN IMPLEMENTED | COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY | Α | В | С | D | Е | F |
|-------------------------|---|--|---------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Utilit | ties and Service Systems – Air Quality (continued): | | | | | | | | |
| USS | S-19 (continued from previous page) | [see previous | [see previous | | | | | | |
| (b) | Construction shall be curtailed as much as possible when the Air Quality Index (AQI) is above 150. AQI forecasts can be found on the SJVAPCD web site. | | | | | | | | |
| (c) | Off-road trucks should be equipped with on-road engines if possible. | | | | | | | | |
| | (d) Construction equipment should have engines that meet the current off-road engine emission standard (as certified by CARB), or be re-powered with an engine that meets this standard. | | | | | | | | |
| Vei | rification comments: | | | | | | | | |
| wat to app sto | S-20: Prior to exceeding capacity within the existing storm ter drainage facilities, the City shall coordinate with FMFCD evaluate the storm water drainage system and shall not prove additional development that would convey additional rm water to a facility that would experience an exceedance capacity until the necessary additional capacity is provided. | inage Facilities: 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

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

A - Incorporated into Project

B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process

D - Responsible Agency Contacted

E - Part of City-Wide Program

EXHIBIT C

PROJECT-SPECIFIC MITIGATION MONITORING CHECKLIST For Environmental Assessment No. A-17-16 November 14, 2017

This monitoring checklist for the above noted environmental assessment is being prepared in accordance with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), as required under Assembly Bill 3180, and is intended to establish a project-specific reporting/monitoring program for Environmental Assessment No. A-17-16. Verification of implementation of these mitigation measures, in addition to the applicable measures specified for this project per the Mitigation Monitoring Checklist prepared for this project pursuant to Master Environmental Impact Report No. SCH No. 2012111015 Fresno General Plan, will be required upon the application for subdivision of the project site, special permits, or grading on the project site. The captions below refer to corresponding sections of the Initial Study checklist for this project, using the Appendix G format from the CEQA Guidelines.

MITIGATION MEASURES FOR ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT NO. A-17-16

| MITIGATION MEASURE | IMPLEMENTED BY | WHEN IMPLEMENTED | VERIFIED BY |
|---|----------------|--|---|
| 1. Project shall implement and incorporate, as appropriate all mitigation measures as identified in the attached Master Environmental Impact Report No. SCH No. 2012111015 Fresno General Plan Mitigation Monitoring Checklist dated November 14, 2017. | Applicant | Processing and review of project proposal prior to construction. | City of Fresno Development & Resource Management and Public Works Departments |
| VIII. Hazards and Hazardous Materials-1a. Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the applicant shall ensure that a Phase I ESA shall be conducted for each individual property to ascertain the presence or absence of Recognized Environmental Conditions, Historical Recognized Environmental | Applicant | Prior to issuance of grading permits or construction | City of Fresno Development & Resource Management and Public Works Departments |

EXHIBIT C: PROJECT-SPECIFIC MITIGATION MONITORING CHECKLIST FOR EA No. A-17-16

| Conditions, and Potential Environmental Concerns. The findings and conclusions of the Phase I ESA shall become the basis for potential recommendations for follow-up investigation, if found to be warranted. | | | |
|---|-----------|--|---|
| Materials 1b. In the event that the findings and conclusions of the Phase I ESA for a property result in evidence of RECs, HRECs, and/or PECs warranting further investigation, the applicant shall ensure that a Phase II ESA shall be conducted to determine the presence or absence of a significant impact to the subject site from hazardous materials. The Phase II ESA may include, but may not be limited to, the following: (1) Collection and laboratory analysis of soils and/or groundwater samples to ascertain the presence or absence or significant concentrations of constituents of concern; (2) Collection and laboratory analysis of soil vapors to ascertain the presence or absence or significant concentrations of volatile constituents of concern; and/or (3) Geophysical surveys to ascertain the presence or absence of subsurface features of concern such as USTs, | Applicant | Prior to issuance of grading permits or construction | City of Fresno Development & Resource Management and Public Works Departments |

EXHIBIT C: PROJECT-SPECIFIC MITIGATION MONITORING CHECKLIST FOR EA No. A-17-16

| drywells, drains, plumbing, and septic systems. The findings and conclusions of the Phase II ESA shall become the basis for potential recommendations for follow-up investigation, site characterization, and/or remedial activities, if found to be warranted | | | |
|--|-----------|--|---|
| VIII. Hazards and Hazardous Materials 1c. In the event the findings and conclusions of the Phase II ESA reveal the presence of significant concentrations of hazardous materials warranting further investigation, the applicant shall ensure that site characterization shall be conducted in the form of additional Phase II ESAs in order to characterize the source and maximum extent of impacts from constituents of concern. The findings and conclusions of the site characterization shall become the basis for formation of a remedial action plan and/or risk assessment. | Applicant | Prior to issuance of grading permits or construction | City of Fresno Development & Resource Management and Public Works Departments |
| VIII. Hazards and Hazardous Materials 1d. If the findings and conclusions of the Phase II ESAs, site characterization and/or risk assessment demonstrate the presence of concentrations of hazardous | Applicant | Prior to issuance of grading permits or construction | City of Fresno Development & Resource Management and Public Works Departments |

EXHIBIT C: PROJECT-SPECIFIC MITIGATION MONITORING CHECKLIST FOR EA No. A-17-16

| materials exceeding regulatory threshold levels, prior to the issuance of a grading permit applicant shall complete site remediation and potential risk assessment with oversight from the applicable regulatory agency including, but not limited to, the Cal-EPA Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) and Fresno County Department of Environmental Health Services (FCEHS). Potential remediation could include the removal or treatment of water and/or soil. If removal occurs, hazardous materials shall be transported and disposed at a hazardous materials permitted facility. | | | |
|---|-----------|--------------------------------|---|
| VIII. Hazards and Hazardous Materials 2a. In the event that unknown soil contamination is discovered during grading activities, the applicant shall ensure that site characterization shall be conducted in the form of a Phase II ESA in order to characterize the source and maximum extent of impacts from constituents of concern. The findings and conclusions of the site characterization shall become the basis for formation of a remedial action plan and/or risk assessment | Applicant | During construction activities | City of Fresno Development & Resource Management and Public Works Departments |

EXHIBIT C: PROJECT-SPECIFIC MITIGATION MONITORING CHECKLIST FOR EA No. A-17-16

| VIII. Hazards and Hazardous Materials 2b. If the findings and conclusions of the Phase II ESA, site characterization and/or risk assessment demonstrate the presence of hazardous materials exceeding regulatory threshold levels, the applicant shall complete sites remediation and potential risk assessment with oversight from the applicable regulatory agency, including but not limited to, the Cal-EPA DTSC or RWQCB, and FCEHS. Potential remediation could include the removal or treatment of water and/or soil. If removal occurs, hazardous materials shall be transported and disposed of at a hazardous materials permitted facility | | During construction activities | City of Fresno Development & Resource Management and Public Works Departments |
|--|--|--------------------------------|---|
|--|--|--------------------------------|---|