




INITIAL STUDY / MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

Fig Garden Financial Center
Office Building - Environmental
Assessment No. P18-03659

May 2019

PREPARED FOR:

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

PREPARED BY:



Crawford & Bowen Planning, Inc.
113 N. Church Street, Suite 302
Visalia, CA 93291

Initial Study/ Mitigated Negative Declaration

**Fig Garden Land Holdings Office Building Plan Amendment and
Rezone Application No. P18-03659**

Prepared for:

City of Fresno
Development and Resource Management Department
2600 Fresno Street
Fresno, CA 93721
Contact: Margo Lerwill, Supervising Planner
(559) 621-8153

Prepared by:



Crawford & Bowen Planning, Inc.
113 N. Church Street, Suite 302
Visalia, CA 93291
(559) 840-4414
Contact: Travis Crawford, AICP

May 2019

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE - INTRODUCTION

1.1 Project Summary	1-1
1.2 Document Format	1-1

CHAPTER TWO – PROJECT DESCRIPTION

2.1 Project Background	2-1
2.2 Project Location and Setting	2-1
2.3 Project Description	2-2
2.4 Other Required Approvals	2-7

CHAPTER THREE – INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

3.1 Environmental Checklist Form	3-1
3.2 Environmental Factors Potentially Affected	3-3
3.3 Determination	3-3
I. Aesthetics	3-8
II. Agricultural and Forest Resources	3-14
III. Air Quality	3-17
IV. Biological Resources	3-24
V. Cultural Resources	3-29
VI. Energy	3-32
VII. Geology and Soils	3-37
VIII. Greenhouse Gas Emissions	3-42
IX. Hazards and Hazardous Materials	3-46
X. Hydrology	3-51
XI. Land Use and Planning	3-57
XII. Mineral Resources	3-61
XIII. Noise	3-62
XIV. Population and Housing	3-66
XV. Public Services	3-68
XVI. Recreation	3-71
XVII. Transportation / Traffic	3-72
XVIII. Tribal Cultural Resources	3-76
XIX. Utilities and Service Systems	3-78
XX. Wildfire	3-82
XXI. Mandatory Findings of Significance	3-84

CHAPTER FOUR – MITIGATION MONITORING PROGRAM

Project-Specific Mitigation Program	4-1
Fresno General Plan MEIR Mitigation Checklist	

CHAPTER FIVE – LIST OF PREPARERS

5-1

(Contd.)

LIST OF FIGURES

1 – Project Vicinity Map	2-3
2 – Site Aerial	2-4
3 – Project Master Plan	2-5
4 – Building Elevation A	3-11
5 – Building Elevation B	3-12

LIST OF TABLES

1 – Standards and Attainment Status	3-18
2 – Project Construction Emissions in Tons	3-21
3 – 2016 CA Energy Consumption	3-33
4 – Annual Project Energy Consumption by Land Use	3-35
5 – Typical Construction Noise Levels	3-63
6 – Proposed Project Trip Generation	3-73

APPENDICES

- A- Air Emissions Output Table
- B- Project Trip Generation Analysis

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Project Summary

This document, Environmental Assessment No. P18-03659, is the Initial Study / Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) on the potential environmental effects of the Fig Garden Office Building Project (Project). The Project consists of construction and operation of a four-story 100,000 square foot office building, parking area, and related improvements. The proposed Project is more fully described in Chapter Two – Project Description.

The City of Fresno will act as the Lead Agency for this project pursuant to the *California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)* and the *CEQA Guidelines*.

1.2 Document Format

This IS/MND contains five chapters, and appendices. Chapter 1, Introduction, provides an overview of the project and the CEQA environmental documentation process. Chapter 2, Project Description, provides a detailed description of project objectives and components. Chapter 3, Initial Study Checklist, presents the CEQA checklist and environmental analysis for all impact areas, mandatory findings of significance, and feasible mitigation measures. If the proposed project does not have the potential to significantly impact a given issue area, the relevant section provides a brief discussion of the reasons why no impacts are expected. If the project could have a potentially significant impact on a resource, the issue area discussion provides a description of potential impacts, and appropriate mitigation measures and/or permit requirements that would reduce those impacts to a less than significant level. Chapter 4, Mitigation and Monitoring Program provides the list of applicable mitigation measures that must be complied with. There are two mitigation lists: a Project-specific mitigation program and the City's General Plan Master EIR mitigation checklist. Both are applicable to the Project. Chapter 5, List of Preparers, provides a list of key personnel involved in the preparation of the IS/MND.

Environmental impacts are separated into the following categories:

Potentially Significant Impact. This category is applicable if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant, and no feasible mitigation measures can be identified to reduce impacts to a less than significant level. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.

Less Than Significant After Mitigation Incorporated. This category applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures would reduce an effect from a "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than

Significant Impact.” The lead agency must describe the mitigation measure(s), and briefly explain how they would reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from earlier analyses may be cross-referenced).

Less Than Significant Impact. This category is identified when the project would result in impacts below the threshold of significance, and no mitigation measures are required.

No Impact. This category applies when a project would not create an impact in the specific environmental issue area. “No Impact” answers do not require a detailed explanation if they are adequately supported by the information sources cited by the lead agency, which show that the impact does not apply to the specific project (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.)

Regardless of the type of CEQA document that must be prepared, the basic purpose of the CEQA process as set forth in the CEQA Guidelines Section 15002(a) is to:

- (1) Inform governmental decision makers and the public about the potential, significant environmental effects of proposed activities.
- (2) Identify ways that environmental damage can be avoided or significantly reduced.
- (3) Prevent significant, avoidable damage to the environment by requiring changes in projects through the use of alternatives or mitigation measures when the governmental agency finds the changes to be feasible.
- (4) Disclose to the public the reasons why a governmental agency approved the project in the manner the agency chose if significant environmental effects are involved.

According to Section 15070(b), a Mitigated Negative Declaration is appropriate if it is determined that:

- (1) Revisions in the project plans or proposals made by or agreed to by the applicant before a proposed mitigated negative declaration and initial study are released for public review would avoid the effects or mitigate the effects to a point where clearly no significant effects would occur, and
- (2) There is no substantial evidence, in light of the whole record before the agency, that the project as revised may have a significant effect on the environment.

This document is tiering from the City of Fresno Master Environmental Impact Report (MEIR) (State Clearinghouse No. 2007121033) pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15152. The MEIR and

supporting documents are available for review at the City of Fresno Development and Resource Management Department, 2600 Fresno Street, Room 3065, Fresno, CA 93721.

The Initial Study contained in Chapter Three of this document has determined that the proposed Project is a subsequent project identified in the MEIR but that it is not fully within the scope of the MEIR because the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment that was not examined in the MEIR. However, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. The project specific mitigation measures and all applicable mitigation measures contained in the MEIR Mitigation Measure Monitoring Checklist will be imposed upon the proposed project. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

Chapter 2

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Project Description

2.1 Project Background

The proposed project description and actions have been distributed internally to applicable City departments (Planning, Public Works, Police/Fire, etc.) for review. All applicable development requirements have been applied to the project either through project design, conditions of approval, or as mitigation measures outlined in this document.

The project is being proposed by the project applicant to take advantage of the site's strategic location in an area that is suitable for large scale offices that serve a variety of uses. The location provides accessibility, infrastructure and demand in an area that provides an in-fill development opportunity within one of the City's busiest shopping / office areas.

2.2 Project Location and Setting

The proposed Office Complex is located on 1.08 acres at an existing office / commercial area north of Fig Garden Village (east of N. Palm Avenue at San Jose Avenue / Colonial Avenue). The site is known as the Fig Garden Financial Center located at 5204 North Palm Avenue in Fresno, CA 93704. Specifically, the proposed Office Complex is on APN 417-140-21. The proposed new parking area is on a 2.35 acre lot (APN 417-231-16).

Additional components associated with the project (infrastructure, street abandonment, etc.) are on portions of APNs 417-140-26, 417-231-17 and 417-231-19.

See Figure 1 (Project Vicinity Map), Figure 2 (Site Aerial) and Figure 3 (Project Master Plan).

The site is located at the existing Fig Garden Financial Center adjacent to Fig Garden Village in a relatively busy mixed-use area including shopping, services and housing in central Fresno. The immediate vicinity is comprised of large office buildings, parking areas and residential housing. To the north and east of the proposed office building is residential housing while existing office buildings are located to the south and west. The proposed new parking area is surrounded by residential housing to the north and south, a vacant lot to the east, and an office building to the west. The area is highly disturbed with urban uses.

Zoning

APN 417-140-21 is zoned RS-5/EQ (Residential Single-Family / Equine Overlay)

APN 417-231-16 is zoned RMX (Regional Mixed-Use)

APN 417-140-26 is zoned RMX/cz (Regional Mixed-Use / Conditions of Zoning)

APN 417-231-19 is zoned RMX/cz (Regional Mixed-Use / Conditions of Zoning)

2.3 Project Description

The project consists of construction and operation of a four-story, 100,000 square foot professional office building on a 1.08 acre lot. The footprint of the building is approximately 25,000 square feet with the remainder being occupied by hardscape, parking, landscaping and related features. Each floor of the building will occupy approximately 25,000 square feet of space.

The building will be constructed of concrete, steel and wood-frame structures. Landscaping is proposed along the site's perimeter, entrance and within the parking areas. Some existing trees on the site will be removed to accommodate the project.

Site Access

The project site will be accessed from Palm Avenue through the adjacent Fig Garden Financial Center's driveway and from Shaw Avenue via private driveways through Fig Garden Village Shopping Center. The new parking area can also be accessed from W. San Jose Avenue. Pedestrian access will remain from the surrounding areas.

The project also includes additional parking to accommodate 329 additional parking spaces (the City requires 1 space per 400 sq. ft. of building area which would require a minimum of 250 parking spaces). The existing 140 parking spaces located at the site of the proposed office building will be demolished. However, a total of 470 "new" spaces will be created, thus resulting in a net new parking capacity of 329 spaces.

Figure 1
Project Vicinity Map




Figure 2
Site Aerial





Figure 3
Project Master Plan



Parking

To accommodate the required parking spaces needed for the office building, the project applicant will construct an additional parking area on a 2.35 acre lot just south of San Jose Avenue (See Figure 2). Previously, this site consisted of a 44-unit apartment complex that had been abandoned for several years and was demolished.

Other Improvements

Landscaping, walkways, security lighting, trash enclosures and related appurtenances will be installed. The project also includes a small park area that will be located near the new parking area between the parking stalls and W. San Jose Avenue. The park area will be open to the public.

Street Abandonment

To accommodate the new office building and parking area, the project will require abandonment of a portion N. Colonial Avenue and W. San Jose Avenue where those streets meet adjacent to the project site. The intention is to create a “dead-end” cul-de-sac with an adequately sized turn-around pocket just south of the intersection of N. Colonial Avenue and W. San Ramon Avenue and a second cul-de-sac turn-around pocket on W. San Jose Avenue just north of the proposed new parking area. This will eliminate thru-traffic along this route. However, access to the project will be provided from W. San Jose Avenue. The turn-around pockets have been adequately sized for emergency vehicles and will provide emergency vehicle access to the site and surrounding area as needed. Pedestrian access will be maintained in the area.

Infrastructure

The project will be required to tie into existing infrastructure in the area for sewer, water and storm drain. The existing pipelines for these services are located within the adjacent streets. The project developer will be required to pay for all improvements related to obtaining these facilities to serve the project. This includes constructing appropriately sized water mains that will provide adequate water pressure for fire flow and project water use. The project will require installation of sewer mains to serve the project including any sewer easements that will be required by the City. Storm water will be controlled through implementation of a Storm Water Management Plan and will be directed to the existing storm drains in W. San Jose Avenue. More detailed descriptions of project infrastructure requirements are included in Chapter Three.

The project has been reviewed by City of Fresno Public Works and specifications pertaining to project financial responsibilities for accessing City-provided services have been made conditions of project approval.

Project Schedule

The project developer intends to begin construction in 2019 for completion in 2020.

Entitlements

The project will require the following entitlements from the City of Fresno:

- General Plan Amendment for 417-140-21 from planned land use from RM (Residential Medium Density) to RMX (Regional Mixed-Use);
- Rezone Application for 417-140-21 from RS-5 / EQ (Residential Single-Family / Equine Overlay) zone district to the RMX (Regional Mixed Use) zone district;
- Rezone Application to Modify Conditions of Zoning for 417-231-19 and 417-140-26 to remove previously established conditions of zoning;
- Lot merger or lot line adjustment with cross access agreement;
- Street abandonment; and
- Grading and building permits.

2.4 Other Required Approvals

The proposed Project would include, but not be limited to, the following regulatory requirements:

- The adoption of this Mitigated Negative Declaration by the City of Fresno.
- Compliance with other federal, state and local requirements such as the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District for a dust control plan and the Regional Water Quality Control Board for a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan.
- City of Fresno Department of Public Utilities
- Fresno Irrigation District

Chapter 3

IMPACT ANALYSIS

Initial Study Checklist

3.1 Environmental Checklist Form

Project title: Fig Garden Land Holdings Office Building Plan Amendment / Rezone
Application No. P18-03659

Lead agency name and address:

City of Fresno
Development and Resource Management Department
2600 Fresno Street, Room 3065
Fresno, CA 93721

Contact person and phone number:

Margo Lerwill
City of Fresno
(559) 621-8153

Project location:

The proposed Office Complex is located on 1.08 acres at an existing office / commercial area north of Fig Garden Village (east of N. Palm Avenue at San Jose Avenue / Colonial Avenue). The site is known as the Fig Garden Financial Center located at 5204 North Palm Avenue in Fresno, CA 93704. Specifically, the proposed Office Complex is on APN 417-140-21. The proposed new parking area is on a 2.35 acre lot (APN 417-231-16).

Additional components associated with the Project (infrastructure, street vacation, etc.) are on portions of APNs 417-140-26, 417-231-17 and 417-231-19.

See Figure 1 (Project Vicinity Map) and Figure 2 (Site Aerial).

Project sponsor's name/address:

Assemi Group, Inc.
Jeff Roberts
1396 W. Herndon Ave.
Fresno, CA 93711

General plan designation:

Residential – Medium Density

Zoning:

APN 417-140-21 is zoned RS-5/EQ (Residential Single-Family / Equine Overlay)

APN 417-231-16 is zoned RMX (Regional Mixed-Use)

APN 417-140-26 is zoned RMX/cz (Regional Mixed-Use / Conditions of Zoning)

APN 417-231-19 is zoned RMX/cz (Regional Mixed-Use / Conditions of Zoning)

Description of project:

The Project consists of construction and operation of a four-story, 100,000 square foot professional office building and a new parking area (See Section 2.3 for a full description).

Surrounding land uses/setting:

The site is located at the existing Fig Garden Financial Center adjacent to Fig Garden Village in a relatively busy mixed-use area including shopping, services and housing in central Fresno. The immediate vicinity is comprised of large office buildings, parking areas and residential housing. To the north and east of the proposed office building is residential housing while existing office buildings are located to the south and west. The proposed new parking area is surrounded by residential housing to the north and south, a vacant lot to the east, and an office building to the west. The area is highly disturbed with urban uses.

California Native American Tribal Consultation:

Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1? If so, has consultation begun or is there a plan for consultation that includes, for example, the determination of significance of impacts to tribal cultural resources, procedures regarding confidentiality, etc.?

In accordance with Assembly Bill (AB) 52 and Senate Bill (SB) 18, potentially affected Tribes were formally notified of this Project and were given the opportunity to request consultation on the Project. The City contacted the Native American Heritage Commission, requesting a contact list of applicable Native

American Tribes, which was provided to the City. The City provided letters to the listed Tribes, notifying them of the Project and requesting consultation, if desired. A total of ten Tribes were contacted of which four (4) indicated they had no comment, and the remaining six (6) did not respond to the invitation to comment and consult. Refer to Section XVIII – Tribal Cultural Resources for more information.

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

- The adoption of this Mitigated Negative Declaration by the City of Fresno.
- Compliance with other federal, state and local requirements such as the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District for a dust control plan and the Regional Water Quality Control Board for a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan.
- City of Fresno Department of Public Utilities
- Fresno Irrigation District

3.2 Environmental Factors Potentially Affected

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 Resources
and Forest Resources | ☐ Air Quality |
| ☒ Biological Resources | ☒ Cultural Resources | ☐ Energy |
| ☒ Geology / Soils | ☐ Greenhouse Gas
Emissions | ☒ Hazards &
Hazardous
Materials |
| ☒ Hydrology / Water
Quality | ☒ Land Use / Planning | ☐ Mineral Resources |
| ☐ Noise | ☐ Population / Housing | ☒ Public Services |
| ☐ Recreation | ☒ Transportation | ☐ Tribal Cultural
Resources |
| ☐ Utilities / Service
Systems | ☐ Wildfire | ☐ Mandatory
Findings of
Significance |

3.3 Determination

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- ☐ I find that the proposed project is a subsequent project identified in the MEIR and that it is fully within the scope of the MEIR because it would have no additional significant effects that were not examined in the MEIR such that no new additional mitigation measures or alternatives may be required. All applicable mitigation measures contained in the Mitigation Measure Monitoring Checklist shall be imposed upon the proposed project. A FINDING OF CONFORMITY will be prepared.
- ☒ I find that the proposed project is a subsequent project identified in the MEIR but that it is not fully within the scope of the MEIR because the proposed project could have a

significant effect on the environment that was not examined in the MEIR. However, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. The project specific mitigation measures and all applicable mitigation measures contained in the MEIR Mitigation Measure Monitoring Checklist will be imposed upon the proposed project. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

— I find that the proposed project is a subsequent project identified in the MEIR but that it MAY have a significant effect on the environment that was not examined in the MEIR, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required to analyze the potentially significant effects not examined in the MEIR pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21157.1(d) and CEQA Guidelines 15178(a).

Margo Lerwill, Supervising Planner

Date

EVALUATION OF ADDITIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS NOT ASSESSED IN THE MEIR:

1. For purposes of this MEIR Initial Study, the following answers have the corresponding meanings:
 - a. "No Impact" means the subsequent project will not cause any additional significant effect related to the threshold under consideration which was not previously examined in the MEIR.
 - b. "Less Than Significant Impact" means there is an impact related to the threshold under consideration that was not previously examined in the MEIR, but that impact is less than significant;
 - c. "Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation" means there is a potentially significant impact related to the threshold under consideration that was not previously examined in the MEIR, however, with the mitigation incorporated into the project, the impact is less than significant.
 - d. "Potentially Significant Impact" means there is an additional potentially significant effect related to the threshold under consideration that was not previously examined in the MEIR.
2. A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question.

A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).

3. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
4. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
5. A "Finding of Conformity" is a determination based on an initial study that the proposed project is a subsequent project identified in the MEIR and that it is fully within the scope of the MEIR because it would have no additional significant effects that were not examined in the MEIR.
6. "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section XVII, "Earlier Analyses," may be cross-referenced).
7. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR or MEIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a. Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b. Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in the MEIR or another earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c. Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
8. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for

potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.

9. Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
10. This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
11. The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a. The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b. The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significant.

I. AESTHETICS

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c. In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and regulations governing scenic quality?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	☐	☒	☐	☐

AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

The Project is located within an urbanized area in the northwest portion of Fresno, in the Fig Garden community. The property is situated near the northeast corner of Palm Avenue and Shaw Avenue, and is bounded by the Fig Garden Financial Center to the west, West San Ramon Avenue, North Colonial Avenue and West San Jose Avenue to the east and northeast, and the Fig Garden Village shopping center to the southwest.

The existing visual character of the site consists of a vacant parcel (location of the proposed office building), parking areas and a vacant lot where a previous apartment building was demolished. The remainder of the site contains a number of trees, including redwood, pine, palm, olive, and fig species.

Views of the existing development portion of the Fig Garden Financial Center site from the residential neighborhoods to the north and east are impeded by existing block walls and trees. More distant views of the existing Fig Garden Financial Center may be available from the Fig Garden Shopping Center. Views of the Project site are available from surrounding streets and existing residential areas.

RESPONSES

- a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?
- b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?

No Impact. A scenic vista is defined as a viewpoint that provides expansive views of highly valued landscape for the benefit of the general public. The Sierra Nevada Mountains are the only natural and visual resource in the Project area. Views of these distant mountains are afforded only during clear conditions due to poor air quality in the valley. Distant views of the Sierra Nevada Mountains would largely be unaffected by the development of the Project because of the nature of the Project, distance and limited visibility of these features. The City of Fresno does not identify views of these features as required to be “protected.”

The Project site is within an urbanized area of Fresno. The Fig Garden Financial Center is currently occupied by three 60-foot office buildings that are similar in size and nature to the proposed Project. There are no scenic vistas or other protected scenic resources on or near the site. Visual character of the site is addressed further in response c. below.

The nearest eligible scenic highway is a section of SR 168 which is located over 20 miles east of the site. However, the Project is not visible to or from this eligible scenic highway due to intervening land uses.

Therefore, the Project has *no impact* on scenic vistas or designated scenic resources or highways.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

- c. In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and regulations governing scenic quality?

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed Project would alter the existing visual character of public views of the site and its surroundings by constructing a new four-story office building and associated parking area. The building will be approximately 60 feet in height. Elevations of the

building are shown in Figures 4 and 5. The Project design is subject to the City's Design Guidelines adopted for the City's General Plan which apply to site layout, building design, landscaping, lighting, parking and signage. Detailed architectural plans, color palettes and building materials as well as landscaping plans will be submitted by the Project developer to the City of Fresno Development and Resource Management Department. The plans shall be required prior to issuance of any building permits. The review shall be substantially based on the building plans and elevations illustrated within this document.

The Project will require removal of some trees on site. However, trees and other landscaping will be integrated along the building perimeter, entrance, and within the parking areas. In addition, a small park will be installed next to the new parking area along W. San Jose Avenue.

The improvements such as those proposed by the Project are typical of large City urban areas and are generally expected from residents of the City. These improvements would not substantially degrade the visual character of the area and would not diminish the visual quality of the area, as they would be consistent with the existing visual setting. The Project itself is not visually imposing against the scale of the existing adjacent office buildings and nature of the surrounding area.

Therefore, the Project would have *less than significant impacts* on the visual character of the area.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

Figure 4
Office Building Elevation A





Figure 5
Office Building Elevation B



- d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation. With the exception of windows, the Project does not propose any significant sources of glare. The use of standard windows in the proposed four-story office building would not result in significant glare impacts. Substantial portions of the overall Project site are currently predominantly impacted by light and glare from the adjacent Fig Garden Shopping and Financial Centers and associated lighting sources. The majority of the Project site is currently vacant and the only sources of night time light are street lamps and security lighting.

The proposed Project would require night lighting on the outside of the building and within the parking areas for security purposes. Additional night lighting sources on the Project site, especially any unshielded light, could result in spillover light that could impact surrounding adjacent residential uses. This would create new sources of light that could potentially have a significant impact on nighttime light levels in the area. During the entitlement process, staff will ensure that lights are located in areas that will minimize light sources to the neighboring properties. Further, Mitigation Measures (MM) AES-1 through MM AES-3 from the General Plan MEIR require lighting systems to be shielded to direct light to ground surfaces and orient light away from adjacent properties. In addition, MM AES – 5 requires use of non-reflective building materials to reduce glare impacts. As a result, the Project will have a less than significant impact on aesthetics.

In addition, a condition of approval will require that lighting, where provided for security and to illuminate parking area and public streets, shall be hooded and so arranged and controlled so as not to cause a nuisance either to traffic or to the living environment. The amount of light shall be provided according to the standards of the Department of Public Works. As a result, the Project will have a less than significant impact on aesthetics.

Mitigation Measures: General Plan MEIR Mitigation Measures AES – 1, AES – 2, AES – 3 and AES – 5. See attached MEIR Mitigation Measure Monitoring Checklist.

In conclusion, with MEIR mitigation measures, the Project will not result in any aesthetic impacts beyond those analyzed in MEIR SCH No. 2012111015 prepared for the Fresno General Plan.

II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES

Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	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 California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

Fresno is located in Fresno County, which is a nationally-leading agricultural producer. The City's General Plan contains several policies intended to protect agricultural resources. The Project site, however, does not contain any agricultural resource and therefore, the City's policies are not applicable. There are no agricultural resources near the site or in the surrounding area.

RESPONSES

- a. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?
- b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?
- c. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?
- d. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?
- 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?

No Impact. There are no agricultural resources or forest lands present on the Project site, which consists of "Urban and Built-Up Land" as designated in the 2014 Rural Mapping Edition: Fresno County Important Farmland Map of the California Department of Conservation. Urban and Built-Up Land is not afforded protection under CEQA as it typically consists of land that is not suitable for agricultural uses. Since the majority of the site is developed, there are no existing agricultural uses or operations within the Project boundaries, nor in the immediate vicinity. The proposed Project would not convert prime farmland, conflict with an existing agricultural use, or result in the conversion of existing farmland. Additionally, no Williamson Act contracted lands would be impacted due to the Project.

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

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

In conclusion, the Project will not result in any agriculture or forestry impacts beyond those analyzed in MEIR SCH No. 2012111015 prepared for the Fresno General Plan.

III. AIR QUALITY

Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b. 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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d. Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors or adversely affecting a substantial number of people)?	☐	☐	☒	☐

AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

The climate of the City of Fresno and the San Joaquin Valley is characterized by long, hot summers and stagnant, foggy winters. Precipitation is low and temperature inversions are common. These characteristics are conducive to the formation and retention of air pollutants and are in part influenced by the surrounding mountains which intercept precipitation and act as a barrier to the passage of cold air and air pollutants.

The proposed Project lies within the San Joaquin Valley Air Basin, which is managed by the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD or Air District). National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) and California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS) have been established for the following criteria pollutants: carbon monoxide (CO), ozone (O₃), sulfur dioxide (SO₂), nitrogen dioxide (NO₂), particulate matter (PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}), and lead (Pb). The CAAQS also set standards for sulfates, hydrogen sulfide, and visibility.

Air quality plans or attainment plans are used to bring the applicable air basin into attainment with all state and federal ambient air quality standards designed to protect the health and safety of residents within that air basin. Areas are classified under the Federal Clean Air Act as either “attainment”, “non-

attainment”, or “extreme non-attainment” areas for each criteria pollutant based on whether the NAAQS have been achieved or not. Attainment relative to the State standards is determined by the California Air Resources Board (CARB). The San Joaquin Valley is designated as a State and Federal extreme non-attainment area for O₃, a State and Federal non-attainment area for PM_{2.5}, a State non-attainment area for PM₁₀, and Federal and State attainment area for CO, SO₂, NO₂, and Pb.

Standards and attainment status for listed pollutants in the Air District can be found in Table 1. Note that both state and federal standards are presented.

Table 1
Standards and Attainment Status for Listed Pollutants in the Air District

	Federal Standard	California Standard
Ozone	0.075 ppm (8-hr avg)	0.07 ppm (8-hr avg) 0.09 ppm (1-hr avg)
Carbon Monoxide	9.0 ppm (8-hr avg) 35.0 ppm (1-hr avg)	9.0 ppm (8-hr avg) 20.0 ppm (1-hr avg)
Nitrogen Dioxide	0.053 ppm (annual avg)	0.30 ppm (annual avg) 0.18 ppm (1-hr avg)
Sulfur Dioxide	0.03 ppm (annual avg) 0.14 ppm (24-hr avg) 0.5 ppm (3-hr avg)	0.04 ppm (24-hr avg) 0.25 ppm (1hr avg)
Lead	1.5 µg/m ³ (calendar quarter) 0.15 µg/m ³ (rolling 3-month avg)	1.5 µg/m ³ (30-day avg)
Particulate Matter (PM ₁₀)	150 µg/m ³ (24-hr avg)	20 µg/m ³ (annual avg) 50 µg/m ³ (24-hr avg)
Particulate Matter (PM _{2.5})	15 µg/m ³ (annual avg)	35 µg/m ³ (24-hr avg) 12 µg/m ³ (annual avg)

µg/m³ = micrograms per cubic meter

Additional State regulations include:

CARB Portable Equipment Registration Program – This program was designed to allow owners and operators of portable engines and other common construction or farming equipment to register their equipment under a statewide program so they may operate it statewide without the need to obtain a permit from the local air district.

U.S. EPA/CARB Off-Road Mobile Sources Emission Reduction Program – The California Clean Air Act (CCAA) requires CARB to achieve a maximum degree of emissions reductions from off-road mobile sources to attain State Ambient Air Quality Standards (SAAQS); off- road mobile sources include most construction equipment. Tier 1 standards for large compression-ignition engines used in off-road mobile sources went into effect in California in 1996. These standards, along with ongoing rulemaking, address emissions of nitrogen oxides (NOX) and toxic particulate matter from diesel engines. CARB is currently developing a control measure to reduce diesel PM and NOX emissions from existing off-road diesel equipment throughout the state.

California Global Warming Solutions Act – Established in 2006, Assembly Bill 32 (AB 32) requires that California’s GHG emissions be reduced to 1990 levels by the year 2020. This will be implemented through a statewide cap on GHG emissions, which will be phased in beginning in 2012. AB 32 requires CARB to develop regulations and a mandatory reporting system to monitor global warming emissions levels.

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

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

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

CalEEMod Version 2016.3.2, was used to estimate construction and operational (vehicle trips) emissions resulting from both phases of the proposed Project.

RESPONSES

- a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?
- b. 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?
- c. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed Project lies within the San Joaquin Valley Air Basin (SJVAB). At the Federal level, the SJVAB is designated as extreme nonattainment for the 8-hour ozone standard, attainment for PM₁₀ and CO, and nonattainment for PM_{2.5}. At the State level, the SJVAB is designated as nonattainment for the 8-hour ozone, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5} standards. Although the Federal 1-hour ozone standard was revoked in 2005, areas must still attain this standard, and the SJVAPCD recently requested an EPA finding that the SJVAB has attained the standard based on 2011-2013 data¹. To meet Federal Clean Air Act (CAA) requirements, the SJVAPCD has multiple air quality attainment plan (AQAP) documents, including:

- Extreme Ozone Attainment Demonstration Plan (EOADP) for attainment of the 1-hour ozone standard (2004);
- 2007 Ozone Plan for attainment of the 8-hour ozone standard;
- 2007 PM₁₀ Maintenance Plan and Request for Redesignation; and
- 2008 PM_{2.5} Plan.

Because of the region's non-attainment status for ozone, PM_{2.5}, and PM₁₀, if the Project-generated emissions of either of the ozone precursor pollutants (ROG or NO_x), PM₁₀, or PM_{2.5} were to exceed the SJVAPCD's significance thresholds, then the project uses would be considered to conflict with the attainment plans. In addition, if the project uses were to result in a change in land use and corresponding increases in vehicle miles traveled, they may result in an increase in vehicle miles traveled that is unaccounted for in regional emissions inventories contained in regional air quality control plans.

The annual significance thresholds to be used for the Project for construction and operational emissions are as follows²:

- 10 tons per year ROG;
- 10 tons per year NO_x;
- 15 tons per year PM₁₀; and
- 15 tons per year PM_{2.5}.

The Project will result in both construction emissions and operational emissions as described below.

Short-Term (Construction) Emissions

¹ San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District. Guide to Assessing and Mitigating Air Quality Impacts. March 19, 2015. Page 28. http://www.valleyair.org/transportation/GAMAQI_3-19-15.pdf. Accessed January 2016.

² San Joaquin Valley Air Control District – Air Quality Threshold of Significance – Criteria Pollutants. <http://www.valleyair.org/transportation/0714-GAMAQI-Criteria-Pollutant-Thresholds-of-Significance.pdf>. Accessed January 2019.

Site preparation and Project construction would involve demolition of paving/asphalt, excavation, grading, hauling, and various activities needed to construct the Project. During construction, the Project could generate pollutants such as hydrocarbons, oxides of nitrogen, carbon monoxide, and suspended PM. A major source of PM would be windblown dust generated during construction activities. Sources of fugitive dust would include disturbed soils at the construction site and trucks carrying uncovered loads of soils. Vehicles leaving the site could deposit dirt and mud on local streets, which could be an additional source of airborne dust after it dries. PM₁₀ emissions would vary from day to day, depending on the nature and magnitude of construction activity and local weather conditions. PM₁₀ emissions would depend on soil moisture, the silt content of soil, wind speed, and the amount of operating equipment. Larger dust particles would settle near the source, while fine particles would be dispersed over greater distances from the construction site. These emissions would be temporary and limited to the immediate area surrounding the construction site.

Operational Emissions

Operational emissions would primarily be generated from vehicles traveling to and from the office building. According to the Trip Generation Analysis prepared for the Project, the office building will generate approximately 993 trips per day. There are no substantial stationary emission generators associated with the Project.

Total Project Emissions

The estimated annual construction and operational emissions are shown below. The California Emissions Estimator (CalEEMod), Version 2016.3.2, was used to estimate construction and operational (vehicle trips) emissions resulting from both phases of the proposed Project. The modeling is based on the square footage of the office building, construction activities, and Project trip generation (see traffic section of this document for Project trip generation information). Modeling results are provided in Table 2 and the CalEEMod output files are provided in Appendix A.

Table 2
Proposed Project Construction and Operation Emissions

	VOC (ROG) (tons/year)	NO_x (tons/year)	PM₁₀ (tons/year)	PM_{2.5} (tons/year)
Years 2019/2020 Construction (combined)	0.8419	1.8806	0.2139	0.1404
Year 2020 Operation	2.4214	7.7201	0.6848	0.3271
Total Estimated Emissions	3.2633	9.6007	0.8987	0.4675
Threshold of Significance	10	10	15	15
Significant?	No	No	No	No

Source: CalEEMod results (Appendix A). Crawford & Bowen Planning (2019)

As demonstrated in Table 2, estimated construction and operational emissions would not exceed the SJVAPCD's significance thresholds for ROG, NO_x, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5}. As a result, the Project uses would not conflict with emissions inventories contained in regional air quality attainment plans, and would not result in a significant contribution to the region's air quality non-attainment status³.

Localized high levels of CO are associated with traffic congestion and idling or slow-moving vehicles. The SJVAPCD provides screening criteria to determine when to quantify local CO concentrations based on impacts to the level of service (LOS) of roadways in the Project vicinity.

As further discussed in the Transportation/Traffic checklist evaluation, the Project would not generate substantial traffic (less than 1,000 trips per day) that would reduce the level of service on local roadways. Therefore, the Project would not significantly contribute to an exceedance that would exceed state or federal CO standards. Additionally, as the estimated construction and operational emissions are below SJVAPCD thresholds, any cumulative considerable increase in criteria pollutants would be less than significant.

As described above, the Project will not occur at a scale or scope with potential to contribute substantially or cumulatively to existing or projected air quality violations, impacts, or increases of criteria pollutants for which the San Joaquin Valley region is under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors). The proposed Project will comply with all applicable air quality plans. Therefore, no violations of air quality standards will occur and no net increase of pollutants will occur.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

e. Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors adversely affecting a substantial number of people?

Less Than Significant Impact. During construction, the various diesel powered vehicles and equipment in use on-site could create localized odors. These odors would be temporary and are not likely to be noticeable for extended periods of time beyond the Project site. In addition, once the Project is operational, there would be no source of odors from the Project. Therefore, the impact is *less than significant*.

³ San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District. Guide to Assessing and Mitigating Air Quality Impacts. March 19, 2015. Page 65. http://www.valleyair.org/transportation/GAMAQI_3-19-15.pdf. Accessed January 2019.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

In conclusion, the Project will not result in any air quality impacts beyond those analyzed in MEIR SCH No. 2012111015 prepared for the Fresno General Plan.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	☐	☒	☐	☐
b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c. Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

IV. BIOLOGICAL
RESOURCES

Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

The proposed Project site is located in a portion of the central San Joaquin Valley that has, for decades, experienced intensive agricultural and urban disturbances. Like most of California, Fresno and the Central San Joaquin Valley experiences a Mediterranean climate. Warm dry summers are followed by cool moist winters. Summer temperatures usually exceed 90 degrees Fahrenheit, and the relative humidity is generally very low. Winter temperatures rarely raise much above 70 degrees Fahrenheit, with daytime highs often below 60 degrees Fahrenheit. Annual precipitation within the proposed Project site is about 10 inches, almost 85% of which falls between the months of October and March. Nearly all precipitation falls in the form of rain and storm-water readily infiltrates the soils of the surrounding the sites.

Native plant and animal species once abundant in the region have become locally extirpated or have experienced large reductions in their populations due to conversion of upland, riparian, and aquatic habitats to agricultural and urban uses. Remaining native habitats are particularly valuable to native wildlife species including special status species that still persist in the region.

Over the years, the Fresno area has been substantially disturbed by agricultural and residential activities, with lands within the City itself having primarily been converted to urban development.

The Project area is level (nearly flat) and has two predominate habitat types: landscape and ruderal.

The potential ground-disturbance areas associated with the Project consist of asphalt paved parking areas, a vacant dirt lot void of vegetation, and some landscaping/trees. The site is completely surrounded by intense urban development.

RESPONSES

- a. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation. The Project area and vicinity consist of developed land uses. Existing development has altered the natural landscape by introducing non-native plant species and removing potentially suitable natural habitat for sensitive plant or animal species within the Project area. The vegetation found within and along the Project area consists of ornamental non-native species that provide little or no biological importance and value.

The California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB) was examined to determine if any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species were located in or near the Proposed Project Area. The CNDDDB did not identify any species within the Proposed Project area or site. There are no reported records of special status species (which included both listed species and species of concern or of statewide importance).

However, both raptors and migratory birds and their nests are protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act 16 U.S.C. §§ 703–712 (MBTA). The proposed Project will likely require removal of some trees to accommodate the Project. Tree removal could remove an active nest at the time of Project commencement or construction near an active nest could result in nest abandonment. Species with some likelihood to occur (at least for foraging) at the Project site include, but are not limited to, the following: red-tailed hawk (*Buteo jamaicensis*), sharp-shinned hawk (*Accipiter striatus*), Cooper’s hawk (*Accipiter cooperii*), and American kestrel (*Falco sparverius*). While the life histories of these species vary, overlapping nesting and foraging similarities allow for their concurrent discussion. Impacts to nesting birds is potentially significant; however, implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-4 from the General Plan MEIR would reduce this impact to a *less-than-significant* level. This mitigation measure consists of preconstruction surveys and timing of construction in relation to potential nesting birds in the Project area.

Mitigation Measures: General Plan MEIR Mitigation Measure BIO – 4. See attached MEIR Mitigation Measure Monitoring Checklist.

- b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

No Impact. The Proposed Project site is located in an urban area that is surrounded by commercial and residential land uses. The site is not located within an established fish or wildlife migratory corridor. Therefore, *no impacts* to 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 would occur as a result of this Project.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

- c. Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

No Impact. The United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) regulates the dredge and fill of “Waters of the U.S.” through Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (CWA). This proposed Project site and area are urbanized and does not contain federally protected waters or wetlands. Therefore, no impacts would occur 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 as a result of this Proposed Project. As such, there would be *no impacts* associated with the proposed improvements.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

- 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?

No Impact. The Proposed Project site is located in an urban area that is surrounded by commercial and residential land uses. The site is not located within an established fish or wildlife migratory corridor. Therefore, *no impacts* to 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 would occur as a result of this Project.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

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

Less Than Significant. The City's General Plan Parks, Open Space and Schools Element contains several objectives and policies pertaining to the protection of biological resources. Most of the policies pertain to general long-term protection and preservation of biological resources including providing buffers for natural areas, implementing habitat restoration where applicable, protection/enhancement of the San Joaquin River area, and other similar policies. Since the Project is located in a highly disturbed urban area with minimal biological resources and does not include significant impacts to protected plant or animal species, the Project does not conflict with any adopted policies pertaining to biological resources. The Project is also required to implement Municipal Code Chapter 13 Article 3 – Street Trees and Parkways pertaining to tree removal and replacement. Therefore, there is a *less than significant impact*.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

- 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?

No Impact. The Project site is not subject to any adopted habitat conservation plan, natural community conservation plan or other conservation plan, as there are no adopted plans. Therefore, there is *no impact*.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

In conclusion, with MEIR mitigation measures included, the Project will not result in any biological impacts beyond those analyzed in MEIR SCH No. 2012111015 prepared for the Fresno General Plan.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	☐	☒	☐	☐
c. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	☐	☒	☐	☐

AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

Archaeological resources are places where human activity has measurably altered the earth or left deposits of physical remains. Archaeological resources may be either prehistoric (before the introduction of writing in a particular area) or historic (after the introduction of writing). The majority of such places in this region are associated with either Native American or Euroamerican occupation of the area. The most frequently encountered prehistoric and early historic Native American archaeological sites are village settlements with residential areas and sometimes cemeteries; temporary camps where food and raw materials were collected; smaller, briefly occupied sites where tools were manufactured or repaired; and special-use areas like caves, rock shelters, and sites of rock art. Historic archaeological sites may include foundations or features such as privies, corrals, and trash dumps.

The City of Fresno lies at the intersection of where ethnographers generally recognize three cultural-geographical divisions of Yokuts: Foothills, Northern Valley, and Southern Valley. The Foothill Yokuts included about 15 named tribes, representing the eastern third of the 40 to 50 recorded Yokuts tribes. The immediate Project vicinity consists of intense urban uses.

The Project site has been subject to several environmental evaluations for a variety of proposed land uses including residential and commercial. As such, previous cultural resource evaluations have taken place for the Project site. The most recent study was a Cultural Resources Literature and Field Review prepared by Basin Research Associates, Inc. (January 2010) and a Historical Evaluation for the property at 507 W.

San Jose Avenue (Johnson Architecture, January 2010). Since cultural resources tend to be stationary, it can be reasonably assumed that the cultural evaluation that occurred in 2010 is still applicable, since the site remains undeveloped.

The prehistoric and historic site records and literature search was completed by the California Historical Resources Information System, Southern San Joaquin Valley Information Center (CHRIS/SSJVIC), California State University Bakersfield (File RS# 09-427, November 20, 2009). Specialized listings for cultural resources consulted by the SSJVIC include the Historic Properties Directory for Fresno County with the most recent updates of the National Register of Historic Places, California Historical Landmarks, and California Points of Historical Interest as well as other evaluations of properties reviewed by the State of California Office of Historic Preservation. Other sources consulted by the SSJVIC include California Inventory of Historic Resources, California Points of Historical Interest, and California Register. In addition, The California History Plan and Five Views: An Ethnic Sites Survey for California, Historic Properties Directory and available local and regional surveys/inventories/historic maps were consulted.

The records search found no recorded cultural resources (including archaeological sites and architectural properties) located within or adjacent to the proposed Project or within 0.25 miles. This review included cultural resources listed in the National Register of Historic Places, California Register of Historical Resources, California State Landmarks, and the California Points of Historical Interest. None of the archaeological compliance reports on file at the CHRIS/SSJVIC include the Project. The review of the Sacred Lands Inventory by the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) was negative (Dave Singleton, NAHC, November 2009).

No additional archaeological or historic resources were identified within or near the Project site.

RESPONSES

- a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5?

No Impact. As discussed above, no historic resources were identified within or near the Project site. Therefore, there is *no impact*.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

- b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?

c. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation. The Project area is highly disturbed, consisting of office buildings, parking lots and residential housing. There are no known or visible cultural or archaeological resources, paleontological resources, or human remains that exist on the surface of the Project area. Therefore, it is determined that the Project has low potential to impact any sensitive resources and no further cultural resources work is required unless Project plans change to include work not currently identified in the Project description.

Although no cultural or archaeological resources, paleontological resources or human remains have been identified in the Project area, the possibility exists that such resources or remains may be discovered during Project site preparation, excavation and/or grading activities. The General Plan MEIR contains mitigation measures CUL – 1 and CUL – 4 pertaining to protection of cultural resources if they are discovered during construction and will be implemented to ensure that Project will result in *less than significant impacts with mitigation*.

Mitigation Measures: General Plan MEIR Mitigation Measures CUL – 1 and CUL - 2. See attached MEIR Mitigation Measure Monitoring Checklist.

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

VI. ENERGY

Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b. Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	☐	☐	☒	☐

AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

California's total energy consumption is second-highest in the nation, but, in 2016, the state's per capita energy consumption ranked 48th, due in part to its mild climate and its energy efficiency programs. In 2017, California ranked second in the nation in conventional hydroelectric generation and first as a producer of electricity from solar, geothermal, and biomass resources while also in 2017, solar PV and solar thermal installations provided about 16% of California's net electricity generation.⁴

Energy usage is typically quantified using the British thermal unit (BTU). As a point of reference, the approximately amounts of energy contained in common energy sources are as follows:

Energy Source	BTUs ⁵
Gasoline	120,429 per gallon
Natural Gas	1,037 per cubic foot
Electricity	3,412 per kilowatt-hour

⁴ U.S. Energy Information Administration. Independent Statistics and Analysis. California Profile Overview. <https://www.eia.gov/state/?sid=CA#tabs-1>. Accessed January 2019.

⁵ U.S. Energy Information Administration. Energy Units and Calculators Explained. https://www.eia.gov/energyexplained/index.php?page=about_energy_units. Accessed January 2019.

California electrical consumption in 2016 was 7,830.8 trillion BTU⁶, as provided in Table 3, while total electrical consumption by Fresno County in 2017 was 25.457 trillion BTU.⁷

Table 3 – 2016 California Energy Consumption⁸

End User	BTU of energy consumed (in trillions)	Percentage of total consumption
Residential	1,384.4	17.7
Commercial	1,477.2	18.9
Industrial	1,854.3	23.7
Transportation	3,114.9	39.8
Total	7,830.8	--

The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) reports that approximately 25.1 million automobiles, 5.7 million trucks, and 889,024 motorcycles were registered in the state in 2017, resulting in a total estimated 339.8 billion vehicles miles traveled (VMT).⁹ Within Fresno County, an estimated 8.2 million vehicle miles were traveled in 2017 for an average of 22,556 per day.¹⁰

Applicable Regulations

California Energy Code (Title 24, Part 6, Building Energy Efficiency Standards)

California Code of Regulations Title 24, Part 6 comprises the California Energy Code, which was adopted to ensure that building construction, system design and installation achieve energy efficiency. The California Energy Code was first established in 1978 by the CEC in response to a legislative mandate to reduce California's energy consumption, and apply to energy consumed for heating, cooling, ventilation, water heating, and lighting in new residential and non-residential buildings. The standards are updated periodically to increase the baseline energy efficiency requirements. The 2013 Building Energy Efficiency Standards focus on several key areas to improve the energy efficiency of newly constructed buildings and additions and alterations to existing buildings and include requirements to enable both demand reductions during critical peak periods and future solar electric and thermal system installations. Although it was not originally intended to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, electricity production

⁶ U.S. Energy Information Administration. Independent Statistics and Analysis. California Profile Overview. <https://www.eia.gov/state/?sid=CA#tabs-1>. Accessed January 2019.

⁷ California Energy Commission. Electricity Consumption by County. <http://ecdms.energy.ca.gov/electbycounty.aspx>. Accessed January 2019.

⁸ U.S. Energy Information Administration. Independent Statistics and Analysis. California Profile Overview. <https://www.eia.gov/state/?sid=CA#tabs-1>. Accessed January 2019.

⁹ Caltrans. 2017. California Transportation Quick Facts. <http://www.dot.ca.gov/drsi/library/qf/qf2017.pdf>. Accessed January 2019

¹⁰ Caltrans. 2017. Fresno County Transportation Quick Facts. <http://www.dot.ca.gov/drsi/library/qfco/fre/fre2017.pdf>. Accessed January 2019.

by fossil fuels results in GHG emissions and energy efficient buildings require less electricity. Therefore, increased energy efficiency results in decreased GHG emissions.

California Green Building Standards Code (Title 24, Part II, CALGreen)

The California Building Standards Commission adopted the California Green Buildings Standards Code (CALGreen in Part 11 of the Title 24 Building Standards Code) for all new construction statewide on July 17, 2008. Originally a volunteer measure, the code became mandatory in 2010. The most recent update was 2016. CALGreen sets targets for energy efficiency, water consumption, dual plumbing systems for potable and recyclable water, diversion of construction waste from landfills, and use of environmentally sensitive materials in construction and design, including eco-friendly flooring, carpeting, paint, coatings, thermal insulation, and acoustical wall and ceiling panels. The 2016 CALGreen Code includes mandatory measures for non-residential development related to site development; water use; weather resistance and moisture management; construction waste reduction, disposal, and recycling; building maintenance and operation; pollutant control; indoor air quality; environmental comfort; and outdoor air quality. Mandatory measures for residential development pertain to green building; planning and design; energy efficiency; water efficiency and conservation; material conservation and resource efficiency; environmental quality; and installer and special inspector qualifications.

Clean Energy and Pollution Reduction Act (SB 350)

The Clean Energy and Pollution Reduction Act (SB 350) was passed by California Governor Brown on October 7, 2015, and establishes new clean energy, clean air, and greenhouse gas reduction goals for the year 2030 and beyond. SB 350 establishes a greenhouse gas reduction target of 40 percent below 1990 levels for the State of California, further enhancing the ability for the state to meet the goal of reducing greenhouse gas emissions by 80 percent below 1990 levels by the year 2050.

Renewable Portfolio Standard (SB 1078 and SB 107)

Established in 2002 under SB 1078, the state's Renewables Portfolio Standard (RPS) was amended under SB 107 to require accelerated energy reduction goals by requiring that by the year 2010, 20 percent of electricity sales in the state be served by renewable energy resources. In years following its adoption, Executive Order S-14-08 was signed, requiring electricity retail sellers to provide 33 percent of their service loads with renewable energy by the year 2020. In 2011, SB X1-2 was signed, aligning the RPS target with the 33 percent requirement by the year 2020. This new RPS applied to all state electricity retailers, including publicly owned utilities, investor-owned utilities, electrical service providers, and community choice aggregators. All entities included under the RPS were required to adopt the RPS 20 percent by year 2020 reduction goal by the end of 2013, adopt a reduction goal of 25 percent by the end of 2016, and meet the 33 percent reduction goal by the end of 2020. In addition, the Air Resources Board,

under Executive Order S-21-09, was required to adopt regulations consistent with these 33 percent renewable energy targets.

RESPONSES

- a. Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?
- b. Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed Project includes constructing an office complex on a 1.08-acre vacant lot and constructing a parking lot on a 2.35-acre lot that previously housed a 44-unit apartment structure (since demolished). The Project would introduce energy usage on a site that is currently demanding minimal energy. By comparison, at buildout, the Project would consume large amounts of energy in both the short-term during Project construction and in the long-term during Project operation.

During construction, the Project would consume energy in two general forms: (1) the fuel energy consumed by construction vehicles and equipment; and (2) bound energy in construction materials, such as asphalt, steel, concrete, pipes, and manufactured or processed materials such as lumber and glass. Title 24 Building Energy Efficiency Standards provide guidance on construction techniques to maximize energy conservation and it is expected that contractors and owners have a strong financial incentive to use recycled materials and products originating from nearby sources in order to reduce materials costs. As such, it is anticipated that materials used in construction and construction vehicle fuel energy would not involve the wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy.

Operational Project energy consumption would occur for multiple purposes, including but not limited to, building heating and cooling, refrigeration, lighting, electronics, and office equipment. Operational energy would also be consumed during each vehicle trip associated with the proposed use. CalEEMod was utilized to generate the estimated energy demand of the proposed Project, and the results are provided in Table 4 and in Appendix A.

Table 4 – Annual Project Energy Consumption by Land Use

Land Use	Electricity Use in kWh/year	Natural Gas Use in kBTU/year	Annual Energy Consumption (in Million BTU)
Office Park	1,049,400	2,050,200	5,630.9
Parking Lot	46,060	0	157.2
Total	1,095,460	2,050,200	5,788.1

The proposed Project would be required to comply with Title 24 Building Energy Efficiency Standards, which provide minimum efficiency standards related to various building features, including appliances, water and space heating and cooling equipment, building insulation and roofing, and lighting. Implementation of Title 24 standards significantly increases energy savings, and it is generally assumed that compliance with Title 24 ensures projects will not result in the inefficient, wasteful, or unnecessary consumption of energy.

As discussed in Impact XVII – Transportation/Traffic, the proposed Project would generate approximately 993 daily vehicle trips. The length of these trips and the individual vehicle fuel efficiencies are not known; therefore, the resulting energy consumption cannot be accurately calculated. However, it can be assumed that such a volume of vehicle trips would consume a generous amount of fuel. Adopted federal vehicle fuel standards have continually improved since their original adoption in 1975 and assists in avoiding the inefficient, wasteful, and unnecessary use of energy by vehicles. Additionally, the proposed Project will be located in a major shopping area that is surrounded by residential land uses. A high-frequency bus line is within ¼ mile of the proposed Project and the site will be developed with pedestrian accessibility in mind, which will reduce VMT, thereby further reducing the amount of energy consumed by the proposed Project.

As discussed previously, the proposed Project would be required to implement and be consistent with existing energy design standards at the local and state level. The Project would be subject to energy conservation requirements in the California Energy Code and CALGreen. Adherence to state code requirements would ensure that the Project would not result in wasteful and inefficient use of non-renewable resources due to building operation.

Therefore, any impacts are *less than significant*.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Would the project:

a. Directly or indirectly cause 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.

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	---	------------------------------------	--------------

☐	☐	☒	☐
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?

☐	☐	☒	☐
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

☐	☐	☒	☐
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

iv. Landslides?

☐	☐	☐	☒
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

☐	☒	☐	☐
--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

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?

☐	☒	☐	☐
--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the most recently

☐	☒	☐	☐
--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Would the project:

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	---	------------------------------------	--------------

adopted Uniform Building Code
creating substantial direct or indirect
risks to life or property?

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?

☐	☐	☐	☒
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

f. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique
paleontological resource or site or
unique geologic feature?

☐	☐	☒	☐
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

The Project site is located within the San Joaquin Valley structural basin, bounded to the east by the Sierra Nevada Mountain Range and to the west by the Coastal Ranges. The Project area is located on the high alluvial fan of the San Joaquin River. The site is relatively flat at an elevation of 320 feet above mean sea level in an area of intense urban uses. The Project site is mapped as containing soils classified as San Joaquin Sandy Loam, shallow, 0-3 percent slopes (Natural Resources Conservation Service, US Department of Agriculture, Soil Survey Geographic Database).

RESPONSES

a-i. Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.

- a-ii. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving strong seismic ground shaking?
- a-iii. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?
- a-iv. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving landslides?

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed Project site is not located in an earthquake fault zone as delineated by the 1972 Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map Act. The nearest known potentially active fault is the Clovis Fault, located about nine miles east of the site. No active faults have been mapped within the Project boundaries, so there is no potential for fault rupture. It is anticipated that the proposed Project site would be subject to some ground acceleration and ground shaking associated with seismic activity during its design life. The Project site would be engineered and constructed in strict accordance with the earthquake resistant design requirements contained in the latest edition of the California Building Code (CBC) for seismic zone III, as well as Title 24 of the California Administrative Code, and therefore would avoid potential seismically induced hazards on planned structures. The impact of seismic hazards on the Project would be *less than significant*.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

- b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation. Construction activities associated with the Project involves excavation of existing asphalt pavement and concrete as well as ground preparation work for the new office building and parking areas. These activities could expose barren soils to sources of wind or water, resulting in the potential for erosion and sedimentation on and off the Project site. During construction, nuisance flow caused by minor rain could flow off-site. The City and/or contractor would be required to employ appropriate sediment and erosion control BMPs as part of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) that would be required in the California National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES). In addition, soil erosion and loss of topsoil would be minimized through implementation of the SVJAPCD fugitive dust control measures (See Section III). Once construction is complete, the Project would not result in soil erosion or loss of topsoil. Mitigation Measure GEO – 1 (requirement to prepare a SWPPP) will ensure that impacts remain *less than significant*.

Mitigation Measures: Project-specific Mitigation Measures GEO – 1. See attached Project-specific Mitigation Measure Monitoring Checklist.

- 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?
- d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the most recently adopted Uniform Building Code creating substantial risks to life or property?

Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation. See Section VIa. above. The site is not at significant risk from earthquakes, ground shaking, liquefaction, or landslide and is otherwise considered geologically stable. Subsidence is typically related to over-extraction of groundwater from certain types of geologic formations where the water is partly responsible for supporting the ground surface. However, the site may be subject to soil hazards including existing fills and settlement potential that could adversely impact proposed structures. Mitigation Measure GEO – 2 (requirement for a design level geotechnical analysis) will reduce impacts to a *less than significant* level.

Mitigation Measures: Project-specific Mitigation Measures GEO – 2. See attached Project-specific Mitigation Measure Monitoring Checklist.

- 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?

No Impact. The Project does not include the construction, replacement, or disturbance of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems. The Project will be required to tie into existing sewer services (See Utilities section for more details). Therefore, there is *no impact*.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

- f. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

Less Than Significant Impact. As identified in the previous cultural studies performed for the Project site, there are no known paleontological resources on or near the site. (See Section V. for more details). Mitigation measures have been added that will protect unknown (buried) resources during construction, including paleontological resources. In addition, the site is substantially developed

with the remainder a dirt lot that has been graded. There are no unique geological features on site or in the area. Therefore, there is a *less than significant impact*.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

In conclusion, with Project-specific mitigation measures incorporated, the Project will not result in any geological impacts beyond those analyzed in MEIR SCH No. 2012111015.

VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Would the project:

a. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
☐	☐	☒	☐

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

☐	☐	☒	☐
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

Various gases in the earth’s atmosphere play an important role in moderating the earth’s surface temperature. Solar radiation enters earth’s atmosphere from space and a portion of the radiation is absorbed by the earth’s surface. The earth emits this radiation back toward space, but the properties of the radiation change from high-frequency solar radiation to lower-frequency infrared radiation. GHGs are transparent to solar radiation, but are effective in absorbing infrared radiation. Consequently, radiation that would otherwise escape back into space is retained, resulting in a warming of the earth’s atmosphere. This phenomenon is known as the greenhouse effect. Scientific research to date indicates that some of the observed climate change is a result of increased GHG emissions associated with human activity. Among the GHGs contributing to the greenhouse effect are water vapor, carbon dioxide (CO₂), methane (CH₄), ozone, Nitrous Oxide (NO_x), and chlorofluorocarbons. Human-caused emissions of these GHGs in excess of natural ambient concentrations are considered responsible for enhancing the greenhouse effect. GHG emissions contributing to global climate change are attributable, in large part, to human activities associated with the industrial/manufacturing, utility, transportation, residential, and agricultural sectors.

In California, the transportation sector is the largest emitter of GHGs, followed by electricity generation. Global climate change is, indeed, a global issue. GHGs are global pollutants, unlike criteria pollutants and TACs (which are pollutants of regional and/or local concern). Global climate change, if it occurs, could potentially affect water resources in California. Rising temperatures could be anticipated to result in sea-level rise (as polar ice caps melt) and possibly change the timing and amount of precipitation, which could alter water quality. According to some, climate change could result in more extreme weather patterns; both heavier precipitation that could lead to flooding, as well as more extended drought

periods. There is uncertainty regarding the timing, magnitude, and nature of the potential changes to water resources as a result of climate change; however, several trends are evident.

Snowpack and snowmelt may also be affected by climate change. Much of California's precipitation falls as snow in the Sierra Nevada and southern Cascades, and snowpack represents approximately 35 percent of the state's useable annual water supply. The snowmelt typically occurs from April through July; it provides natural water flow to streams and reservoirs after the annual rainy season has ended. As air temperatures increase due to climate change, the water stored in California's snowpack could be affected by increasing temperatures resulting in: (1) decreased snowfall, and (2) earlier snowmelt.

RESPONSES

- a. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?
- b. Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

Less Than Significant Impact. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency published a rule for the mandatory reporting of greenhouse gases from sources that in general emit 25,000 metric tons or more of carbon dioxide (CO₂) per year. As shown in the CalEEMod results (Appendix A), the Project will produce the following CO₂:

Construction (2019)	252.66 MT/yr
Construction (2020)	275.50 MT/yr
<u>Operation (2020)</u>	<u>1,071.07 MT/yr</u>
Combined:	1,599.23 MT/yr

To be conservative, the proposed Project construction and operational CO₂ emissions are combined and the Project is estimated to produce 1,599.23 tons per year of CO₂. This represents approximately six percent of the reporting threshold.

The City of Fresno prepared a Greenhouse Gas Reduction Plan (Appendix F-2 of the General Plan MEIR) as part of the General Plan Update, which included an emission reduction target for demonstrating consistency with State greenhouse gas reduction targets. The General Plan contains several policies designed to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Due to its proposed location at the Fig Garden Financial Center, as well as its location on a vacant / underutilized parcel, the Project is consistent with the following policies:

Policy UF-12-b: Activity Centers. Mixed-use designated areas along BRT and/or transit corridors are appropriate for more intensive concentrations of urban uses. Typical uses could include commercial areas; employment centers; schools; compact residential development; religious institutions; parks; and other gathering points where residents may interact, work, and obtain goods and services in the same place.

Policy UF-12-e: Access to Activity Centers. Promote adoption and implementation of standards supporting pedestrian activities and bicycle linkages from surrounding land uses and neighborhoods into Activity Centers and to transit stops. Provide for priority transit routes and facilities to serve the Activity Centers.

Policy LU-2-a: Infill Development and Redevelopment. Promote development of vacant, underdeveloped, and redevelopable land within the City Limits where urban services are available by considering the establishment and implementation of supportive regulations and programs.

Policy MT-2-c: Reduce VMT through Infill Development. Provide incentives for infill development that would provide jobs and services closer to housing and multi-modal transportation corridors, and vice versa, in order to reduce citywide vehicle miles travelled.

Policy RC-2-a Link Land Use to Transportation. Promote mixed-use, higher density infill development in multi-modal corridors. Support land use patterns that make more efficient use of the transportation system and plan future transportation investments in areas of higher-intensity development. Discourage investment in infrastructure that would not meet these criteria.

Policy RC-8-a Existing Standards and Programs. Continue existing beneficial energy conservation programs, including adhering to the California Energy Code in new construction and major renovations.

In addition, the proposed Project will comply with the following City of Fresno GHG Reduction Plan strategies:

- Energy Efficiency in New Buildings: the Project will meet or exceed Title 24 Energy Efficiency Standards.
- Water Conservation: The Project will implement the City of Fresno Water Conservation Program, including implementation of the State's Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance. The California Water Conservation Act mandates a 20 percent reduction in water usage by 2020. The City has a reduction target of per capita water usage in the City's water service area to 230 gpd per capita

(25 percent below the current consumption rate) in 2035. The City will meet the reduction target with measures applicable to new and existing development. Reductions beyond the state mandated 20 percent are possible with the use of building and landscaping water conservation features. The reductions from buildings can be achieved with high efficiency toilets, low-flow faucets, and water-efficient appliances such as dishwashers. Water savings from landscaping would be achieved primarily through the use of drought-tolerant landscaping or xeriscaping.

- **Bicycle and Pedestrian Infrastructure:** The Project includes a small park within the Fig Garden Financial Center and enhanced pedestrian access to the green space, providing local residents and employees with additional access to open space. The Project also includes pedestrian access to the Fig Garden district from the adjacent residential areas.
- **Compact and Infill Development:** The Project will make use of an existing underutilized space where similar facilities are located and public transit is available. More intense commercial development increases opportunities for walking, bicycling and transit use for some trips, thereby reducing vehicle trips.

The City's GHG Reduction Plan, Section 6.2.2 – New Discretionary Development requiring a General Plan Amendment (3.) states that 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.

The proposed Project is consistent with the City's General Plan policies pertaining to greenhouse gases, and implements greenhouse gas reduction features included in the City's GHG Reduction Plan. Therefore, the impact is considered *less than significant*.

Construction emissions

Emissions from construction are temporary in nature. The SJVAPCD has implemented a guidance policy for development projects within their jurisdiction. This policy, "Guidance for Land-use Agencies in Addressing GHG Emission Impacts for New Projects under CEQA," approved by the Board on December 17, 2009, does not address temporary GHG emissions from construction, nor does this policy establish numeric thresholds for ongoing GHG emissions. Therefore, construction-generated GHGs are *less than significant*.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

In conclusion, the Project will not result in any greenhouse gas impacts beyond those analyzed in MEIR SCH No. 2012111015.

IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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 or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?	☐	☐	☒	☐
f. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency	☐	☐	☒	☐

IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Would the project:

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	---	------------------------------------	--------------

response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

- g. Expose people or structures either directly or indirectly to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?

☐	☐	☐	☒
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

Hazardous materials refer generally to hazardous substances that exhibit corrosive, poisonous, flammable, and/or reactive properties and have the potential to harm human health and/or the environment. There are no known hazardous material producing facilities in the vicinity of the Project. The Project is located adjacent to and within the existing Fig Garden Financial Center and is adjacent to residential housing. There are no schools within ¼ mile and the Project site is not within two miles of any airports.

RESPONSES

- a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?
- 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?

Less Than Significant Impact. Construction of the Project would require the use and transport of hazardous materials, including fuels, oils, and other chemicals (e.g., paints, lead, adhesives, etc.) typically used during construction. It is likely that these hazardous materials and vehicles would be stored by the contractor(s) on-site during construction activities. Improper use and transportation of hazardous materials could result in accidental releases or spills, potentially posing health risks to workers, the public, and the environment. However, all materials used during construction would be contained, stored, and handled in compliance with applicable standards and regulations established by the

Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC), the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA). In addition, a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) is required for the Project (see Mitigation Measure GEO – 1) and shall include emergency procedures for incidental hazardous materials releases. The SWPPP also includes Best Management Practices which includes requirements for hazardous materials storage.

The use of hazardous materials would be confined to the Project construction period. The Project itself, once constructed, will not contain, use or produce any hazardous materials.

- c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

No Impact. No schools are located within 0.25 mile of the Project site. This condition precludes the possibility of activities associated with the proposed Project exposing schools within a 0.25-mile radius of the Project site to hazardous materials. No impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

- 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?

Less Than Significant Impact. A database search was conducted to identify recorded hazardous materials incidents in the Project area. The search included recorded incidents on the National Priorities List (NPL), State Priority List (SPL), the Superfund Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation and Liability Information System List (CERLIS), the EPA's emergency response notification system list (ERNS), and other federal, state, and local agency databases. The Project site was not listed in any of the databases searched. See also Response b. Pursuant to Mitigation Measure HAZ – 1, the Project proponent will be required to prepare a Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment. Therefore, there the impact will be *less than significant*.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

- 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 or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?

Less Than Significant Impact. According to the Fresno County *Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan* (adopted December 2018), the proposed Project site is within the airport land use plan area for the Fresno Yosemite International Airport, which is located approximately 4 miles southeast of the site.

Fresno Yosemite International Airport is owned and operated by the City of Fresno. The Airport is approximately five miles northeast of downtown Fresno. The 2017 – 2021 *National Plan of Integrated Airport Systems* classifies the Airport as a small hub primary facility, and the 2013 *California Aviation System Plan* (CASP) considers it a primary small hub metropolitan airport. The Airport sits at an elevation of 336 feet above mean sea level. The Airport is a joint use civilian and military facility used by commercial air carriers, air cargo operators, charter operators, the State of California, general aviation, and the United States military. The California National Guard uses a 58-acre portion of the southeastern part of the Airport. The Army National Guard, the California Division of Forestry, corporate aviation businesses, and two fixed base operators also lease facilities from the Airport.¹¹

According to the *Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan*, the proposed Project site is located within the Precision Approach Zone of the Fresno Yosemite International Airport. This zone includes the 14 CFR Part 77 Outer Approach Transitional Surface and Precision Approach Surface. These Surfaces are used at airports with runways with an existing or planned Precision Instrument Approach. The aircraft accident risk level is considered to be low within the Precision Approach Zone.¹²

The proposed Project is located in an area that has three existing buildings with approximate 60 foot heights. As such, the proposed new 60-foot high office building would not create any new safety hazards to future occupants or airport operations. The Project has been reviewed by the Fresno County Airport Land Use Commission who evaluated all Project components including building height, lighting and glare and approved the Project at their February 2019 meeting. Therefore, the impact is *less than impact*.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

- f. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

¹¹ Fresno County *Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan* (2018), Appendix D.

¹² Fresno County *Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan* (2018), Page 3-3.

Less Than Significant Impact. To accommodate the new office building and parking area, the Project will require abandonment of a portion N. Colonial Avenue and W. San Jose Avenue where those streets meet adjacent to the Project site. The intention is to create a cul-de-sac with an adequately sized turn-around pocket just south of the intersection of N. Colonial Avenue and W. San Ramon Avenue and a second cul-de-sac turn-around pocket on W. San Jose Avenue just north of the proposed new parking area. This will eliminate thru-traffic along this route. However, access to the new parking area and the new office building will be provided from W. San Jose Avenue. The turn-around pockets have been adequately sized for emergency vehicles and will provide emergency vehicle access to the site and surrounding area as needed.

The City has consulted with its police, fire and ambulance service providers to determine that the proposed Project provides adequate emergency access to the Project site and surrounding areas. The City will also provide specific construction schedules and pertinent Project information so that adequate access is maintained at all times. Therefore, the Project will have *a less than significant impact*.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

- g. Expose people or structures either directly or indirectly to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?

No Impact. Implementation of the Project would not change the degree of exposure to wildfires because there are no wildlands in the Project vicinity, thus precluding the possibility of wildfires. Therefore, there is *no impact*.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

In conclusion, with mitigation incorporated, the Project will not result in any hazards or hazardous materials impacts beyond those analyzed in MEIR SCH No. 2012111015.

X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b. Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	☐	☒	☐	☐
c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:	☐	☒	☐	☐
i. Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off- site;	☐	☐	☒	☐
ii. substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite;	☐	☐	☒	☐
iii. 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; or	☐	☐	☒	☐
iv. impede or redirect flood flows?	☐	☐	☒	☐

X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
d. In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒

AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

According to the City's adopted Urban Water Management Plan (2015), the City's existing water system consists of about 1,799 miles of transmission and distribution pipelines, 260 active municipal groundwater wells, 224 of which registered flows in the past year, 2 surface water treatment facilities of rated capacities of 2 and 30 mgd, 3 water storage facilities, and 4 booster pump facilities. The distribution system was previously divided into four quasi-pressure zones to help regulate and optimize system pressures as there is an approximate 120 feet of elevation decrease running across the city from the northeast to the southwest.

The City of Fresno will provide water to the office building, however, the Project will be required to tie into the City's existing water service infrastructure.

RESPONSES

- a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?

Less Than Significant Impact. The Project has the potential to impact water quality standards and/or waste discharge requirements during construction (temporary impacts) and operation. Impacts are discussed below.

Construction

Although the proposed Project site is relatively small in scale, grading, excavation, removal of vegetation cover, and loading activities associated with construction activities could temporarily increase runoff, erosion, and sedimentation. Construction activities also could result in soil compaction and wind erosion effects that could adversely affect soils and reduce the revegetation potential at construction sites and staging areas.

Three general sources of potential short-term construction-related stormwater pollution associated with the proposed Project are: 1) the handling, storage, and disposal of construction materials containing pollutants; 2) the maintenance and operation of construction equipment; and 3) earth moving activities which, when not controlled, may generate soil erosion and transportation, via storm runoff or mechanical equipment. Generally, routine safety precautions for handling and storing construction materials may effectively mitigate the potential pollution of stormwater by these materials. These same types of common sense, “good housekeeping” procedures can be extended to non-hazardous stormwater pollutants such as sawdust and other solid wastes.

Poorly maintained vehicles and heavy equipment leaking fuel, oil, antifreeze, or other fluids on the construction site are also common sources of stormwater pollution and soil contamination. In addition, grading activities can greatly increase erosion processes. Two general strategies are recommended to prevent construction silt from entering local storm drains. First, erosion control procedures should be implemented for those areas that must be exposed. Secondly, the area should be secured to control offsite migration of pollutants. These Best Management Practices (BMPs) would be required in the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) to be prepared prior to commencement of Project construction. When properly designed and implemented, these “good-housekeeping” practices are expected to reduce short-term construction-related impacts to less than significant.

In accordance with the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Stormwater Program, as discussed in Section 3.5 Geology and Soils the Project will be required to comply with existing regulatory requirements to prepare a SWPPP designed to control erosion and the loss of topsoil to the extent practicable using BMPs that the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) has deemed effective in controlling erosion, sedimentation, runoff during construction activities. The specific controls are subject to the review and approval by the RWQCB and are an existing regulatory requirement.

Operation

The proposed office building will result in wastewater from restroom and kitchen facilities that will be discharged into the City’s existing wastewater treatment system. The effluent produced by the

Project will be typical of other office buildings and therefore is not anticipated to produce any discharge that would violate the City's waste discharge requirements. According to projections used in the City of Fresno Wastewater Collection System Master Plan (2006), wastewater from office buildings is estimated to be approximately 200 gallons per day (GPD) per 1,000 sq. ft. of space. Using this rate, the proposed Project would generate approximately 18,000 gallons per day (GPD) of wastewater (90,000 sq. ft. of office space @ 200 GPD per 1,000 sq. ft.). For purposes of comparison, the previously occupied 44-unit apartment building (since demolished) is estimated to have used approximately 8,157 GPD (assuming 103 GPD/person).

The Fresno-Clovis Regional Water Treatment Facility has a design capacity of 88,000,000 GPD. At 18,000 GPD, the proposed Project would generate a negligible increase in wastewater of less than 0.00002%. Therefore, the impact is *less than significant*.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

- b. Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?

Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation. The Project does not propose any wells on the site; the City of Fresno Department of Public Utilities Water Division has determined that no new or expanded water supply facilities are necessary to serve the Project. The Project's potential impacts related to water supply and groundwater resources (to the extent that groundwater represents the City's primary source of supply) are more appropriately addressed within the context of the adequacy of existing water supply infrastructure in the Project area. Please see Section XVIII. Utilities and Service Systems. Water service would be provided to the Project by the City of Fresno.

Project demands for groundwater resources in connection with the proposed Project would not substantially deplete water supplies. The proposed Project is not anticipated to result in additional demands for water resources beyond those considered in the 2015 UWMP. The proposed office building would result in less water demand than anticipated in the 2015 UWMP based on the site's existing land use designation (residential). The Project would, however, increase demand for water resources beyond existing levels (vacant land). Current on-site water use is primarily associated with exterior landscaping and maintenance requirements. As a result, the Project would potentially affect water resources by increasing on-site water use as compared to current on-site use.

While the Project would increase demand for water resources beyond current levels, the Project would utilize less water than the water demand projections contained in the 2015 UWMP with

respect to development of this site. The site is currently designated for residential housing. If the Project area were developed fully with residential uses, the water use would exceed that of the office building. Therefore, the Project's water demands were effectively considered under the terms of that UWMP. Based on the assumptions in the City's UWMP, the Project would not negatively impact water supplies or otherwise deplete groundwater supplies. Moreover, the proposed Project is not anticipated to interfere with groundwater recharge efforts being implemented by the City. The City's UWMP contains a detailed evaluation of existing sources of water supply, anticipated future water demand, extensive conservation measures, and the development of new water supplies (recycled water, increased recharge, surface water treatment, etc.). Measures contained in the UWMP as well as the City's General Plan are intended to reduce demands on groundwater resources by augmenting supply and introducing conservation measures and other mitigation strategies. The proposed Project will implement Mitigation Measure HYD – 1 which includes water use reduction measures.

The proposed Project would not require new or expanded water entitlements and there is sufficient water supply for the Project. Therefore, the impact is *less than significant*.

Mitigation Measures: Project-specific Mitigation Measures HYD – 1. See attached Project-specific Mitigation Measure Monitoring Checklist.

The proposed Project would not substantially deplete groundwater resources such that a significant environmental impact would occur. Therefore, the impact is *less than significant*.

- c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:
 - i. result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or offsite;
 - ii. substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite;
 - iii. 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; or
 - iv. impede or redirect flood flows?

Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation. The Project includes minor changes to the existing stormwater drainage pattern of the area through the installation of asphalt, the office building, parking

areas, landscaping, curb, gutter and sidewalks. The Project area was previously planned for residential uses rather than for commercial uses. Therefore, as a condition of approval, the Project applicant will be required to mitigate the impacts of increased runoff from the proposed office development and parking area. The Project has been reviewed by the Fresno Metropolitan Flood Control District and conditions and requirements of the Project pertaining to storm drain facilities have been provided to the Project developer. The Project developer will be required to prepare a drainage / grading plan as identified in Mitigation Measure HYD – 2 (preparation of a drainage / grading plan). Therefore, with mitigation, the Project will have a *less than significant impact*.

Mitigation Measures: Project-specific Mitigation Measures HYD – 2. See attached Project-specific Mitigation Measure Monitoring Checklist.

- d. In flood hazard, tsunami or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?
- e. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?

No Impact. The Project is not within a regulatory floodway or within a base floodplain (100 year) elevation. In addition, the Project does not include any housing or structures that would be subject to flooding either from a watercourse or from dam inundation. There are no bodies of water near the site that would create a potential risk of hazards from seiche, tsunami or mudflow. The Project will not conflict with any water quality control plans or sustainable groundwater management plan. Therefore, there are *no impacts*.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

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

XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING

Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Physically divide an established community?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b. Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	☐	☒	☐	☐

AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

The Project site is located within the Bullard Community Planning area in the City of Fresno, California. The Project site is situated near the northeast corner of Palm Avenue and Shaw Avenue, and is bounded by N. Palm Avenue to the west, W. San Ramon Avenue, N. Colonial Avenue and W. San Jose Avenue to the north, the Fig Garden Village shopping center to the southwest, and single- and multi-family residential development to the north, south, and east.

RESPONSES

- a. Physically divide an established community?
- b. Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation. The site is located at the existing Fig Garden Financial Center adjacent to Fig Garden Village in a relatively busy mixed-use area including shopping, services and housing in central Fresno. The immediate vicinity is comprised of large office buildings, parking areas and residential housing. To the north and east of the proposed office building is residential housing while existing office buildings are located to the south and west. The proposed new parking area is surrounded by residential housing to the north and south, a vacant lot to the east, and an office building to the west. The area is highly disturbed with urban uses.

Zoning

APN 417-140-21 is zoned RS-5/EQ (Residential Single-Family / Equine Overlay)

APN 417-231-16 is zoned RMX (Regional Mixed-Use)

APN 417-140-26 is zoned RMX/cz (Regional Mixed-Use / Conditions of Zoning)

APN 417-231-19 is zoned RMX/cz (Regional Mixed-Use / Conditions of Zoning)

The Project has no characteristics that would physically divide the City of Fresno. Although a portion of a thru-street will be abandoned, the result would not physically divide an established community, as access to the existing residential and commercial establishments will remain.

The proposed Project would conflict with the current zoning and planned land use for the site. As such, the Project is pursuing a zone change and planned land use change. The proposed Mitigation Measure LU -1 (requirement to obtain appropriate entitlements) will reduce the impacts to a *less than significant* level. With the approved zoning and land use changes, the proposed Project will be consistent with the following land use policies:

Fresno General Plan

The Fresno General Plan designates the subject site as planned land use Residential Medium Density. Plan Amendment/Rezone Application No. P18-3659 proposes to amend the Fresno General Plan and Bullard Community Plan planned land use from Residential Medium Density to Regional Mixed Use. The proposed Project is compatible with goals, objectives, and policies included in the Fresno General Plan, including:

- Goal No. 1 of the Fresno General Plan encourages the use of urban form, land use, and Development Code policies to streamline permit approval, promote local educational excellence and workforce relevance, significantly increase business development and expansion, retain and attract talented people, create jobs and sustained economic growth, strategically locate employment lands and facilities, and avoid over-saturation of a single type of housing, retail or employment.
- Goal No. 7 of the Fresno General Plan encourages the provision 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.
- Goal No. 8 of the Fresno General Plan encourages the development of Complete Neighborhoods and districts with an efficient and diverse mix of residential densities,

building types, and affordability which are designed to be healthy, attractive, and centered by schools, parks, and public and commercial services to provide a sense of place and that provide as many services as possible within walking distance.

- Goal No. 12 of the Fresno General Plan encourages the resolution of existing public infrastructure and service deficiencies, full use of existing infrastructure, and investment in improvements to increase competitiveness and promote economic growth.
- Implementing Policies LU-1-a and LU-2-a of the Fresno General Plan promote development of vacant, underdeveloped, and re-developable land within the Existing City Limits as of December 31, 2012 where urban services are available.
- Objective LU-6 of the Fresno General Plan promotes the retention and enhancement of existing commercial areas to strengthen Fresno's economic base and development of new office, retail, and lodging use districts on sites which will serve neighborhoods and regional visitors.
- Fresno General Plan Policy LU-6-a fosters high quality design, diversity, and a mix of amenities in new development with uses through the consideration of guidelines, regulations and design review procedures.

Plan Amendment/Rezone Application No. P18-3659, as the initial step in the future development of an approximately 90,000-square-foot, 4-story expansion of office uses at The Fig Garden Financial Center, would aid in the accommodation of sustained economic growth and the expansion of employment in an area with surrounding residential and retail uses, avoiding over-saturation of a single type of housing, retail or employment in the area.

The applicant has also been working with local residents on the concept of a park within the Fig Garden Financial Center and enhanced pedestrian access to the complex's green space, providing local residents and employees with additional access to open space.

As an expansion of an existing use in a developed urban area, the future Project would make use of existing public infrastructure and services. The proposed development would be evaluated at the time of the development permit application submittal to determine possible impacts to public infrastructure and services. At that time, the proposed development may be required to construct or contribute to infrastructure and/or service improvements.

Bullard Community Plan

Upon reviewing the policies contained in the Plan, staff has determined that there are no policies that are more restrictive than those contained in the FMC. The proposed Project is compatible with goals and policies included in the Bullard Community Plan, including:

- Goal 4.2.3-5 promotes office land use designations of a size, configuration, location and visibility that would be attractive to prospective office users.
- Policy 4.2.4-4 indicates that commercial areas shall be designed such that commercial traffic will not route through local residential streets.
- Policy 4.2.4-7-d indicates that no commercial or office building shall be constructed within fifty-feet of the property line of abutting properties zoned or planned for residential uses.

The proposed Project prepares the subject properties for an expansion of the existing office use at Fig Garden Financial Center with a concept that inhibits commercial traffic passing through local residential streets. The future location of the new office building, while not yet part of an official application, conceptually places the building at a greater distance from existing residential uses than attempting to place an office building on the northeast corner of North Colonial and West San Jose Avenues directly abutting single-family residences. See Exhibit I for the conceptual site plan.

Fresno County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan

On December 3, 2018, the Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) adopted the Fresno County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan. The proposed Project is within the Airport Influence Area of Fresno Yosemite International Airport and must be reviewed by the ALUC. The subject site is located in the Precision Approach Zone, where the Safety Criteria Matrix for the Plan indicates no limit on Project density but does require Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) 7460 review to determine that development will not exceed the airport's airspace protection surface. As the Project does not include a development permit application with building elevations at this time, the FAA review will not be required for the ALUC to review the proposed plan amendment/rezone application. It should be noted that Fig Garden Financial Center already has existing buildings of the same mass and height as the future office building concept.

Mitigation Measures: Project-specific Mitigation Measures LU - 1. See attached Project-specific Mitigation Measure Monitoring Checklist.

XII. MINERAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

RESPONSES

- 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?
- 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?

No Impact. There are no known mineral resources in the Project area and none are identified in the City’s General Plan near the Project site. Therefore, there is *no impact*.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

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

XIII. NOISE

Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b. Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c. For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	☐	☐	☐	☒

AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

Noise is most often described as unwanted sound. Although sound can be easily measured, the perception of noise and the physical response to sound complicate the analysis of its impact on people. The City of Fresno is impacted by a multitude of noise sources. Mobile sources of noise, especially cars and trucks, are the most common and significant sources of noise in most communities, and they are predominant sources of noise in the City. In addition, commercial, industrial, and institutional land uses throughout the City (i.e., schools, fire stations, utilities) generate stationary-source noise. The Project is located in an intensively developed commercial/office area, but is adjacent to residential housing. The predominant noise sources in the Project area include traffic on local roadways and typical noise associated with shopping centers such as Fig Garden Village and residential noise (lawn mowers, audio equipment, voices, etc.). Sensitive receptors in the area include the residential housing adjacent to the Project areas.

RESPONSES

- a. Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?
- b. Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

Less than Significant Impact.

Short-term (Construction) Noise Impacts

Proposed Project construction related activities will involve temporary noise sources and are anticipated to begin in 2019 through 2020. Typical construction related equipment include graders, trenchers, small tractors and excavators. During the proposed Project construction, noise from construction related activities will contribute to the noise environment in the immediate vicinity. Activities involved in construction will generate maximum noise levels, as indicated in Table 5, ranging from 79 to 91 dBA at a distance of 50 feet, without feasible noise control (e.g., mufflers) and ranging from 75 to 80 dBA at a distance of 50 feet, with feasible noise controls.

Table 5
Typical Construction Noise Levels

Type of Equipment	dBA at 50 ft	
	Without Feasible Noise Control	With Feasible Noise Control
Dozer or Tractor	80	75
Excavator	88	80
Scraper	88	80
Front End Loader	79	75
Backhoe	85	75
Grader	85	75
Truck	91	75

The distinction between short-term construction noise impacts and long-term operational noise impacts is a typical one in both CEQA documents and local noise ordinances, which generally recognize the reality that short-term noise from construction is inevitable and cannot be mitigated beyond a certain level. Thus, local agencies frequently tolerate short-term noise at levels that they would not accept for permanent noise sources. A more severe approach would be impractical and might preclude the kind of construction activities that are to be expected from time to time in urban environments. Most residents of urban areas recognize this reality and expect to hear construction activities on occasion.

In addition, construction activities would not occur between the hours of 10:00 PM and 7:00 AM, Monday through Saturday, in accordance with Fresno Municipal Code Section 10-109, which limits work hours “to between the hours of 7 AM and 10 PM on any day except Sunday.” Further restrictions on construction noise may be placed on the Project as determined through the Conditional Use permit process.

Long-term (Operational) Noise Impacts

The primary source of on-going noise from the Project will be from vehicles traveling to and from the site. The Project will result in an increase in traffic on some roadways in the Project area. However, the relatively low number of new trips associated with the Project is not likely to increase the ambient noise levels by a significant amount. Policy H-1-b of the City’s Noise Element addresses significant Project-related increases in ambient noise levels for evaluation of noise impacts. A significant increase is assumed to occur if a project causes the ambient noise level to increase by the following amounts:

Where ambient noise levels are <60 dB : an increase of 5 dB or more

Where ambient noise levels are 60-65 dB: an increase of 3 dB or more

Where ambient noise levels are >65 dB : an increase of 1.5 dB or more

Given the relatively large amount of existing vehicular activity in the Project area, the small increase in traffic associated with the new office building (less than 1,000 daily trips), is not expected to increase ambient noise levels by more than 1 dB. The area is highly active with vehicles, commercial establishments and other noise generating sources and the proposed Project will not introduce a new source of noise that isn’t already occurring in the area. Other operational noise generation from air conditioning systems or other mechanical equipment will be similar to the other offices in the area and will be shielded to dampen the noise impacts. Therefore, the impact is considered *less than significant*.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

- e. For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan, or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

No Impact. The Project is located within an airport land use plan but is located well outside the CNEL contours. Therefore, there is *no impact*.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

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

XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING

Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b. Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☒	☐

AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

The Project consists of the construction and operation of a professional office building. There is no new housing associated with the Project, however a 44-unit apartment building previously occupied a portion of the site (since demolished).

RESPONSES

- a. Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?
- b. Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

Less Than Significant Impact. There are no new homes associated with the proposed Project. The relatively minor amount of new employment opportunities that would be created by the proposed Project could be readily filled by the existing employment base, given the City’s existing unemployment rates. The proposed Project will not affect any regional population, housing, or employment projections anticipated by City policy documents. There is a *less than significant impact*.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

In conclusion, with mitigation incorporated, the Project will not result in any population or housing impacts beyond those analyzed in MEIR SCH No. 2012111015.

XV. PUBLIC SERVICES

Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------------	---	------------------------------------	--------------

- a. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

Fire protection?	☐	☐	☒	☐
Police protection?	☐	☐	☒	☐
Schools?	☐	☐	☒	☐
Parks?	☐	☐	☒	☐
Other public facilities?	☐	☐	☒	☐

AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

The site is located at the existing Fig Garden Financial Center adjacent to Fig Garden Village in a relatively busy mixed-use area including shopping, services and housing in central Fresno. The immediate vicinity is comprised of large office buildings, parking areas and residential housing. The area is served by City of Fresno Police, Fire, the Fresno Unified School District and other public facilities.

RESPONSES

- a. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

Fire protection?

Police Protection?

Schools?

Parks?

Other public facilities?

Less Than Significant Impact. Police protection services would be provided to the Project site from the existing Northwest District Station, which is situated on 3781 N. Hughes Ave, approximately three miles from the Project site. The Project is located within the Northwest District. The Project site is located in an area currently served by the Police Department; the Department would not need to expand its existing service area or construct a new facility to serve the Project site.

According to the City of Fresno Fire Department, the proposed Project would be served by Station 11, which is located at 5544 North Fresno, approximately 0.5 miles from the Project site. Project development would result in an incremental increase in demand for fire protection services due to the introduction of a new commercial office building within the Project area. According to the Fire Department, response times to the Project site would be within the Department's stated goal of four minutes. As a result, the Project would not adversely impact the Department's ability to provide fire protection services within the Project area or adversely impact target response times such that additional facilities would need to be constructed.

The proposed Project, as a condition of approval, will be required to comply with all applicable fire and building safety codes (California Building Code and Uniform Fire Code) to ensure adequate fire safety elements are incorporated into final Project design, including the providing minimum turning radii for fire equipment. Proposed driveways will be required to provide appropriate widths and turning radii to safely accommodate emergency response and the transport of emergency/public safety vehicles. The Project will also be designed to meet Fire Department requirements regarding fire flow, water storage requirements, hydrant spacing, infrastructure sizing, and emergency access. As a result, appropriate fire safety considerations will be included as part of the final design of the Project. Based on the above analysis, the proposed Project would not impact the Department's ability to provide fire protection services within the Project area.

The Project does not include any housing and thus would not impact any school facilities. In addition, the Project includes a small park area that will be open to the public, the environmental impacts of which are addressed in this document.

The Project has no design, construction or operational characteristics that would necessitate the need for new or expanded facilities related to fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, or other public facilities. There is no housing related or population inducing component of the Project. The Project applicant will be required to pay standard development impact fees for the public services described herein as determined by the City of Fresno. Therefore, there is a *less than significant impact*.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

In conclusion, with mitigation incorporated, the Project will not result in any public services impacts beyond those analyzed in MEIR SCH No. 2012111015.

XVI. RECREATION

Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

There are no parks or recreational facilities in the immediate vicinity of the Project site. However, the Project includes construction of a small park area that will be open to the public.

RESPONSES

- 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?
- 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?

No Impact. The Project has no design, construction or operational characteristics that would necessitate the need for new or expanded facilities related to recreational facilities. There is no housing related or population inducing component of the Project. However, the Project is likely to improve park/recreational facilities by constructing a small park to be located north of the new parking area adjacent to W. San Jose Avenue. Therefore, there is *no impact*.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

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

XVII. TRANSPORTATION/
TRAFFIC

Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Conflict with a program plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b. Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	☐	☒	☐	☐
c. Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d. Result in inadequate emergency access?	☐	☐	☒	☐

AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

The Project site is located near the northeast corner of Palm Avenue and Shaw Avenue, and is bounded by N. Palm Avenue and the Fig Garden Financial Center to the west, W. San Ramon Avenue, N. Colonial Avenue and W. San Jose Avenue to the north, the Fig Garden Village shopping center to the south, and single- and multi-family residential development to the north, south, and east.

A Trip Generation Analysis for the Project was prepared by Precision Civil Engineering (See Appendix B).

RESPONSES

- a. Conflict with a program plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?

- b. Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?
- c. Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?
- d. Result in inadequate emergency access?

Less Than Significant Impact. To accommodate the new office building and parking area, the Project will require abandonment of a portion N. Colonial Avenue and W. San Jose Avenue where those streets meet adjacent to the Project site. The intention is to create a “dead-end” cul-de-sac with an adequately sized turn-around pocket just south of the intersection of N. Colonial Avenue and W. San Ramon Avenue and a second cul-de-sac turn-around pocket on W. San Jose Avenue just north of the proposed new parking area. This will eliminate thru-traffic along this route. However, access to the Project will be provided from W. San Jose Avenue. The turn-around pockets have been adequately sized for emergency vehicles and will provide emergency vehicle access to the site and surrounding area as needed.

The “Mobility and Transportation” element of the City of Fresno General Plan 2035 breaks down the City of Fresno into four Traffic Impact Zones (TIZ’s) on General Plan Figure MT-4. The Project lies within TIX-II, which represents areas of the City that are mostly developed and built out. To encourage infill development and minimize upfront infrastructure cost, the peak hour Level of Service (LOS) shall be maintained at LOS E or better for all intersections and roadway segments. The trigger for requiring a Traffic Impact Study (TIS) for all development within the TIZ-II is when a Project is anticipated to generate 200 or more new peak hour trips. As identified below, the Project will result in less than 200 peak hour trips and thus a full TIS is not warranted.

Trip Generation Analysis

Project trip generation was developed assuming approximately 90,000 square feet of usable office space would be available. According to the Institute of Transportation Engineers, Trip Generation (Ninth Edition), the Project will generate approximately 993 daily trips and is anticipated to have 141 AM peak hour trips and 134 PM peak hour trips (See Table 6 below).

Table 6
Proposed Project Trip Generation

Project Component	Total Daily Trips	AM Peak Hour In	AM Peak Hour Out	PM Peak Hour In	PM Peak Hour Out
General Office ITE Code 710	993	124	17	23	111
			Total: 141		Total: 134

With the proposed abandonment and restricted access to the existing local roads, the proposed trips will gain access to the Project site through the existing commercial and office developments to the west. San Jose Avenue and Palm Avenue will be the main access point. According to the Trip Generation Analysis, the intersections of Palm/Shaw, Palm/San Jose and Palm/Barstow, are all signalized. The City should continue to monitor these intersections and adjust signal timing as needed to improve the level of service. The City of Fresno Public Works Department, Traffic and Engineering Services Division determined that the Project does not represent a significant change in traffic beyond existing levels generated by the current office uses in the Fig Garden Financial Center.

The Project will not conflict with plans or policies pertaining to transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities. Nor is the Project inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3 subdivision (b). The Project is located in an area served by transit and is proximate to other destinations such as restaurants and shopping opportunities in the Fig Garden Village located adjacent to the Project. The Project includes the addition of pedestrian facilities (walkways, sidewalks, curbs and ADA facilities), as well as bicycle storage accommodations. Implementation of the Project will be beneficial to such facilities. The Project is consistent with the following General Plan policies pertaining to public transit, bicycle or pedestrian facilities:

Policy UF-12-b: Activity Centers. Mixed-use designated areas along BRT and/or transit corridors are appropriate for more intensive concentrations of urban uses. Typical uses could include commercial areas; employment centers; schools; compact residential development; religious institutions; parks; and other gathering points where residents may interact, work, and obtain goods and services in the same place.

Policy UF-12-e: Access to Activity Centers. Promote adoption and implementation of standards supporting pedestrian activities and bicycle linkages from surrounding land uses and neighborhoods into Activity Centers and to transit stops. Provide for priority transit routes and facilities to serve the Activity Centers.

Policy MT-2-c: Reduce VMT through Infill Development. Provide incentives for infill development that would provide jobs and services closer to housing and multi-modal transportation corridors, and vice versa, in order to reduce citywide vehicle miles travelled.

Policy RC-2-a Link Land Use to Transportation. Promote mixed-use, higher density infill development in multi-modal corridors. Support land use patterns that make more efficient use of the transportation system and plan future transportation investments in areas of higher-intensity development. Discourage investment in infrastructure that would not meet these criteria.

The City of Fresno also prepared an Active Transportation Plan (ATP) in 2016, which envisions a complete, safe and comfortable network of trails, sidewalks and bikeways that serves all residents of Fresno. While there are no established trails associated with the site, as previously mentioned, the Project will provide pedestrian access from adjacent residential neighborhoods, will provide bicycle storage facilities and will not otherwise conflict with any policies or programs included in the ATP.

In order to ensure that impacts remain *less than significant*, Mitigation Measures TRA – 1 (provide pedestrian connectivity to adjacent residents), TRA – 2 (provide bicycle storage), TRA – 3 (maintain emergency vehicle access), and TRA – 4 (payment of transportation impact fees) have been included.

Mitigation Measures: Project-specific Mitigation Measures TRA – 1, TRA – 2, TRA – 3, and TRA – 4. See attached Project-specific Mitigation Measure Monitoring Checklist.

It is also recommended that the City continue to monitor the intersections of Palm/Shaw, Palm/San Jose and Palm/Barstow and adjust signal timing to improve the intersection level of services.

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

XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

a. Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code 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:

- i) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or
- 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 Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

☐	☐	☒	☐
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

☐	☐	☒	☐
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

RESPONSES

- a). Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code 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:
- i) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or
 - 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 Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.

Less Than Significant Impact In accordance with Assembly Bill (AB) 52 and Senate Bill (SB) 18, potentially affected Tribes were formally notified of this Project and were given the opportunity to request consultation on the Project. The City contacted the Native American Heritage Commission, requesting a contact list of applicable Native American Tribes, which was provided to the City. The City provided letters to the listed Tribes, notifying them of the Project and requesting consultation, if desired. A total of ten Tribes were contacted of which four (4) indicated they had no comment, and the remaining six (6) did not respond to the invitation to comment and consult. Therefore, there is a *less than significant impact*.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c. 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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d. Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e. Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	☐	☐	☒	☐

AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

The City of Fresno provides water, sewer, storm drain and solid waste services. The Project will be responsible for constructing infrastructure to tie into these services.

RESPONSES

- a. Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?

Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation. The Project includes minor changes to the existing stormwater drainage pattern of the area through the installation of asphalt, the office building, parking areas, landscaping, curb, gutter and sidewalks. The Project area was previously planned for residential uses rather than for commercial uses. Therefore, as a condition of approval, the Project applicant will be required to mitigate the impacts of increased runoff from the proposed office development and parking area. The Project has been reviewed by the Fresno Metropolitan Flood Control District and conditions and requirements of the Project pertaining to storm drain facilities have been provided to the Project developer. The Project developer will be required to prepare a drainage / grading plan as identified in Mitigation Measure HYD – 2 (preparation of a drainage / grading plan). Therefore, with mitigation, the Project will have a *less than significant impact*.

Mitigation Measures: Project-specific Mitigation Measures HYD – 2. See attached Project-specific Mitigation Measure Monitoring Checklist.

- b. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?

Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation. Water service would be provided to the Project by the City of Fresno and the City of Fresno Department of Public Utilities Water Division has determined that no new or expanded water supply facilities are necessary to serve the Project.

Project demands for groundwater resources in connection with the proposed Project would not substantially deplete water supplies. The proposed Project is not anticipated to result in additional demands for water resources beyond those considered in the 2015 UWMP. The proposed office building would result in less water demand than anticipated in the 2015 UWMP based on the site's existing land use designation (residential). The Project would, however, increase demand for water resources beyond existing levels (vacant land). Current on-site water use is primarily associated with exterior landscaping

and maintenance requirements. As a result, the Project would potentially affect water resources by increasing on-site water use as compared to current on-site use.

While the Project would increase demand for water resources beyond current levels, the Project would utilize less water than the water demand projections contained in the 2015 UWMP with respect to development of this site. The site is currently designated for residential housing. If the Project area were developed fully with residential uses, the water use would exceed that of the office building. Therefore, the Project's water demands were effectively considered under the terms of that UWMP. Based on the assumptions in the City's UWMP, the Project would not negatively impact water supplies or otherwise deplete groundwater supplies. Moreover, the proposed Project is not anticipated to interfere with groundwater recharge efforts being implemented by the City. The City's UWMP contains a detailed evaluation of existing sources of water supply, anticipated future water demand, extensive conservation measures, and the development of new water supplies (recycled water, increased recharge, surface water treatment, etc.). Measures contained in the UWMP as well as the City's General Plan are intended to reduce demands on groundwater resources by augmenting supply and introducing conservation measures and other mitigation strategies. The proposed Project will implement Mitigation Measure HYD – 1 which includes water use reduction measures.

The proposed Project would not require new or expanded water entitlements and there is sufficient water supply for the Project. Therefore, the impact is *less than significant*.

Mitigation Measures: Project-specific Mitigation Measures HYD – 1. See attached Project-specific Mitigation Measure Monitoring Checklist.

- c. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed office building will result in wastewater from restroom and kitchen facilities that will be discharged into the City's existing wastewater treatment system. The effluent produced by the Project will be typical of other office buildings and therefore is not anticipated to produce any discharge that would violate the City's waste discharge requirements. The City of Fresno Public Works Department has reviewed the Project and has determined that it has adequate capacity to serve the Project. For more information, please refer to the Hydrology section of this Chapter.

Therefore, the impact is *less than significant*.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

- d. Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?
- e. Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

Less Than Significant Impact. The Project will be served by the City of Fresno Department of Public Utilities (Trash Disposal and Recycling) who has reviewed the Project. The location will be serviced by Allied Waste and will require a 2-cell trash enclosure with adequate access for trash pickup vehicles. Therefore, the impact is *less than significant*.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

In conclusion, with mitigation incorporated, the Project will not result in any utility or service system impacts beyond those analyzed in MEIR SCH No. 2012111015.

XX. WILDFIRE

If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b. Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c. Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d. Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?	☐	☐	☒	☐

AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

Although the City of Fresno is proximate to high and very high fire hazard designated areas, the City itself is largely categorized as little or no threat or moderate fire hazard, which is largely attributed to paved areas.¹³ Some small areas along the San Joaquin River Bluff in the northern portion of the City of

¹³ City of Fresno. General Plan and Development Code Update. Master Environmental Impact Report. Page 5.13-4.

<https://www.fresno.gov/darm/wp-content/uploads/sites/10/2016/11/Sec-05-13-Public-Services-Fresno-MEIR.pdf>. Accessed January 2019.

Fresno are prone to wildfire due to the relatively steep terrain and vegetation and are classified as having a high fire hazard. The City does have an adopted Emergency Operations Plan (EOP); however, the EOP does not designate evacuation routes, which may not be necessary since Fresno does not face any expected natural hazards from likely sources or locations.¹⁴

The proposed Project site is relatively flat at an elevation of 320 feet above mean sea level in an area of intense urban uses. It is located near the northeast corner of Palm Avenue and Shaw Avenue, and is bounded by N. Palm Avenue and the Fig Garden Financial Center to the west, W. San Ramon Avenue, N. Colonial Avenue and W. San Jose Avenue to the north, the Fig Garden Village shopping center to the south, and single- and multi-family residential development to the north, south, and east.

RESPONSES

- a. Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?
- b. Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?
- c. Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?
- d. Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed Project is located in the center of a highly urbanized area (buildings, roads, ect.) which precludes the risk of wildfire. The area is flat in nature which would limit the risk of downslope flooding and landslides, and limit any wildfire spread.

To receive building permits, the proposed Project would be required to be in compliance with the adopted emergency response plan. As such, any wildfire risk to the Project structures or people would be *less than significant*.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

¹⁴ City of Fresno General Plan. December 2014. Page 9-36. <https://www.fresno.gov/darm/wp-content/uploads/sites/10/2016/11/GP9NoiseandSafety.pdf>. Accessed January 2019

XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Would the project:

- a. Does the project have the potential to substantially 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, substantially 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?
- 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)?
- c. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

☐	☒	☐	☐
--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

☐	☐	☒	☐
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

☐	☒	☐	☐
--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

RESPONSES

- 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?

Less than Significant Impact With Mitigation. The analyses of environmental issues contained in this Initial Study indicate that the proposed Project is not expected to have substantial impact on the environment or on any resources identified in the Initial Study. Mitigation measures have been incorporated in the Project to reduce all potentially significant impacts to *less than significant*.

- 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)?

Less than Significant Impact. CEQA Guidelines Section 15064(i) states that a Lead Agency shall consider whether the cumulative impact of a project is significant and whether the effects of the project are cumulatively considerable. The assessment of the significance of the cumulative effects of a project must, therefore, be conducted in connection with the effects of past projects, other current projects, and probable future projects. Due to the nature of the Project and consistency with environmental policies, incremental contributions to impacts are considered less than cumulatively considerable. All Project-related impacts were determined to be either less than significant, or less than significant after mitigation. The proposed Project would not contribute substantially to adverse cumulative conditions, or create any substantial indirect impacts (i.e., increase in population could lead to an increase need for housing, increase in traffic, air pollutants, etc.). Due to extensive buildout of the area and existing land constraints, it is not anticipated that further substantial commercial or residential development will occur in the area. As such, Project impacts are not considered to be cumulatively considerable given the lack of proposed new development in the area and the insignificance of Project-induced impacts. The impact is therefore *less than significant*.

- c. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

Less than Significant Impact With Mitigation. The analyses of environmental issues contained in this Initial Study indicate that the Project is not expected to have substantial impact on human beings, either directly or indirectly. Mitigation measures have been incorporated in the Project to reduce all potentially significant impacts to *less than significant*.

Chapter 4

MITIGATION MONITORING & REPORTING PROGRAM

Project Specific Mitigation Measure Monitoring Checklist

This Project Specific Mitigation Monitoring Checklist has been formulated based upon the findings of the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) for Environmental Assessment No. P18-03659. These Project Specific Mitigation Measures are in addition to the applicable mitigation measures from the City of Fresno MEIR.

Mitigation Measure	Party responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Timing	Party responsible for Monitoring	Verification (name/date)
Geology/Soils				
Mitigation Measure GEO – 1 In order to reduce on-site erosion due to project construction and operation, an erosion control plan and Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) shall be prepared for the site preparation, construction, and post-construction periods by a registered civil engineer or certified professional. The erosion control plan shall incorporate best management practices consistent with the requirements of the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES). The erosion component of the plan must at least meet the requirements of the SWPPP required by the California State Water Resources Control Board. If earth disturbing activities are proposed between October 15 and April 15, these activities shall be limited to the extent feasible to minimize potential erosion related impacts. Additional erosion control measures shall be implemented in consultation with the City of Fresno. Prior to the issuance of any permit, the project proponent shall submit detailed plans to the satisfaction of the City of Fresno. The components of the erosion control plan and SWPPP shall be monitored for effectiveness by City of Fresno. Erosion control measures may include, but not be limited to, the following: a. Limit disturbance of soils and vegetation disturbance removal to the minimum area necessary for access and construction; b. Confine all vehicular traffic associated with construction to the right-of-way of designated access roads; c. Adhere to construction schedules designed to avoid periods of heavy precipitation or high winds; d. Ensure that all exposed soil is provided with temporary drainage and soil protection when construction activity is shut down during the winter periods; and e. Inform construction personnel prior to construction and periodically during construction activities of environmental concerns, pertinent laws and regulations, and elements of the proposed erosion control measures.	Project Applicant	Prior to issuance of grading permits	City of Fresno	

Mitigation Measure	Party responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Timing	Party responsible for Monitoring	Verification (name/date)
Mitigation Measure GEO – 2 The project proponent shall retain a registered geotechnical engineer to prepare a design level geotechnical analysis prior to the issuance of any grading and/or building permit. The design-level analysis shall address site preparation measures and foundation design requirements of the project. The design-level analysis shall be prepared to the satisfaction of the City of Fresno. Final design-level project plans shall be designed in accordance with the approved geotechnical analysis. This shall include certification of engineered fills and subgrade preparation through monitoring of earthwork and compaction testing by a geotechnical engineer during construction.				
Hydrology				
Mitigation Measure HYD – 1 The project proponent shall retain a qualified consultant to prepare a drainage / grading plan prior to the issuance of any grading and/or building permit. The design-level analysis shall be prepared to the satisfaction of the City of Fresno. The developer may either make improvements to the existing pipeline system to provide additional capacity or may use some type of permanent peak reducing facility in order to eliminate adverse impacts on the existing storm drain system. Mitigation Measure HYD - 2 The Project will implement the City of Fresno Water Conservation Program, including implementation of the State's Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance. The California Water Conservation Act mandates a 20 percent reduction in water usage by 2020. The City will meet the reduction target with measures applicable to new and existing development. Reductions beyond the state mandated 20 percent are possible with the use of building and landscaping water conservation features. The reductions from buildings can be achieved with high efficiency toilets, low-flow faucets,	Project Applicant	Prior to issuance of building permits	City of Fresno	

Mitigation Measure	Party responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Timing	Party responsible for Monitoring	Verification (name/date)
and water-efficient appliances such as dishwashers. Water savings from landscaping would be achieved primarily through the use of drought-tolerant landscaping or xeriscaping.				
Land Use				
Mitigation Measure LU – 1 As a condition of approval, the project developer will be required to obtain the following entitlements: ▪ General Plan Amendment for 417-140-21 from planned land use from RM (Residential Medium Density) to RMX (Regional Mixed-Use); ▪ Rezone Application for 417-140-21 from RS-5 / EQ (Residential Single-Family / Equine Overlay) zone district to the RMX (Regional Mixed Use) zone district; ▪ Rezone Application to Modify Conditions of Zoning for 417-231-19 and 417-140-26 to remove previously established conditions of zoning.	Project Applicant / City of Fresno	Condition of Approval	City of Fresno	
Traffic				
Mitigation Measure TRA – 1 Provide pedestrian connectivity to the adjacent commercial shopping center and the existing residential developments to the west and north. Mitigation Measure TRA – 2 Provide bicycle storage facilities on-site to encourage use of pedestrian, bicycle and transit modes for accessing the project site. Mitigation Measure TRA – 3 Access to San Jose Avenue and N.	Project Applicant	Prior to issuance of building permits	City of Fresno	

Mitigation Measure	Party responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Timing	Party responsible for Monitoring	Verification (name/date)
Colonial Avenue should be restricted to emergency access only. Mitigation Measure TRA – 4 The project shall pay into applicable transportation fee programs. These include a Fresno Major Street Impact Fee (FMSI), a Traffic Signal Mitigation Impact Fee (TSMI) and a Regional Transportation Mitigation Fee (RTMF). The FMSI Fee will be calculated and assessed during the building permit process. The RTMF will be calculated and assessed by Fresno COG.				

MEIR Mitigation Measure Monitoring Checklist for Environmental Assessment No. P18-03659 for the Fig Garden Financial Office Complex Project

May 2019

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

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

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

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

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

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

MEIR MITIGATION MEASURE MONITORING CHECKLIST FOR Fig Garden Financial Center Office

May 2019

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

A - Incorporated into Project
B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process
D - Responsible Agency Contacted

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

MEIR MITIGATION MEASURE MONITORING CHECKLIST FOR Fig Garden Financial Center Office

May 2019

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

Aesthetics *(continued)*:

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

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 NO ₂ and PM _{2.5} . If projects exceed screening criteria, refined dispersion modeling and health risk assessment shall be accomplished and if needed, mitigation measures to reduce impacts shall be included in the project to reduce the impacts to the extent feasible. Mitigation measures include but are not limited to: • Locate loading docks and truck access routes as far from sensitive receptors as reasonably possible considering site design limitations to comply with other City design standards. • Post signs requiring drivers to limit idling to 5 minutes or less. Verification comments:	Prior to development project approval	DARM						X

A - Incorporated into Project
B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process
D - Responsible Agency Contacted

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

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

Air Quality *(continued):*

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: • 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. <i>(continued on next page)</i>	Prior to development project approval	DARM						X
---	---------------------------------------	------	--	--	--	--	--	---

A - Incorporated into Project
B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process
D - Responsible Agency Contacted

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

MEIR MITIGATION MEASURE MONITORING CHECKLIST FOR Fig Garden Financial Center Office

May 2019

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

Air Quality *(continued)*:

AIR-2 <i>(continued from previous page)</i> - For large distribution centers where the owner controls the vehicle fleet, provide facilities to support alternative fueled trucks powered by fuels such as natural gas or bio-diesel - Utilize electric powered material handling equipment where feasible for the weight and volume of material to be moved. Verification comments:	<i>[see previous page]</i>	<i>[see previous page]</i>						
AIR-3: Require developers proposing projects on ARB's list of projects in its Air Quality and Land Use Handbook (Handbook) warranting special consideration to prepare a cumulative health risk assessment when sensitive receptors are located within the distance screening criteria of the facility as listed in the ARB Handbook. Verification comments:	Prior to development project approval	DARM						X

A - Incorporated into Project
B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process
D - Responsible Agency Contacted

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

MEIR MITIGATION MEASURE MONITORING CHECKLIST FOR Fig Garden Financial Center Office

May 2019

MITIGATION MEASURE	WHEN IMPLEMENTED	COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY	A	B	C	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
F - Not Applicable

MEIR MITIGATION MEASURE MONITORING CHECKLIST FOR Fig Garden Financial Center Office

May 2019

MITIGATION MEASURE	WHEN IMPLEMENTED	COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY	A	B	C	D	E	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 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 <i>(continued on next page)</i>	Prior to development project approval	DARM						X

A - Incorporated into Project
B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process
D - Responsible Agency Contacted

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

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

Biological Resources *(continued):*

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

A - Incorporated into Project
B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process
D - Responsible Agency Contacted

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

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

Biological Resources *(continued)*:

BIO-3 <i>(continued from previous page)</i> : 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. Verification comments:	[see previous page]	[see previous page]						
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 <i>(continued on next page)</i>	Prior to development project approval and during construction activities	DARM	X				X	

A - Incorporated into Project
B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process
D - Responsible Agency Contacted

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

MEIR MITIGATION MEASURE MONITORING CHECKLIST FOR Fig Garden Financial Center Office

May 2019

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

Biological Resources *(continued)*:

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

A - Incorporated into Project
B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process
D - Responsible Agency Contacted

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

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

Biological Resources *(continued)*:

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
F - Not Applicable

MITIGATION MEASURE	WHEN IMPLEMENTED	COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY	A	B	C	D	E	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
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 <i>(continued on next page)</i>	Prior to development project approval; but for long-term operational BMPs, prior to issuance of occupancy	DARM						X

A - Incorporated into Project
B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process
D - Responsible Agency Contacted

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

MEIR MITIGATION MEASURE MONITORING CHECKLIST FOR Fig Garden Financial Center Office

May 2019

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

Biological Resources *(continued)*:

BIO-9 <i>(continued from previous page)</i> : incorporating detention basins shall assist in ensuring project-related impacts to wetland habitat are minimized to the greatest extent feasible. Verification comments:	<i>[see previous page]</i>	<i>[see previous page]</i>						
--	----------------------------	----------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

Cultural Resources:

CUL-1: If previously unknown resources are encountered before or during grading activities, construction shall stop in the immediate vicinity of the find and a qualified historical resources specialist shall be consulted to determine whether the resource requires further study. The qualified historical resources specialist shall make recommendations to the City on the measures that shall be implemented to protect the discovered resources, including but not limited to excavation of the finds and evaluation of the finds in accordance with Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines and the City's Historic Preservation Ordinance. If the resources are determined to be unique historical resources as defined under Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines, measures shall be identified by the monitor and <i>(continued on next page)</i>	Prior to commencement of, and during, construction activities	DARM	X				X	
---	---	------	---	--	--	--	---	--

A - Incorporated into Project
B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process
D - Responsible Agency Contacted

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

MEIR MITIGATION MEASURE MONITORING CHECKLIST FOR Fig Garden Financial Center Office

May 2019

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

Cultural Resources *(continued)*:

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

A - Incorporated into Project
B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process
D - Responsible Agency Contacted

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

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

Cultural Resources *(continued):*

CUL-2 <i>(continued from previous page)</i> archaeological resources are discovered during excavation and/or construction activities, construction shall stop in the immediate vicinity of the find and a qualified archaeologist shall be consulted to determine whether the resource requires further study. The qualified archaeologist shall make recommendations to the City on the measures that shall be implemented to protect the discovered resources, including but not limited to excavation of the finds and evaluation of the finds in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5. If the resources are determined to be unique prehistoric archaeological resources as defined under Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines, mitigation measures shall be identified by the monitor and recommended to the Lead Agency. Appropriate measures for significant resources could include avoidance or capping, incorporation of the site in green space, parks, or open space, or data recovery excavations of the finds. No further grading shall occur in the area of the discovery until the Lead Agency approves the measures to protect these resources. Any prehistoric archaeological artifacts recovered as a result of mitigation shall be provided <i>(continued on next page)</i>	[see previous page]	[see previous page]					
---	---------------------	---------------------	--	--	--	--	--

A - Incorporated into Project
B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process
D - Responsible Agency Contacted

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

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

Cultural Resources *(continued)*:

CUL-2 <i>(further continued from previous two pages)</i> 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 <i>(continued on next page)</i>	[see Page 14]	[see Page 14]						
---	---------------	---------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

Cultural Resources *(continued)*:

A - Incorporated into Project
B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process
D - Responsible Agency Contacted

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

MEIR MITIGATION MEASURE MONITORING CHECKLIST FOR Fig Garden Financial Center Office

May 2019

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

A - Incorporated into Project
B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process
D - Responsible Agency Contacted

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

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

A - Incorporated into Project

B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process

D - Responsible Agency Contacted

E - Part of City-Wide Program

F - Not Applicable

MEIR MITIGATION MEASURE MONITORING CHECKLIST FOR Fig Garden Financial Center Office

May 2019

MITIGATION MEASURE	WHEN IMPLEMENTED	COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY	A	B	C	D	E	F
Cultural Resources <i>(continued)</i> :								
CUL-3 <i>(further continued from previous two pages)</i> 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:	<i>[see Page 17]</i>	<i>[see Page 17]</i>						
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 <i>(continued on next page)</i>	Prior to commencement of, and during, construction activities	DARM	X				X	

A - Incorporated into Project
B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process
D - Responsible Agency Contacted

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

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

Cultural Resources *(continued)*:

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

A - Incorporated into Project
B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process
D - Responsible Agency Contacted

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

MEIR MITIGATION MEASURE MONITORING CHECKLIST FOR Fig Garden Financial Center Office

May 2019

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

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

HAZ-1: Re-designate the existing vacant land proposed for low density residential located northwest of the intersection of East Garland Avenue and North Dearing Avenue and located within Fresno Yosemite International Airport Zone 1-RPZ, to Open Space. Verification comments:	Prior to development approvals	DARM						X
HAZ-2: Limit the proposed low density residential (1 to 3 dwelling units per acre) located northwest of the airport, and located within Fresno Yosemite International Airport Zone 3-Inner Turning Area, to 2 dwelling units per acre or less. 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

A - Incorporated into Project
B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process
D - Responsible Agency Contacted

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

MEIR MITIGATION MEASURE MONITORING CHECKLIST FOR Fig Garden Financial Center Office

May 2019

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

Hazards and Hazardous Materials *(continued)*:

HAZ-4: Re-designate the current vacant lots at the northeast corner of Kearney Boulevard and South Thorne Avenue to Public Facilities-Airport or Open Space. 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						X
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
F - Not Applicable

MITIGATION MEASURE	WHEN IMPLEMENTED	COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY	A	B	C	D	E	F
Hydrology and Water Quality								
HYD-1: The City shall develop and implement water conservation measures to reduce the per capita water use to 215 gallons per capita per day. Verification comments:	Prior to water demand exceeding water supply	Department of Public Utilities (DPU)	X				X	
HYD-2: The City shall continue to be an active participant in the Kings Water Authority and the implementation of the Kings Basin IRWMP. 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. <i>(continued on next page)</i>	Prior to exceedance of capacity of existing stormwater drainage facilities	Fresno Metropolitan Flood Control District (FMFCD), DARM, and PW						X

A - Incorporated into Project
B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process
D - Responsible Agency Contacted

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

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

Hydrology and Water Quality *(continued)*:

HYD-5.1 <i>(continued from previous page)</i> • Update the SDMP in those drainage areas where the amount of imperviousness increased due to the change in land uses to determine the changes in the collection systems that would need to occur to provide adequate capacity for the stormwater runoff from the increased imperviousness. • Implement the updated SDMP to provide stormwater collection systems that have sufficient capacity to convey the peak runoff rates from the areas of increased imperviousness. Require developments that increase site imperviousness to install, operate, and maintain FMFCD approved on-site detention systems to reduce the peak runoff rates resulting from the increased imperviousness to the peak runoff rates that will not exceed the capacity of the existing stormwater collection systems. Verification comments:	[see previous page]	[see previous page]					
--	---------------------	---------------------	--	--	--	--	--

A - Incorporated into Project
B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process
D - Responsible Agency Contacted

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

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

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: • 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:	Prior to exceedance of capacity of existing retention basin facilities	FMFCD, DARM, and PW						X
--	--	---------------------	--	--	--	--	--	---

A - Incorporated into Project
B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process
D - Responsible Agency Contacted

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

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

Hydrology and Water Quality *(continued)*:

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. 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: • 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:	Prior to exceedance of capacity of existing urban detention basin (stormwater quality) facilities	FMFCD, DARM, and PW						X
--	---	---------------------	--	--	--	--	--	---

A - Incorporated into Project
B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process
D - Responsible Agency Contacted

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

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

Hydrology and Water Quality *(continued)*:

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. Verification comments:	Prior to exceedance of capacity of existing pump disposal systems	FMFCD, DARM, and PW						X
---	---	---------------------	--	--	--	--	--	---

A - Incorporated into Project
B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process
D - Responsible Agency Contacted

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

MEIR MITIGATION MEASURE MONITORING CHECKLIST FOR Fig Garden Financial Center Office

May 2019

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

Hydrology and Water Quality *(continued)*:

HYD-5.5: The City shall work with FMFCD to develop and adopt an update to the SDMP for the Southeast Development Area that would be adequately designed to collect, convey and dispose of runoff at the rates and volumes which would be generated by the planned land uses in that area. Verification comments:	Prior to development approvals in the Southeast Development Area	FMFCD, DARM, and PW						X
---	--	---------------------	--	--	--	--	--	---

Public Services:

PS-1: As future fire facilities are planned, the fire department shall evaluate if specific environmental effects would occur. Typical impacts from fire facilities include noise, traffic, and lighting. Typical mitigation to reduce these impacts includes: <i>Noise:</i> Barriers and setbacks on the fire department sites. <i>Traffic:</i> Traffic devices for circulation and a “keep clear zone” during emergency responses. <i>Lighting:</i> Provision of hoods and deflectors on lighting fixtures on the fire department sites. Verification comments:	During the planning process for future fire department facilities	DARM					X	
---	---	------	--	--	--	--	---	--

A - Incorporated into Project
B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process
D - Responsible Agency Contacted

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

MEIR MITIGATION MEASURE MONITORING CHECKLIST FOR Fig Garden Financial Center Office

May 2019

MITIGATION MEASURE	WHEN IMPLEMENTED	COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY	A	B	C	D	E	F
Public Services <i>(continued)</i> :								
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: • <i>Noise:</i> Barriers and setbacks on the police department sites. • <i>Traffic:</i> Traffic devices for circulation. • <i>Lighting:</i> Provision of hoods and deflectors on lighting fixtures on the police department sites. 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: <i>(continued on next page)</i>	During the planning process for future school facilities	DARM, local school districts, and the Division of the State Architect					X	

A - Incorporated into Project
B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process
D - Responsible Agency Contacted

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

MEIR MITIGATION MEASURE MONITORING CHECKLIST FOR Fig Garden Financial Center Office

May 2019

MITIGATION MEASURE	WHEN IMPLEMENTED	COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY	A	B	C	D	E	F
Public Services (continued):								
PS-3 (continued from previous page) • <i>Noise</i>: Barriers and setbacks placed on school sites. • <i>Traffic</i>: Traffic devices for circulation. • <i>Lighting</i>: Provision of hoods and deflectors on lighting fixtures for stadium lights. Verification comments:	[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: • <i>Noise</i>: Barriers and setbacks placed on school sites. • <i>Traffic</i>: Traffic devices for circulation. • <i>Lighting</i>: Provision of hoods and deflectors on lighting fixtures for outdoor play area/field lights. Verification comments:	During the planning process for future park and recreation facilities	DARM					X	

A - Incorporated into Project
B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process
D - Responsible Agency Contacted

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

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

Public Services (continued):

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: • <i>Noise:</i> Barriers and setbacks placed on school sites. • <i>Traffic:</i> Traffic devices for circulation. • <i>Lighting:</i> Provision of hoods and deflectors on outdoor lighting fixtures. 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 exceeding capacity	DPU					X	
---	--	-----	--	--	--	--	---	--

A - Incorporated into Project
B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process
D - Responsible Agency Contacted

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

MEIR MITIGATION MEASURE MONITORING CHECKLIST FOR Fig Garden Financial Center Office

May 2019

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

Utilities and Service Systems *(continued)*:

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 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:	Prior to exceeding existing wastewater treatment capacity	DPU						X
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 <i>(continued on next page)</i>	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
F - Not Applicable

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

Utilities and Service Systems *(continued)*:

USS-3 <i>(continued from previous page)</i> approximately the year 2025, the City shall construct the following improvements: - Construct an approximately 24 MGD wastewater treatment facility within the Southeast Development Area and obtain revised waste discharge requirements as the generation of wastewater is increased. - Construct an approximately 9.6 MGD expansion of the Regional Wastewater Treatment and Reclamation Facility and obtain revised waste discharge permits as the generation of wastewater is increased. Verification comments:	[see previous page]	[see previous page]						
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 unincorporated 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. Verification comments:	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	

A - Incorporated into Project
B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process
D - Responsible Agency Contacted

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

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

Utilities and Service Systems *(continued)*:

USS-5: Prior to exceeding capacity within the existing wastewater collection system facilities, the City shall evaluate the wastewater collection system and shall not approve additional development that would generate additional wastewater and exceed the capacity of a facility until additional capacity is provided. By approximately the year 2025, the following capacity improvements shall be provided. • 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. <i>(continued on next page)</i>	Prior to exceeding capacity within the existing wastewater collection system facilities	DPU						X

A - Incorporated into Project
B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process
D - Responsible Agency Contacted

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

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

Utilities and Service Systems *(continued)*:

USS-5 <i>(continued from previous page)</i> • North Avenue Trunk Sewer: This facility shall be improved between Polk and Fruit Avenues and also between Orange and Maple Avenues. Approximately 25,700 feet of new sewer main shall be installed. The size of the new sewer main shall range from 48 inches to 66 inches in diameter. The associated project designations in the 2006 Wastewater Master Plan are CN1-REL1 and CN3-REL1. • Ashlan Avenue Trunk Sewer: This facility shall be improved between Hughes and West Avenues and also between Fruit and Blackstone Avenues. Approximately 9,260 feet of new sewer main shall be installed. The size of the new sewer main shall range from 24 inches to 36 inches in diameter. The associated project designations in the 2006 Wastewater Master Plan are CA1-REL and CA2-REP. Verification comments:	[see previous page]	[see previous page]					
--	---------------------	---------------------	--	--	--	--	--

A - Incorporated into Project
B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process
D - Responsible Agency Contacted

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

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

Utilities and Service Systems *(continued)*:

USS-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 segments 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. 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. <i>(continued on next page)</i>	Prior to exceeding existing water supply capacity	DPU						X

A - Incorporated into Project
B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process
D - Responsible Agency Contacted

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

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

Utilities and Service Systems *(continued)*:

USS-7 <i>(continued from previous page)</i> - Construct an approximately 30 MGD expansion of the existing northeast surface water treatment facility for a total capacity of 60 MGD, in accordance with Chapter 9 and Figure 9-1 of the 2014 Metro Plan Update. - Construct an approximately 20 MGD surface water treatment facility in the southwest portion of the City, in accordance with Chapter 9 and Figure 9-1 of the 2014 Metro Plan Update. Verification comments:	<i>[see previous page]</i>	<i>[see previous page]</i>						
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. Construct 65 new groundwater wells, in accordance with Chapter 9 and Figure 9-1 of the 2014 Metro Plan Update. <i>(continued on next page)</i>	Prior to exceeding capacity within the existing water conveyance facilities	DPU						X

A - Incorporated into Project
B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process
D - Responsible Agency Contacted

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

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

Utilities and Service Systems *(continued)*:

USS-8 <i>(continued from previous page)</i> - Construct a 2.0 million gallon potable water reservoir (Reservoir T2) near the intersection of Clovis and California Avenues, in accordance with Chapter 9 and Figure 9-1 of the 2014 Metro Plan Update. - Construct a 3.0 million gallon potable water reservoir (Reservoir T3) near the intersection of Temperance and Dakota Avenues, in accordance with Chapter 9 and Figure 9-1 of the 2014 Metro Plan Update. - Construct a 3.0 million gallon potable water reservoir (Reservoir T4) in the Downtown Planning Area, in accordance with Chapter 9 and Figure 9-1 of the 2014 Metro Plan Update. - Construct a 4.0 million gallon potable water reservoir (Reservoir T5) near the intersection of Ashlan and Chestnut Avenues, in accordance with Chapter 9 and Figure 9-1 of the 2014 Metro Plan Update. - Construct a 4.0 million gallon potable water reservoir (Reservoir T6) near the intersection of Ashlan Avenue and Highway 99, in accordance with Chapter 9 and Figure 9-1 of the 2014 Metro Plan Update. <i>(continued on next page)</i>	<i>[see previous page]</i>	<i>[see previous page]</i>					
---	----------------------------	----------------------------	--	--	--	--	--

A - Incorporated into Project
B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process
D - Responsible Agency Contacted

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

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

Utilities and Service Systems *(continued)*:

USS-8 <i>(continued from previous two pages)</i> - 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:	<i>[see Page 37]</i>	<i>[see Page 37]</i>						
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. <i>(continued on next page)</i>	Prior to exceeding capacity within the existing water conveyance facilities	DPU						X

A - Incorporated into Project
B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process
D - Responsible Agency Contacted

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

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

Utilities and Service Systems *(continued)*:

USS-9 <i>(continued from previous page)</i> - Construct a 4.0 million gallon potable water reservoir (SEDA Reservoir 1) within the northern part of the Southeast Development Area. - Construct a 4.0 million gallon potable water reservoir (SEDA Reservoir 2) within the southern part of the Southeast Development Area. 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:	<i>[see previous page]</i>	<i>[see previous page]</i>						
---	----------------------------	----------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

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. Verification comments:	During the dry season	Fresno Irrigation District (FID)						X

A - Incorporated into Project
B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process
D - Responsible Agency Contacted

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

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

Utilities and Service Systems - *Biological Resources*:

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. (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 <i>(continued on next page)</i>	Prior to development approvals outside of highly urbanized areas	California Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), and USACE						X
---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---

A - Incorporated into Project

B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process

D - Responsible Agency Contacted

E - Part of City-Wide Program

F - Not Applicable

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

Utilities and Service Systems - *Biological Resources* (continued):

USS-11 <i>(continued from previous page)</i> Regional Water Quality Control Board for any activity involving filling of jurisdictional waters). At a minimum, to meet “no net loss policy,” the permits shall require replacement of wetland habitat at a 1:1 ratio. (c) Where proposed activities could have an impact on areas verified by the Corps as jurisdictional wetlands or waters of the U.S. (urban and rural streams, seasonal wetlands, and vernal pools), FMFCD shall submit and implement a wetland mitigation plan based on the wetland acreage verified by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. The wetland mitigation plan shall be prepared by a qualified biologist or wetland scientist experienced in wetland creation, and shall include the following or equally effective elements: i. Specific location, size, and existing hydrology and soils within the wetland creation area. ii. Wetland mitigation techniques, seed source, planting specifications, and required buffer setbacks. In addition, the mitigation plan shall ensure adequate water supply is provided to the created wetlands in order to maintain the proper <i>(continued on next page)</i>	[see previous page]	[see previous page]					
--	---------------------	---------------------	--	--	--	--	--

A - Incorporated into Project
B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process
D - Responsible Agency Contacted

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

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

Utilities and Service Systems - *Biological Resources* (continued):

USS-11 <i>(continued from previous two pages)</i> 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. <i>(continued on next page)</i>	[see Page 41]	[see Page 41]					
--	---------------	---------------	--	--	--	--	--

A - Incorporated into Project
B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process
D - Responsible Agency Contacted

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

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

Utilities and Service Systems - *Biological Resources* (continued):

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

A - Incorporated into Project
B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process
D - Responsible Agency Contacted

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

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

Utilities and Service Systems - *Biological Resources* (continued):

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

A - Incorporated into Project
B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process
D - Responsible Agency Contacted

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

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

Utilities and Service Systems - *Biological Resources* (continued):

USS-12 (continued from previous two pages) 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:	[see Page 44]	[see Page 44]						
USS-13: When FMFCD proposes to provide drainage service outside in areas that support seasonal wetlands or vernal pools: (a) During facility design and prior to initiation of ground disturbing activities in areas that support seasonal wetlands or vernal pools, FMFCD shall conduct a preliminary survey to determine the presence of listed vernal pool crustaceans. (continued on next page)	During facility design and prior to initiation of ground disturbing activities in areas that support seasonal wetlands or vernal pools	CDFW and USFWS						X

A - Incorporated into Project
B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process
D - Responsible Agency Contacted

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

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

Utilities and Service Systems - *Biological Resources* (continued):

USS-13 <i>(continued from previous page)</i> (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. (c) If fairy shrimp are found to be present within vernal pools or other areas of inundation to be impacted by the implementation of storm drainage facilities, FMFCD shall mitigate impacts on fairy shrimp habitat in accordance with the USFWS requirements of the Programmatic Biological Opinion. This shall include on-site or off-site creation and/or preservation of fairy shrimp habitat at ratios ranging from 3:1 to 5:1 depending on the habitat impacted and the choice of on-site or off-site mitigation. Or mitigation shall be the purchase of mitigation credit through an accredited mitigation bank. Verification comments:	[see previous page]	[see previous page]					
--	---------------------	---------------------	--	--	--	--	--

A - Incorporated into Project
B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process
D - Responsible Agency Contacted

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

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

Utilities and Service Systems - *Biological Resources* (continued):

USS-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
F - Not Applicable

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

Utilities and Service Systems - *Biological Resources* (continued):

USS-15: Prior to ground disturbing activities during nesting season (March through July) for a project that supports bird nesting habitat, FMFCD shall conduct a survey of trees. If nests are found during the survey, a qualified biologist shall assess the nesting activity on the project site. If active nests are located, no construction activities shall be allowed within 250 feet of the nest until the young have fledged. If construction activities are planned during the non-breeding period (August through February), a nest survey is not necessary. 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. <i>(continued on next page)</i>	Prior to ground disturbing activities during nesting season (March through July) for a project that supports bird nesting habitat	CDFW and USFWS						X

A - Incorporated into Project
B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process
D - Responsible Agency Contacted

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

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

Utilities and Service Systems - *Biological Resources* (continued):

USS-16 (continued from previous page) (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. 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)	[see previous page]	[see previous page]					
--	---------------------	---------------------	--	--	--	--	--

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

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

Utilities and Service Systems - *Biological Resources* (continued):

USS-16 <i>(continued from previous two pages)</i> For each burrow destroyed, a new burrow shall be created (by installing artificial burrows at a ratio of 2:1 on protected lands nearby). Verification comments:	[see Page 49]	[see Page 49]						
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 channel. The location of replacement trees on or within <i>(continued on next page)</i>	During instream activities conducted between October 15 and April 15	National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), CDFW, and Central Valley Flood Protection Board (CVFPB)						X

A - Incorporated into Project
B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process
D - Responsible Agency Contacted

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

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

Utilities and Service Systems / Biological Resources (continued):

USS-17 (continued from previous page) FMFCD berms, detention ponds or river channels shall be approved by FMFCD and the Central Valley Flood Protection Board. Verification comments:	[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: <i>(continued on next page)</i>	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
F - Not Applicable

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

Utilities and Service Systems – Recreation / Trails (continued):

USS-18 (continued from previous page) (a) If short-term disruption of adopted existing or planned trails and associated recreational facilities occur, FMFCD shall consult and coordinate with Fresno County, City of Fresno, and City of Clovis to temporarily re-route the trails and associated facilities. (b) If permanent displacement of the adopted existing or planned trails and associated recreational facilities occur, the appropriate design modifications to prevent permanent displacement shall be implemented in the final project design or FMFCD shall replace these facilities. Verification comments:	[see previous page]	[see previous page]						
--	---------------------	---------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

Utilities and Service Systems – Air Quality:

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

A - Incorporated into Project
B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process
D - Responsible Agency Contacted

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

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

Utilities and Service Systems – Air Quality (continued):

USS-19 (continued from previous page) (b) Construction shall be curtailed as much as possible when the Air Quality Index (AQI) is above 150. AQI forecasts can be found on the SJVAPCD web site. (c) Off-road trucks should be equipped with on-road engines if possible. (d) Construction equipment should have engines that meet the current off-road engine emission standard (as certified by CARB), or be re-powered with an engine that meets this standard. Verification comments:	[see previous page]	[see previous page]						
--	---------------------	---------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

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

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

A - Incorporated into Project
B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process
D - Responsible Agency Contacted

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

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

Utilities and Service Systems – Adequacy of Water Supply Capacity:

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				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				X	
--	--------------------------------------	--------------	---	--	--	--	---	--

A - Incorporated into Project
B - Mitigated

C - Mitigation in Process
D - Responsible Agency Contacted

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

Chapter 5

PREPARERS

LIST OF PREPARERS AND CONSULTATIONS

List of Preparers

Crawford & Bowen Planning, Inc.

- Travis Crawford, AICP, Principal Environmental Planner
- Emily Bowen, LEED AP, Principal Environmental Planner

Persons and Agencies Consulted

City of Fresno

- Margo Lerwill, Planner

Appendices

Appendix A

Air Emissions Output Table

Fig Garden Land Holdings Plan Amendment - San Joaquin Valley Unified APCD Air District, Annual

Fig Garden Land Holdings Plan Amendment

San Joaquin Valley Unified APCD Air District, Annual

1.0 Project Characteristics

1.1 Land Usage

Land Uses	Size	Metric	Lot Acreage	Floor Surface Area	Population
Office Park	90.00	1000sqft	1.08	90,000.00	0
Parking Lot	329.00	Space	2.35	131,600.00	0

1.2 Other Project Characteristics

Urbanization	Urban	Wind Speed (m/s)	2.7	Precipitation Freq (Days)	45
Climate Zone	3			Operational Year	2000
Utility Company					
CO2 Intensity (lb/MW hr)	0	CH4 Intensity (lb/MW hr)	0	N2O Intensity (lb/MW hr)	0

1.3 User Entered Comments & Non-Default Data

Project Characteristics -

Land Use - Project includes a 4-story office building with 90,000 sq ft of floor space on a 1.08 acre lot. Project also includes a 2.35 acre parking lot, which will be built over a demolished 44-unit apartment building.

Construction Phase -

Vehicle Trips - Weekday trip rate has been reconciled with the Trip Generation Analysis performed by Precision Civil Engineering, Inc.

Mobile Land Use Mitigation - Proposed Project is within 1/4 mile of Fig Garden Village - a major job center and within 1/2 mile of the City of Fresno Palm/Butler Bus Service.

Fig Garden Land Holdings Plan Amendment - San Joaquin Valley Unified APCD Air District, Annual

Table Name	Column Name	Default Value	New Value
tblLandUse	LotAcreage	2.07	1.08
tblLandUse	LotAcreage	2.96	2.35
tblVehicleTrips	WD_TR	11.42	11.03

2.0 Emissions Summary

Fig Garden Land Holdings Plan Amendment - San Joaquin Valley Unified APCD Air District, Annual

2.1 Overall Construction

Unmitigated Construction

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Year	tons/yr										MT/yr					
2019	0.2024	1.8806	1.3831	2.8100e-003	0.1185	0.0954	0.2139	0.0511	0.0893	0.1404	0.0000	251.4244	251.4244	0.0492	0.0000	252.6533
2020	0.8419	1.6818	1.4552	3.0900e-003	0.0623	0.0819	0.1442	0.0169	0.0770	0.0939	0.0000	274.2992	274.2992	0.0481	0.0000	275.5004
Maximum	0.8419	1.8806	1.4552	3.0900e-003	0.1185	0.0954	0.2139	0.0511	0.0893	0.1404	0.0000	274.2992	274.2992	0.0492	0.0000	275.5004

Mitigated Construction

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Year	tons/yr										MT/yr					
2019	0.2024	1.8806	1.3831	2.8100e-003	0.1185	0.0954	0.2139	0.0511	0.0893	0.1404	0.0000	251.4242	251.4242	0.0492	0.0000	252.6530
2020	0.8419	1.6818	1.4552	3.0900e-003	0.0623	0.0819	0.1442	0.0169	0.0770	0.0939	0.0000	274.2990	274.2990	0.0481	0.0000	275.5002
Maximum	0.8419	1.8806	1.4552	3.0900e-003	0.1185	0.0954	0.2139	0.0511	0.0893	0.1404	0.0000	274.2990	274.2990	0.0492	0.0000	275.5002

[illegible]

Fig Garden Land Holdings Plan Amendment - San Joaquin Valley Unified APCD Air District, Annual

Quarter	Start Date	End Date	Maximum Unmitigated ROG + NOX (tons/quarter)	Maximum Mitigated ROG + NOX (tons/quarter)
1	7-1-2019	9-30-2019	1.1116	1.1116
2	10-1-2019	12-31-2019	0.9573	0.9573
3	1-1-2020	3-31-2020	0.8603	0.8603
4	4-1-2020	6-30-2020	0.8577	0.8577
5	7-1-2020	9-30-2020	0.7742	0.7742
		Highest	1.1116	1.1116

2.2 Overall Operational

Unmitigated Operational

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Area	0.4680	5.0000e-005	6.8200e-003	0.0000		2.0000e-005	2.0000e-005		2.0000e-005	2.0000e-005	0.0000	7.4900e-003	7.4900e-003	5.0000e-005	0.0000	8.7600e-003
Energy	0.0111	0.1005	0.0844	6.0000e-004		7.6400e-003	7.6400e-003		7.6400e-003	7.6400e-003	0.0000	109.4065	109.4065	2.1000e-003	2.0100e-003	110.0566
Mobile	2.2952	9.9751	25.3707	0.0635	0.7080	0.2671	0.9751	0.1907	0.2548	0.4455	0.0000	1,243.4834	1,243.4834	0.2695	0.0000	1,250.2195
Waste						0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	16.9903	0.0000	16.9903	1.0041	0.0000	42.0929
Water						0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	5.0748	0.0000	5.0748	0.5212	0.0123	21.7732
Total	2.7742	10.0757	25.4619	0.0641	0.7080	0.2747	0.9827	0.1907	0.2624	0.4531	22.0651	1,352.8974	1,374.9625	1.7969	0.0143	1,424.1510

Fig Garden Land Holdings Plan Amendment - San Joaquin Valley Unified APCD Air District, Annual

2.2 Overall Operational**Mitigated Operational**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Area	0.4680	5.0000e-005	6.8200e-003	0.0000		2.0000e-005	2.0000e-005		2.0000e-005	2.0000e-005	0.0000	7.4900e-003	7.4900e-003	5.0000e-005	0.0000	8.7600e-003
Energy	0.0111	0.1005	0.0844	6.0000e-004		7.6400e-003	7.6400e-003		7.6400e-003	7.6400e-003	0.0000	109.4065	109.4065	2.1000e-003	2.0100e-003	110.0566
Mobile	1.9423	7.6196	19.2470	0.0474	0.4770	0.2002	0.6772	0.1285	0.1909	0.3194	0.0000	891.4175	891.4175	0.2289	0.0000	897.1390
Waste						0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	16.9903	0.0000	16.9903	1.0041	0.0000	42.0929
Water						0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	5.0748	0.0000	5.0748	0.5212	0.0123	21.7732
Total	2.4214	7.7201	19.3383	0.0480	0.4770	0.2078	0.6848	0.1285	0.1986	0.3271	22.0651	1,000.8315	1,022.8966	1.7563	0.0143	1,071.0704

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio-CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Percent Reduction	12.72	23.38	24.05	25.05	32.62	24.36	30.31	32.62	24.32	27.81	0.00	26.02	25.61	2.26	0.00	24.79

3.0 Construction Detail**Construction Phase**

Fig Garden Land Holdings Plan Amendment - San Joaquin Valley Unified APCD Air District, Annual

Phase Number	Phase Name	Phase Type	Start Date	End Date	Num Days Week	Num Days	Phase Description
1	Demolition	Demolition	7/1/2019	7/26/2019	5	20	
2	Site Preparation	Site Preparation	7/27/2019	8/2/2019	5	5	
3	Grading	Grading	8/3/2019	8/14/2019	5	8	
4	Building Construction	Building Construction	8/15/2019	7/1/2020	5	230	
5	Paving	Paving	7/2/2020	7/27/2020	5	18	
6	Architectural Coating	Architectural Coating	7/28/2020	8/20/2020	5	18	

Acres of Grading (Site Preparation Phase): 0

Acres of Grading (Grading Phase): 4

Acres of Paving: 2.35

Residential Indoor: 0; Residential Outdoor: 0; Non-Residential Indoor: 135,000; Non-Residential Outdoor: 45,000; Striped Parking Area: 7,896 (Architectural Coating – sqft)

OffRoad Equipment

Fig Garden Land Holdings Plan Amendment - San Joaquin Valley Unified APCD Air District, Annual

Phase Name	Offroad Equipment Type	Amount	Usage Hours	Horse Power	Load Factor
Architectural Coating	Air Compressors	1	6.00	78	0.48
Paving	Cement and Mortar Mixers	2	6.00	9	0.56
Demolition	Concrete/Industrial Saws	1	8.00	81	0.73
Demolition	Excavators	3	8.00	158	0.38
Building Construction	Cranes	1	7.00	231	0.29
Building Construction	Forklifts	3	8.00	89	0.20
Grading	Excavators	1	8.00	158	0.38
Paving	Pavers	1	8.00	130	0.42
Paving	Rollers	2	6.00	80	0.38
Demolition	Rubber Tired Dozers	2	8.00	247	0.40
Grading	Rubber Tired Dozers	1	8.00	247	0.40
Building Construction	Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	3	7.00	97	0.37
Building Construction	Generator Sets	1	8.00	84	0.74
Grading	Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	3	8.00	97	0.37
Paving	Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	1	8.00	97	0.37
Site Preparation	Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	4	8.00	97	0.37
Grading	Graders	1	8.00	187	0.41
Paving	Paving Equipment	2	6.00	132	0.36
Site Preparation	Rubber Tired Dozers	3	8.00	247	0.40
Building Construction	Welders	1	8.00	46	0.45

Trips and VMT

Fig Garden Land Holdings Plan Amendment - San Joaquin Valley Unified APCD Air District, Annual

Phase Name	Offroad Equipment Count	Worker Trip Number	Vendor Trip Number	Hauling Trip Number	Worker Trip Length	Vendor Trip Length	Hauling Trip Length	Worker Vehicle Class	Vendor Vehicle Class	Hauling Vehicle Class
Architectural Coating	1	17.00	0.00	0.00	10.80	7.30	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT
Building Construction	9	84.00	36.00	0.00	10.80	7.30	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT
Demolition	6	15.00	0.00	0.00	10.80	7.30	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT
Grading	6	15.00	0.00	0.00	10.80	7.30	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT
Paving	8	20.00	0.00	0.00	10.80	7.30	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT
Site Preparation	7	18.00	0.00	0.00	10.80	7.30	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT

3.1 Mitigation Measures Construction**3.2 Demolition - 2019****Unmitigated Construction On-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Off-Road	0.0351	0.3578	0.2206	3.9000e-004		0.0180	0.0180		0.0167	0.0167	0.0000	34.6263	34.6263	9.6300e-003	0.0000	34.8672
Total	0.0351	0.3578	0.2206	3.9000e-004		0.0180	0.0180		0.0167	0.0167	0.0000	34.6263	34.6263	9.6300e-003	0.0000	34.8672

Fig Garden Land Holdings Plan Amendment - San Joaquin Valley Unified APCD Air District, Annual

3.2 Demolition - 2019**Unmitigated Construction Off-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	7.0000e-004	4.9000e-004	4.9200e-003	1.0000e-005	1.2000e-003	1.0000e-005	1.2100e-003	3.2000e-004	1.0000e-005	3.3000e-004	0.0000	1.1113	1.1113	4.0000e-005	0.0000	1.1122
Total	7.0000e-004	4.9000e-004	4.9200e-003	1.0000e-005	1.2000e-003	1.0000e-005	1.2100e-003	3.2000e-004	1.0000e-005	3.3000e-004	0.0000	1.1113	1.1113	4.0000e-005	0.0000	1.1122

Mitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Off-Road	0.0351	0.3578	0.2206	3.9000e-004		0.0180	0.0180		0.0167	0.0167	0.0000	34.6263	34.6263	9.6300e-003	0.0000	34.8671
Total	0.0351	0.3578	0.2206	3.9000e-004		0.0180	0.0180		0.0167	0.0167	0.0000	34.6263	34.6263	9.6300e-003	0.0000	34.8671

Fig Garden Land Holdings Plan Amendment - San Joaquin Valley Unified APCD Air District, Annual

3.2 Demolition - 2019**Mitigated Construction Off-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	7.0000e-004	4.9000e-004	4.9200e-003	1.0000e-005	1.2000e-003	1.0000e-005	1.2100e-003	3.2000e-004	1.0000e-005	3.3000e-004	0.0000	1.1113	1.1113	4.0000e-005	0.0000	1.1122
Total	7.0000e-004	4.9000e-004	4.9200e-003	1.0000e-005	1.2000e-003	1.0000e-005	1.2100e-003	3.2000e-004	1.0000e-005	3.3000e-004	0.0000	1.1113	1.1113	4.0000e-005	0.0000	1.1122

3.3 Site Preparation - 2019**Unmitigated Construction On-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Fugitive Dust					0.0452	0.0000	0.0452	0.0248	0.0000	0.0248	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Off-Road	0.0108	0.1139	0.0552	9.0000e-005		5.9800e-003	5.9800e-003		5.5000e-003	5.5000e-003	0.0000	8.5422	8.5422	2.7000e-003	0.0000	8.6097
Total	0.0108	0.1139	0.0552	9.0000e-005	0.0452	5.9800e-003	0.0512	0.0248	5.5000e-003	0.0303	0.0000	8.5422	8.5422	2.7000e-003	0.0000	8.6097

Fig Garden Land Holdings Plan Amendment - San Joaquin Valley Unified APCD Air District, Annual

3.3 Site Preparation - 2019**Unmitigated Construction Off-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	2.1000e-004	1.5000e-004	1.4800e-003	0.0000	3.6000e-004	0.0000	3.6000e-004	1.0000e-004	0.0000	1.0000e-004	0.0000	0.3334	0.3334	1.0000e-005	0.0000	0.3337
Total	2.1000e-004	1.5000e-004	1.4800e-003	0.0000	3.6000e-004	0.0000	3.6000e-004	1.0000e-004	0.0000	1.0000e-004	0.0000	0.3334	0.3334	1.0000e-005	0.0000	0.3337

Mitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Fugitive Dust					0.0452	0.0000	0.0452	0.0248	0.0000	0.0248	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Off-Road	0.0108	0.1139	0.0552	9.0000e-005		5.9800e-003	5.9800e-003		5.5000e-003	5.5000e-003	0.0000	8.5422	8.5422	2.7000e-003	0.0000	8.6097
Total	0.0108	0.1139	0.0552	9.0000e-005	0.0452	5.9800e-003	0.0512	0.0248	5.5000e-003	0.0303	0.0000	8.5422	8.5422	2.7000e-003	0.0000	8.6097

Fig Garden Land Holdings Plan Amendment - San Joaquin Valley Unified APCD Air District, Annual

3.3 Site Preparation - 2019**Mitigated Construction Off-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	2.1000e-004	1.5000e-004	1.4800e-003	0.0000	3.6000e-004	0.0000	3.6000e-004	1.0000e-004	0.0000	1.0000e-004	0.0000	0.3334	0.3334	1.0000e-005	0.0000	0.3337
Total	2.1000e-004	1.5000e-004	1.4800e-003	0.0000	3.6000e-004	0.0000	3.6000e-004	1.0000e-004	0.0000	1.0000e-004	0.0000	0.3334	0.3334	1.0000e-005	0.0000	0.3337

3.4 Grading - 2019**Unmitigated Construction On-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Fugitive Dust					0.0262	0.0000	0.0262	0.0135	0.0000	0.0135	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Off-Road	0.0103	0.1134	0.0652	1.2000e-004		5.5900e-003	5.5900e-003		5.1400e-003	5.1400e-003	0.0000	10.6569	10.6569	3.3700e-003	0.0000	10.7412
Total	0.0103	0.1134	0.0652	1.2000e-004	0.0262	5.5900e-003	0.0318	0.0135	5.1400e-003	0.0186	0.0000	10.6569	10.6569	3.3700e-003	0.0000	10.7412

Fig Garden Land Holdings Plan Amendment - San Joaquin Valley Unified APCD Air District, Annual

3.4 Grading - 2019**Unmitigated Construction Off-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	2.8000e-004	2.0000e-004	1.9700e-003	0.0000	4.8000e-004	0.0000	4.8000e-004	1.3000e-004	0.0000	1.3000e-004	0.0000	0.4445	0.4445	1.0000e-005	0.0000	0.4449
Total	2.8000e-004	2.0000e-004	1.9700e-003	0.0000	4.8000e-004	0.0000	4.8000e-004	1.3000e-004	0.0000	1.3000e-004	0.0000	0.4445	0.4445	1.0000e-005	0.0000	0.4449

Mitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Fugitive Dust					0.0262	0.0000	0.0262	0.0135	0.0000	0.0135	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Off-Road	0.0103	0.1134	0.0652	1.2000e-004		5.5900e-003	5.5900e-003		5.1400e-003	5.1400e-003	0.0000	10.6569	10.6569	3.3700e-003	0.0000	10.7412
Total	0.0103	0.1134	0.0652	1.2000e-004	0.0262	5.5900e-003	0.0318	0.0135	5.1400e-003	0.0186	0.0000	10.6569	10.6569	3.3700e-003	0.0000	10.7412

Fig Garden Land Holdings Plan Amendment - San Joaquin Valley Unified APCD Air District, Annual

3.4 Grading - 2019**Mitigated Construction Off-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	2.8000e-004	2.0000e-004	1.9700e-003	0.0000	4.8000e-004	0.0000	4.8000e-004	1.3000e-004	0.0000	1.3000e-004	0.0000	0.4445	0.4445	1.0000e-005	0.0000	0.4449
Total	2.8000e-004	2.0000e-004	1.9700e-003	0.0000	4.8000e-004	0.0000	4.8000e-004	1.3000e-004	0.0000	1.3000e-004	0.0000	0.4445	0.4445	1.0000e-005	0.0000	0.4449

3.5 Building Construction - 2019**Unmitigated Construction On-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Off-Road	0.1169	1.0434	0.8496	1.3300e-003		0.0639	0.0639		0.0600	0.0600	0.0000	116.3766	116.3766	0.0284	0.0000	117.0853
Total	0.1169	1.0434	0.8496	1.3300e-003		0.0639	0.0639		0.0600	0.0600	0.0000	116.3766	116.3766	0.0284	0.0000	117.0853

Fig Garden Land Holdings Plan Amendment - San Joaquin Valley Unified APCD Air District, Annual

3.5 Building Construction - 2019**Unmitigated Construction Off-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	8.7000e-003	0.2377	0.0478	5.1000e-004	0.0118	1.8000e-003	0.0136	3.4100e-003	1.7200e-003	5.1300e-003	0.0000	48.5283	48.5283	4.0500e-003	0.0000	48.6296
Worker	0.0193	0.0136	0.1365	3.4000e-004	0.0332	2.4000e-004	0.0335	8.8400e-003	2.3000e-004	9.0600e-003	0.0000	30.8049	30.8049	9.9000e-004	0.0000	30.8296
Total	0.0280	0.2512	0.1842	8.5000e-004	0.0451	2.0400e-003	0.0471	0.0123	1.9500e-003	0.0142	0.0000	79.3333	79.3333	5.0400e-003	0.0000	79.4591

Mitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Off-Road	0.1169	1.0434	0.8496	1.3300e-003		0.0639	0.0639		0.0600	0.0600	0.0000	116.3764	116.3764	0.0284	0.0000	117.0852
Total	0.1169	1.0434	0.8496	1.3300e-003		0.0639	0.0639		0.0600	0.0600	0.0000	116.3764	116.3764	0.0284	0.0000	117.0852

Fig Garden Land Holdings Plan Amendment - San Joaquin Valley Unified APCD Air District, Annual

3.5 Building Construction - 2019**Mitigated Construction Off-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	8.7000e-003	0.2377	0.0478	5.1000e-004	0.0118	1.8000e-003	0.0136	3.4100e-003	1.7200e-003	5.1300e-003	0.0000	48.5283	48.5283	4.0500e-003	0.0000	48.6296
Worker	0.0193	0.0136	0.1365	3.4000e-004	0.0332	2.4000e-004	0.0335	8.8400e-003	2.3000e-004	9.0600e-003	0.0000	30.8049	30.8049	9.9000e-004	0.0000	30.8296
Total	0.0280	0.2512	0.1842	8.5000e-004	0.0451	2.0400e-003	0.0471	0.0123	1.9500e-003	0.0142	0.0000	79.3333	79.3333	5.0400e-003	0.0000	79.4591

3.5 Building Construction - 2020**Unmitigated Construction On-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Off-Road	0.1389	1.2567	1.1036	1.7600e-003		0.0732	0.0732		0.0688	0.0688	0.0000	151.7045	151.7045	0.0370	0.0000	152.6298
Total	0.1389	1.2567	1.1036	1.7600e-003		0.0732	0.0732		0.0688	0.0688	0.0000	151.7045	151.7045	0.0370	0.0000	152.6298

Fig Garden Land Holdings Plan Amendment - San Joaquin Valley Unified APCD Air District, Annual

3.5 Building Construction - 2020**Unmitigated Construction Off-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	9.3400e-003	0.2870	0.0544	6.7000e-004	0.0156	1.5800e-003	0.0172	4.5200e-003	1.5100e-003	6.0300e-003	0.0000	63.6707	63.6707	5.0300e-003	0.0000	63.7963
Worker	0.0233	0.0158	0.1604	4.4000e-004	0.0440	3.1000e-004	0.0443	0.0117	2.9000e-004	0.0120	0.0000	39.5006	39.5006	1.1300e-003	0.0000	39.5289
Total	0.0326	0.3028	0.2149	1.1100e-003	0.0596	1.8900e-003	0.0615	0.0162	1.8000e-003	0.0180	0.0000	103.1712	103.1712	6.1600e-003	0.0000	103.3252

Mitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Off-Road	0.1389	1.2567	1.1036	1.7600e-003		0.0732	0.0732		0.0688	0.0688	0.0000	151.7044	151.7044	0.0370	0.0000	152.6296
Total	0.1389	1.2567	1.1036	1.7600e-003		0.0732	0.0732		0.0688	0.0688	0.0000	151.7044	151.7044	0.0370	0.0000	152.6296

Fig Garden Land Holdings Plan Amendment - San Joaquin Valley Unified APCD Air District, Annual

3.5 Building Construction - 2020**Mitigated Construction Off-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	9.3400e-003	0.2870	0.0544	6.7000e-004	0.0156	1.5800e-003	0.0172	4.5200e-003	1.5100e-003	6.0300e-003	0.0000	63.6707	63.6707	5.0300e-003	0.0000	63.7963
Worker	0.0233	0.0158	0.1604	4.4000e-004	0.0440	3.1000e-004	0.0443	0.0117	2.9000e-004	0.0120	0.0000	39.5006	39.5006	1.1300e-003	0.0000	39.5289
Total	0.0326	0.3028	0.2149	1.1100e-003	0.0596	1.8900e-003	0.0615	0.0162	1.8000e-003	0.0180	0.0000	103.1712	103.1712	6.1600e-003	0.0000	103.3252

3.6 Paving - 2020**Unmitigated Construction On-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Off-Road	0.0107	0.1062	0.1105	1.7000e-004		5.8600e-003	5.8600e-003		5.4000e-003	5.4000e-003	0.0000	14.7348	14.7348	4.6300e-003	0.0000	14.8506
Paving	3.0800e-003					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Total	0.0137	0.1062	0.1105	1.7000e-004		5.8600e-003	5.8600e-003		5.4000e-003	5.4000e-003	0.0000	14.7348	14.7348	4.6300e-003	0.0000	14.8506

Fig Garden Land Holdings Plan Amendment - San Joaquin Valley Unified APCD Air District, Annual

3.6 Paving - 2020**Unmitigated Construction Off-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	7.6000e-004	5.2000e-004	5.2500e-003	1.0000e-005	1.4400e-003	1.0000e-005	1.4500e-003	3.8000e-004	1.0000e-005	3.9000e-004	0.0000	1.2923	1.2923	4.0000e-005	0.0000	1.2932
Total	7.6000e-004	5.2000e-004	5.2500e-003	1.0000e-005	1.4400e-003	1.0000e-005	1.4500e-003	3.8000e-004	1.0000e-005	3.9000e-004	0.0000	1.2923	1.2923	4.0000e-005	0.0000	1.2932

Mitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Off-Road	0.0107	0.1062	0.1105	1.7000e-004		5.8600e-003	5.8600e-003		5.4000e-003	5.4000e-003	0.0000	14.7348	14.7348	4.6300e-003	0.0000	14.8506
Paving	3.0800e-003					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Total	0.0137	0.1062	0.1105	1.7000e-004		5.8600e-003	5.8600e-003		5.4000e-003	5.4000e-003	0.0000	14.7348	14.7348	4.6300e-003	0.0000	14.8506

Fig Garden Land Holdings Plan Amendment - San Joaquin Valley Unified APCD Air District, Annual

3.6 Paving - 2020**Mitigated Construction Off-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	7.6000e-004	5.2000e-004	5.2500e-003	1.0000e-005	1.4400e-003	1.0000e-005	1.4500e-003	3.8000e-004	1.0000e-005	3.9000e-004	0.0000	1.2923	1.2923	4.0000e-005	0.0000	1.2932
Total	7.6000e-004	5.2000e-004	5.2500e-003	1.0000e-005	1.4400e-003	1.0000e-005	1.4500e-003	3.8000e-004	1.0000e-005	3.9000e-004	0.0000	1.2923	1.2923	4.0000e-005	0.0000	1.2932

3.7 Architectural Coating - 2020**Unmitigated Construction On-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Archit. Coating	0.6532					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Off-Road	2.1800e-003	0.0152	0.0165	3.0000e-005		1.0000e-003	1.0000e-003		1.0000e-003	1.0000e-003	0.0000	2.2979	2.2979	1.8000e-004	0.0000	2.3024
Total	0.6554	0.0152	0.0165	3.0000e-005		1.0000e-003	1.0000e-003		1.0000e-003	1.0000e-003	0.0000	2.2979	2.2979	1.8000e-004	0.0000	2.3024

Fig Garden Land Holdings Plan Amendment - San Joaquin Valley Unified APCD Air District, Annual

3.7 Architectural Coating - 2020**Unmitigated Construction Off-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	6.5000e-004	4.4000e-004	4.4600e-003	1.0000e-005	1.2200e-003	1.0000e-005	1.2300e-003	3.3000e-004	1.0000e-005	3.3000e-004	0.0000	1.0984	1.0984	3.0000e-005	0.0000	1.0992
Total	6.5000e-004	4.4000e-004	4.4600e-003	1.0000e-005	1.2200e-003	1.0000e-005	1.2300e-003	3.3000e-004	1.0000e-005	3.3000e-004	0.0000	1.0984	1.0984	3.0000e-005	0.0000	1.0992

Mitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Archit. Coating	0.6532					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Off-Road	2.1800e-003	0.0152	0.0165	3.0000e-005		1.0000e-003	1.0000e-003		1.0000e-003	1.0000e-003	0.0000	2.2979	2.2979	1.8000e-004	0.0000	2.3024
Total	0.6554	0.0152	0.0165	3.0000e-005		1.0000e-003	1.0000e-003		1.0000e-003	1.0000e-003	0.0000	2.2979	2.2979	1.8000e-004	0.0000	2.3024

Fig Garden Land Holdings Plan Amendment - San Joaquin Valley Unified APCD Air District, Annual

3.7 Architectural Coating - 2020**Mitigated Construction Off-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	6.5000e-004	4.4000e-004	4.4600e-003	1.0000e-005	1.2200e-003	1.0000e-005	1.2300e-003	3.3000e-004	1.0000e-005	3.3000e-004	0.0000	1.0984	1.0984	3.0000e-005	0.0000	1.0992
Total	6.5000e-004	4.4000e-004	4.4600e-003	1.0000e-005	1.2200e-003	1.0000e-005	1.2300e-003	3.3000e-004	1.0000e-005	3.3000e-004	0.0000	1.0984	1.0984	3.0000e-005	0.0000	1.0992

4.0 Operational Detail - Mobile**4.1 Mitigation Measures Mobile**

Improve Destination Accessibility

Increase Transit Accessibility

Fig Garden Land Holdings Plan Amendment - San Joaquin Valley Unified APCD Air District, Annual

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Mitigated	1.9423	7.6196	19.2470	0.0474	0.4770	0.2002	0.6772	0.1285	0.1909	0.3194	0.0000	891.4175	891.4175	0.2289	0.0000	897.1390
Unmitigated	2.2952	9.9751	25.3707	0.0635	0.7080	0.2671	0.9751	0.1907	0.2548	0.4455	0.0000	1,243.483 ₄	1,243.483 ₄	0.2695	0.0000	1,250.219 ₅

4.2 Trip Summary Information

Land Use	Average Daily Trip Rate			Unmitigated	Mitigated
	Weekday	Saturday	Sunday	Annual VMT	Annual VMT
Office Park	992.70	147.60	68.40	1,854,444	1,249,486
Parking Lot	0.00	0.00	0.00		
Total	992.70	147.60	68.40	1,854,444	1,249,486

4.3 Trip Type Information

Land Use	Miles			Trip %			Trip Purpose %		
	H-W or C-W	H-S or C-C	H-O or C-NW	H-W or C-W	H-S or C-C	H-O or C-NW	Primary	Diverted	Pass-by
Office Park	9.50	7.30	7.30	33.00	48.00	19.00	82	15	3
Parking Lot	9.50	7.30	7.30	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0

4.4 Fleet Mix

Land Use	LDA	LDT1	LDT2	MDV	LHD1	LHD2	MHD	HHD	OBUS	UBUS	MCY	SBUS	MH
Office Park	0.471860	0.098559	0.152637	0.110567	0.032842	0.006164	0.021078	0.096768	0.001251	0.001645	0.002796	0.001124	0.002709
Parking Lot	0.471860	0.098559	0.152637	0.110567	0.032842	0.006164	0.021078	0.096768	0.001251	0.001645	0.002796	0.001124	0.002709

Fig Garden Land Holdings Plan Amendment - San Joaquin Valley Unified APCD Air District, Annual

5.0 Energy Detail

Historical Energy Use: N

5.1 Mitigation Measures Energy

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Electricity Mitigated						0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Electricity Unmitigated						0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
NaturalGas Mitigated	0.0111	0.1005	0.0844	6.0000e-004		7.6400e-003	7.6400e-003		7.6400e-003	7.6400e-003	0.0000	109.4065	109.4065	2.1000e-003	2.0100e-003	110.0566
NaturalGas Unmitigated	0.0111	0.1005	0.0844	6.0000e-004		7.6400e-003	7.6400e-003		7.6400e-003	7.6400e-003	0.0000	109.4065	109.4065	2.1000e-003	2.0100e-003	110.0566

Fig Garden Land Holdings Plan Amendment - San Joaquin Valley Unified APCD Air District, Annual

5.2 Energy by Land Use - NaturalGas**Unmitigated**

	NaturalGas Use	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Land Use	kBTU/yr	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Office Park	2.0502e+006	0.0111	0.1005	0.0844	6.0000e-004		7.6400e-003	7.6400e-003		7.6400e-003	7.6400e-003	0.0000	109.4065	109.4065	2.1000e-003	2.0100e-003	110.0566
Parking Lot	0	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Total		0.0111	0.1005	0.0844	6.0000e-004		7.6400e-003	7.6400e-003		7.6400e-003	7.6400e-003	0.0000	109.4065	109.4065	2.1000e-003	2.0100e-003	110.0566

Mitigated

	NaturalGas Use	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Land Use	kBTU/yr	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Office Park	2.0502e+006	0.0111	0.1005	0.0844	6.0000e-004		7.6400e-003	7.6400e-003		7.6400e-003	7.6400e-003	0.0000	109.4065	109.4065	2.1000e-003	2.0100e-003	110.0566
Parking Lot	0	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Total		0.0111	0.1005	0.0844	6.0000e-004		7.6400e-003	7.6400e-003		7.6400e-003	7.6400e-003	0.0000	109.4065	109.4065	2.1000e-003	2.0100e-003	110.0566

Fig Garden Land Holdings Plan Amendment - San Joaquin Valley Unified APCD Air District, Annual

5.3 Energy by Land Use - Electricity**Unmitigated**

	Electricity Use	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Land Use	kWh/yr	MT/yr			
Office Park	1.0494e+006	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Parking Lot	46060	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Total		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000

Mitigated

	Electricity Use	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Land Use	kWh/yr	MT/yr			
Office Park	1.0494e+006	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Parking Lot	46060	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Total		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000

6.0 Area Detail**6.1 Mitigation Measures Area**

Fig Garden Land Holdings Plan Amendment - San Joaquin Valley Unified APCD Air District, Annual

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Mitigated	0.4680	5.0000e-005	6.8200e-003	0.0000		2.0000e-005	2.0000e-005		2.0000e-005	2.0000e-005	0.0000	7.4900e-003	7.4900e-003	5.0000e-005	0.0000	8.7600e-003
Unmitigated	0.4680	5.0000e-005	6.8200e-003	0.0000		2.0000e-005	2.0000e-005		2.0000e-005	2.0000e-005	0.0000	7.4900e-003	7.4900e-003	5.0000e-005	0.0000	8.7600e-003

6.2 Area by SubCategory

Unmitigated

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
SubCategory	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Architectural Coating	0.1070					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Consumer Products	0.3600					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Landscaping	9.6000e-004	5.0000e-005	6.8200e-003	0.0000		2.0000e-005	2.0000e-005		2.0000e-005	2.0000e-005	0.0000	7.4900e-003	7.4900e-003	5.0000e-005	0.0000	8.7600e-003
Total	0.4680	5.0000e-005	6.8200e-003	0.0000		2.0000e-005	2.0000e-005		2.0000e-005	2.0000e-005	0.0000	7.4900e-003	7.4900e-003	5.0000e-005	0.0000	8.7600e-003

Fig Garden Land Holdings Plan Amendment - San Joaquin Valley Unified APCD Air District, Annual

6.2 Area by SubCategory**Mitigated**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
SubCategory	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Architectural Coating	0.1070					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Consumer Products	0.3600					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Landscaping	9.6000e-004	5.0000e-005	6.8200e-003	0.0000		2.0000e-005	2.0000e-005		2.0000e-005	2.0000e-005	0.0000	7.4900e-003	7.4900e-003	5.0000e-005	0.0000	8.7600e-003
Total	0.4680	5.0000e-005	6.8200e-003	0.0000		2.0000e-005	2.0000e-005		2.0000e-005	2.0000e-005	0.0000	7.4900e-003	7.4900e-003	5.0000e-005	0.0000	8.7600e-003

7.0 Water Detail**7.1 Mitigation Measures Water**

Fig Garden Land Holdings Plan Amendment - San Joaquin Valley Unified APCD Air District, Annual

	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	MT/yr			
Mitigated	5.0748	0.5212	0.0123	21.7732
Unmitigated	5.0748	0.5212	0.0123	21.7732

7.2 Water by Land Use**Unmitigated**

	Indoor/Outdoor Use	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Land Use	Mgal	MT/yr			
Office Park	15.996 / 9.80402	5.0748	0.5212	0.0123	21.7732
Parking Lot	0 / 0	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Total		5.0748	0.5212	0.0123	21.7732

Fig Garden Land Holdings Plan Amendment - San Joaquin Valley Unified APCD Air District, Annual

7.2 Water by Land Use**Mitigated**

	Indoor/Outdoor Use	Total CO ₂	CH ₄	N ₂ O	CO ₂ e
Land Use	Mgal	MT/yr			
Office Park	15.996 / 9.80402	5.0748	0.5212	0.0123	21.7732
Parking Lot	0 / 0	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Total		5.0748	0.5212	0.0123	21.7732

8.0 Waste Detail**8.1 Mitigation Measures Waste****Category/Year**

	Total CO ₂	CH ₄	N ₂ O	CO ₂ e
	MT/yr			
Mitigated	16.9903	1.0041	0.0000	42.0929
Unmitigated	16.9903	1.0041	0.0000	42.0929

Fig Garden Land Holdings Plan Amendment - San Joaquin Valley Unified APCD Air District, Annual

8.2 Waste by Land Use**Unmitigated**

	Waste Disposed	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Land Use	tons	MT/yr			
Office Park	83.7	16.9903	1.0041	0.0000	42.0929
Parking Lot	0	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Total		16.9903	1.0041	0.0000	42.0929

Mitigated

	Waste Disposed	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Land Use	tons	MT/yr			
Office Park	83.7	16.9903	1.0041	0.0000	42.0929
Parking Lot	0	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Total		16.9903	1.0041	0.0000	42.0929

9.0 Operational Offroad

Equipment Type	Number	Hours/Day	Days/Year	Horse Power	Load Factor	Fuel Type
----------------	--------	-----------	-----------	-------------	-------------	-----------

Fig Garden Land Holdings Plan Amendment - San Joaquin Valley Unified APCD Air District, Annual

10.0 Stationary Equipment

Fire Pumps and Emergency Generators

Equipment Type	Number	Hours/Day	Hours/Year	Horse Power	Load Factor	Fuel Type
----------------	--------	-----------	------------	-------------	-------------	-----------

Boilers

Equipment Type	Number	Heat Input/Day	Heat Input/Year	Boiler Rating	Fuel Type
----------------	--------	----------------	-----------------	---------------	-----------

User Defined Equipment

Equipment Type	Number
----------------	--------

11.0 Vegetation

Appendix B

Project Trip Generation

RECEIVED

VICE

November 14, 2018

NOV 5 2018

Ms. Jill Gormley, TE
City of Fresno Traffic Engineering
2600 Fresno Street, 4th Floor
Fresno, California 93721

**DARM - DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
CITY OF FRESNO**

Subject: Trip Generation Analysis – Proposed Commercial Office located at San Jose Avenue and N. Colonial Avenue in Fresno, California

Dear Ms. Gormley;

Precision Civil Engineering, Inc. (PCE) has completed a trip generation analysis for a proposed office development locate at San Jose Avenue and N. Colonial Avenue. The properties are identified as APN 417-140-21 and 417-231-16. The proposed use will be multi-story office building with approximately 90,000 sf of leasable space. This letter documents the analysis requested in conjunction with the General Plan Amendment for the proposed land use changes.

Background

The proposed project consists of two parcels APN 417-140-21 and 417-231-16, and is proposing to vacate a portion of San Jose and N. Colonial Ave adjacent to the parcels. APN 417-140-21 is currently zoned low density residential and has a previously approved entitlement to build a 13 unit condo/pud development. The proposed project will vacate the protion of N. Colonial Avenue adjcent to APN 417-140-21 and install a cul de sac at the northely property line. APN 417-231-16 is currently zoned medium high residential and has an existing 44 unit multi-family residential development. The project is proposing to demolish the existing multi-family development and vacate San Jose Avenue west of the easterly property line. A cul de sac is proposed in San Jose Avenue to allow vehicles to turnaround, refer to Exhibit 1. The existing roadway will be abandoned and demolished to accommodate the development of a multistory office building, parking lots and drive isles. There is curently a noticable amount of cut through traffic utilizing San Jose Avenue to access Palm and Maroa. The abandonment of San Jose Avenue and N. Collonial Avenue will eliminate the cut through traffic. However, access should be maintained for emergency vehicle access.

Based on the newly adopted 2035 General Plan and development code update, APN 417-231-16 has a planned land use of Regional Mixed Use (RMX), which Business and Professional Offices is a permitted use, and only requires ministerial approval. However, APN 417-140-21 is planned for Medium Density Residential (RM) land use, and will require a General Plan Amendment (GPA) to change the land use to RMX to allow the proposed office uses. In accordance with the City of Fresno's "Traffic Impact Study Report Guidelines" (February 2, 2009), a traffic impact study is required when a project includes a GPA which changes the planned land use.

The "Mobility and Transportation" element of the City of Fresno General Plan 2035 breaks down the City of Fresno into four Traffic Impact Zones (TIZ's) on General Plan Figure MT-4. The project lies within TIZ-II, which represents areas of the City that are mostly developed and built out. To encourage in fill development and minimize upfront infrastructure cost, the peak hour Level of Service (LOS) shall be maintained at LOS E or better for all intersections and roadway segments. The trigger for requiring a Traffic Impact Study (TIS) for all development within the TIZ-II is when a project is anticipated to generate 200 or more new peak hour trips.

Trip Generation Analysis

The project proposes to construct 90,000 sf business and professional office development. According to Table 1 the development is anticipated to have 140 AM peak hour trips and 134 PM peak hour trips. The proposed development is anticipated to generate less than 200 peak hour trips, therefore a full Traffic Impact Analysis is not needed.

Table 1 – Office Trip Generation

Land Use	Code ¹	Unit ⁴	Average Weekday Rate	AM Peak Hour ²				PM Peak Hour ³			
				Rate	In	Out	Total	Rate	In	Out	Total
General Office	710	90	11.03	1.56	88%	12%		1.49	17%	83%	
			993		124	17	140		23	111	134

¹ Institute of Transportation Engineers, Trip Generation, Ninth Edition (2012).

² AM Peak Hour Rates are peak hours of adjacent street traffic for AM (7:00-9:00).

³ PM Peak Hour Rates are peak hours of adjacent street traffic for PM (4:00-6:00).

⁴ Units based 1,000 sf of gross leasable space.

With the proposed abandonment and restricted access to the existing local roads (San Jose Ave and N. Colonial Ave) the proposed project trips will gain access to the project site through the existing commercial and office developments to the west. San Jose Avenue and Palm Avenue will be the main access point. Figure 2 shows the proposed AM and PM peak hour project trips distributed to the following intersections:

1. Palm/Shaw
2. Palm/San Jose
3. Palm/Barstow

All three intersections are currently signalized. The existing lane configurations are shown on Figure 2. The City should continue to monitor these intersections and adjust signal timing as needed to improve the level of services.

Conclusions and Recommendations

The proposed development is anticipated to generate less than 200 peak hour trips, therefore a full Traffic Impact Analysis is not needed.

It is recommended the project implement the following;

1. Provide pedestrian connectivity to the adjacent commercial shopping center and the existing residential developments to the west and north.
2. Provide Bicycle Storage Facilities on-site to encourage use of pedestrian, bicycle, and transit modes for accessing the project site.
3. Access to San Jose Ave and N. Colonial Ave should be restricted to emergency access only.
4. The project shall pay into applicable transportation fee programs. These include a Fresno Major Street Impact (FMSI) Fee, a Traffic Signal Mitigation Impact (TSMI) Fee, and a Regional Transportation Mitigation Fee (RTMF). The FMSI Fee will be calculated and assessed during the building permit process. The RTMF will be calculated and assessed by Fresno COG.

It is also recommended the City continue to monitor these intersections identified above and adjust signal timing as needed to improve the intersection level of services.

VICE

Please feel free to call our office if you have any questions.

Best Regards,




Ken Vang, P.E., T.E.
Principal

Attachments

- Exhibit 1 – Site Plan
- Exhibit 2 – Trip Distribution





VICE
VANG INC. CONSULTING ENGINEERS

**FIG GARDEN OFFICE
SITE PLAN**

**PREPARED FOR:
ASSEMI**

**DATE: 10/20/18
PROJECT: 18-221**

**EXHIBIT
1**

