

Exhibit H

CITY OF FRESNO ADDENDUM TO ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT NO. R-17-020 Addendum prepared in accordance with Section 15164 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines		
The full Initial Study and the Master Environmental Impact Report SCH No. 2012111015 are on file in the Planning and Development Department, Fresno City Hall, 3rd Floor 2600 Fresno Street Fresno, California 93721 (559) 621-8277	ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT NUMBER: P24-02150	This addendum was not circulated for public review pursuant to Section 15164(c) of the CEQA Guidelines.
APPLICANT: Luke Risner Precision Engineering 1234 O Street Fresno, CA 93721	PROJECT LOCATION: Located on south side of West San Jose Avenue between North Maroa and North College Avenues, Fresno, CA (approx. 1.89 acres) Latitude: 36.811571 & Longitude: -119.797714 Assessor's Parcel Number(s): 417-251-04, -55, -56	
PROJECT DESCRIPTION: Annexation Application No. P24-02150 (Project) was filed by Luke Risner of Precision Civil Engineering, Inc., on behalf of Jeff Roberts of Namak Properties, LLC, and pertains to approximately 1.89 acres of property located along the south side of West San Jose Avenue between North Maroa and North College Avenues. Annexation Application No. P24-02150 proposes to initiate annexation proceedings for the San Jose-Maroa Reorganization No. 2 proposing incorporation of properties within the City of Fresno, and detachment from the Kings River Conservation District and North Central Fire Protection District. The project does not propose any new development in conjunction with the annexation, beyond the multi-family housing evaluated in Environmental Assessment No. R-17-020.		

It should be noted that one of the three parcels within the annexation area is vacant and the other two properties are developed with one single-family home on each of the two properties.

Environmental Assessment No. R-17-020, a Mitigated Negative Declaration (Prior MND) dated April 20, 2018, was prepared for a project that included Pre-zone Application No. R-17-020. The Prior MND was tiered from the General Plan Master Environmental Impact Report ("MEIR" SCH No. 2012111015). This Addendum is to the Prior MND which addresses the environmental effects associated with the Project to determine if there are any new or increased environmental impacts due to implementation of the Project within the current regulatory and environmental setting. The conclusions of the analysis in this Addendum remain consistent with those made in the Prior MND. No new significant impacts will result, and no substantial increase in severity of impacts will result from those previously identified in the Prior MND.

Checklist Evaluation Categories

Conclusion in Prior MND – This analysis provides a cross reference to the section of the Prior MND where the conclusion may be found relative to the environmental issue listed under each topic.

Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts? – Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a)(1), this column indicates whether the changes represented by the revised Project are substantial in nature and will require major revisions of the Prior MND due to the involvement of new significant environmental impacts not previously identified or mitigated by the Prior MND, or whether the changes will result in a substantial increase in the severity of a previously identified significant impact.

New Circumstances Involving New Impacts? – Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a)(2), this column indicates where there have been substantial changes with respect to the circumstances under which the Project is undertaken that will require major revisions to the Prior MND, due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects.

New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification? – Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a)(3)(a)-(d), this column indicates whether new information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the Prior MND was adopted, shows any of the following: (a) The Project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the Prior MND; (b) Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the Prior MND; (c) Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible, and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the Project, but the Project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative; or (d) Mitigation measures or alternative which are considerably different from those analyzed in the Prior MND would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.

Prior MND Mitigation Measures – This column indicates whether the Prior MND provides mitigation measures to address potentially significant effects in the related impact category.

1. Aesthetics

Environmental Issue Area	Prior MND Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Prior MND Mitigation Measures
<i>Would the project:</i>					
a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	No Impact.	No. The only change to the Project is to effectuate the annexation into the City already discussed in the Prior MND.	No. The Project site conditions are substantially similar to those which existed at the time of adoption of the Prior MND. The only change to the Project is to effectuate the annexation into the City already discussed in the Prior MND.	No. No new information has been found since adoption of the Prior MND which identifies new potentially significant impacts or mitigation measures. The only change to the Project is to effectuate the annexation into the City already discussed in the Prior MND.	None.
b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	No Impact	No. The only change to the Project is to effectuate the annexation into the City already discussed in the Prior MND.	No. The Project site conditions are substantially similar to those which existed at the time of adoption of the Prior MND. The only change to the Project is to effectuate the annexation into the City already discussed in the Prior MND.	No. No new information has been found since adoption of the Prior MND which identifies new potentially significant impacts or mitigation measures. The only change to the Project is to effectuate the annexation into the City already discussed in the Prior MND.	None.

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 other regulations governing scenic quality?	Less Than Significant Impact	No. The only change to the Project is to effectuate the annexation into the City already discussed in the Prior MND.	No. The Project site conditions are substantially similar to those which existed at the time of adoption of the Prior MND. The only change to the Project is to effectuate the annexation into the City already discussed in the Prior MND.	No. No new information has been found since adoption of the Prior MND which identifies new potentially significant impacts or mitigation measures. The only change to the Project is to effectuate the annexation into the City already discussed in the Prior MND.	None
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.	No. The only change to the Project is to effectuate the annexation into the City already discussed in the Prior MND.	No. The Project site conditions are substantially similar to those which existed at the time of adoption of the Prior MND. The only change to the Project is to effectuate the annexation into the City already discussed in the Prior MND.	No. No new information has been found since adoption of the Prior MND which identifies new potentially significant impacts or mitigation measures. The only change to the Project is to effectuate the annexation into the City already discussed in the Prior MND.	None.

Discussion

The Prior MND determined that the proposed Project would have less than significant impacts to aesthetic resources. No additional construction or operational activities will occur other than as stated in the Prior MND. There are no changes to the Project that would cause an increase in impacts beyond what was

previously analyzed. The only change to the Project is to effectuate the annexation into the City already discussed in the Prior MND. Therefore, the Project impact remains less than significant. Please see the MMRP adopted with the Prior MND for the MEIR mitigation measures incorporated by reference.

Conclusion

The conclusions from the Prior MND remain unchanged.

2. Agricultural And Forestry Resources

Environmental Issue Area	Prior MND Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Prior MND Mitigation Measures
<i>Would the project:</i>					
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?	No Impact.	No. The only change to the Project is to effectuate the annexation into the City already discussed in the Prior MND.	No. The project will continue to not remove any land from agricultural production. The Project site conditions are substantially similar to those which existed at the time of adoption of the Prior MND.	No. The proposed project remains the same concerning agricultural resources. No new information has been found since adoption of the Prior MND which identifies new potentially significant impacts or mitigation measures.	None.
b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	No Impact.	No. The only change to the Project is to effectuate the annexation into the City already discussed in the Prior MND.	No. The project will continue to not remove any land from agricultural production. The Project site conditions are substantially similar to those which existed at the time of adoption of the Prior MND.	No. The proposed project remains the same concerning agricultural resources. No new information has been found since adoption of the Prior MND which identifies new potentially significant	None.

November 19, 2025

				impacts or mitigation measures.	
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))?	No Impact.	No. The only change to the Project is to effectuate the annexation into the City already discussed in the Prior MND.	No. The Project site does not have any forest land or timberland, and was rezoned from Single-Family Residential to Corridor Mixed Use/Urban Growth Management along with adoption of the Prior MND. This remains the applicable City zoning.	No. The proposed project remains the same concerning forest-land and timberland. No new information has been found since adoption of the Prior MND which identifies new potentially significant impacts or mitigation measures.	None.
d. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	No Impact.	No. The only change to the Project is to effectuate the annexation into the City already discussed in the Prior MND.	No. There is no forest land on site. The Project site conditions are substantially similar to those which existed at the time of adoption of the Prior MND.	No. There is no forest land on site. No new information has been found since adoption of the Prior MND which identifies new potentially significant impacts or mitigation measures.	None.
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.	No. The only change to the Project is to effectuate the annexation into the City already discussed in the Prior MND.	No. The project will continue to not remove any land from agricultural production or forest land. The Project site conditions are substantially similar to those	No. The project will not remove any land from agricultural production or forest land. No new information has been found since adoption	None.

November 19, 2025

			which existed at the time of adoption of the Prior MND.	of the Prior MND which identifies new potentially significant impacts or mitigation measures.	
--	--	--	---	---	--

Discussion

The previously adopted MND determined that the proposed Project would have no impact to agricultural or forestry resources. The site is designated and zoned for residential uses. No additional construction or operational activities will occur other than as stated in the adopted MND. There are no changes to the Project that would cause an increase in impacts beyond what was previously analyzed. Therefore, there remains no impact.

Conclusion

The Project will have no impact on agricultural or forestry resources.

3. Air Quality

Environmental Issue Area	Prior MND Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Prior MND Mitigation Measures
<i>Would the project:</i>					
a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	Less than Significant Impact	No. The project would not create new significant increases in air emissions that would conflict or obstruct implementation of an available air quality plan. The only change to the Project is to effectuate the annexation into the City already discussed in the	No. The project would not create new significant increases in air emissions that would conflict or obstruct implementation of an available air quality plan. The Project site conditions are substantially similar to those which existed at the time of adoption of the	No. The project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard. No	None.

November 19, 2025

		Prior MND	Prior MND. The only change to the Project is to effectuate the annexation into the City already discussed in the Prior MND.	new information has been found since adoption of the Prior MND which identifies new potentially significant impacts or mitigation measures.	
b. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?	Less than Significant Impact	No. The project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard. The only change to the Project is to effectuate the annexation into the City already discussed in the Prior MND	No. The project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard. The Project site conditions are substantially similar to those which existed at the time of adoption of the Prior MND. The only change to the Project is to effectuate the annexation into the City already discussed in the Prior MND.	No. The project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard. No new information has been found since adoption of the Prior MND which identifies new potentially significant impacts or mitigation measures.	None.
c. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.	Less Than Significant Impact.	No. The project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. The only change to the Project is to effectuate the annexation into the City already	No. The project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. The Project site conditions are substantially similar to those which existed at	No. The project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. No new information has been found since adoption of the Prior MND which	None.

November 19, 2025

		discussed in the Prior MND	the time of adoption of the Prior MND. The only change to the Project is to effectuate the annexation into the City already discussed in the Prior MND.	identifies new potentially significant impacts or mitigation measures.	
d. Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?	No Impact.	No. The project would not result in other emissions that would affect a substantial number of people. The only change to the Project is to effectuate the annexation into the City already discussed in the Prior MND	No. The project would not result in other emissions that would affect a substantial number of people. The Project site conditions are substantially similar to those which existed at the time of adoption of the Prior MND. The only change to the Project is to effectuate the annexation into the City already discussed in the Prior MND.	No. The project would not result in other emissions that would affect a substantial number of people. No new information has been found since adoption of the Prior MND which identifies new potentially significant impacts or mitigation measures.	None.

Discussion

The Prior MND determined that the proposed Project would have less than significant impacts on air quality. No additional construction or operational activities will occur other than as stated in the Prior MND. There are no changes to the Project that would cause an increase in impacts beyond what was previously analyzed. Therefore, there remains no impact. Please see the MMRP adopted with the Prior MND for the MEIR mitigation measures incorporated by reference.

Conclusion

The conclusions from the Prior MND remain unchanged.

4. Biological Resources

November 19, 2025

Environmental Issue Area	Prior MND Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Prior MND Mitigation Measures
<i>Would the project:</i>					
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?	No Impact.	No. There are no changes to the Project description that would result in an increase in biological impacts from the Prior MND. The only change to the Project is to effectuate the annexation into the City already discussed in the Prior MND.	No. The Project site conditions are substantially similar to those which existed at the time of adoption of the Prior MND.	No. There are no changes to the Project description that would result in an increase in biological impacts from the previous MND. No new information has been found since adoption of the Prior MND which identifies new potentially significant impacts or mitigation measures.	None.
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.	No. The site does not contain any biologically unique or riparian habitat. The only change to the Project is to effectuate the annexation into the City already discussed in the Prior MND	No. The site does not contain any biologically unique or riparian habitat. The Project site conditions are substantially similar to those which existed at the time of adoption of the Prior MND.	No. The site does not contain any biologically unique or riparian habitat. No new information has been found since adoption of the Prior MND which identifies new potentially significant impacts or mitigation measures.	None.
c. Have a substantial adverse effect on state or 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?	No Impact.	No. The site does not contain any wetlands or other waters that would be impacted. The only change to the Project is to effectuate the annexation into the City already discussed in the Prior MND.	No. The site does not contain any wetlands or other waters that would be impacted. The Project site conditions are substantially similar to those which existed at the time of adoption of the Prior MND.	No. The site does not contain any wetlands or other waters that would be impacted. No new information has been found since adoption of the Prior MND which identifies new potentially significant impacts or mitigation measures.	None.
d. Interfere substantially with the movement of	No Impact.	No. The project will not interfere	No. The project will not interfere	No. The project will not interfere with any	None.

November 19, 2025

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?		with any fish or wildlife movement or corridors. The only change to the Project is to effectuate the annexation into the City already discussed in the Prior MND	with any fish or wildlife movement or corridors. The Project site conditions are substantially similar to those which existed at the time of adoption of the Prior MND.	fish or wildlife movement or corridors. No new information has been found since adoption of the Prior MND which identifies new potentially significant impacts or mitigation measures.	
e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	No impact.	No. The only change to the Project is to effectuate the annexation into the City already discussed in the Prior MND	No. The Project site conditions are substantially similar to those which existed at the time of adoption of the Prior MND. The only change to the Project is to effectuate the annexation into the City already discussed in the Prior MND.	No. No new information has been found since adoption of the Prior MND which identifies new potentially significant impacts or mitigation measures.	None
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.	No. The Project is not subject to any adopted biological conservation plans. The only change to the Project is to effectuate the annexation into the City already discussed in the Prior MND	No. The Project is not subject to any adopted biological conservation plans. The only change to the Project is to effectuate the annexation into the City already discussed in the Prior MND.	No. The Project is not subject to any adopted biological conservation plans. No new information has been found since adoption of the Prior MND which identifies new potentially significant impacts or mitigation measures.	None

Discussion

The Prior MND determined that the proposed Project would have no impacts on biological resources. No additional construction or operational activities will occur other than as stated in the Prior MND. There are no changes to the Project that would cause an increase in impacts beyond what was previously analyzed. The only change to the Project is to effectuate the annexation into the City already discussed in the Prior MND. Therefore, there remains no impact. Please see the MMRP adopted with the Prior MND for the MEIR mitigation measures incorporated by reference.

Conclusion

The conclusions from the Prior MND remain unchanged.

5. Cultural Resources

Environmental Issue Area	Prior MND Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Prior MND Mitigation Measures
<i>Would the project:</i>					
a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?	No Impact.	No. There are no known historic or archaeological resources exist on site. The only change to the Project is to effectuate the annexation into the City already discussed in the Prior MND.	No. There are no known historic or archaeological resources exist on site. The Project site conditions are substantially similar to those which existed at the time of adoption of the Prior MND.	No. There are no known historic or archaeological resources exist on site. No new information has been found since adoption of the Prior MND which identifies new potentially significant impacts or mitigation measures.	None.
b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	No Impact.	No. The project will not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource. The only change to the Project is to effectuate the annexation into the City already discussed in the Prior MND	No. The project will not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource. The Project site conditions are substantially similar to those which existed at the time of adoption of the Prior MND.	No. The project will not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource. No new information has been found since adoption of the Prior MND which identifies new potentially significant impacts or mitigation measures.	None.
c. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	Less Than Significant with Mitigation.	No. The project is not likely to disturb any human remains. The only change to the Project is to effectuate	No. The project is not likely to disturb any human remains. The Project site conditions are substantially	No. The project is not likely to disturb any human remains. No new information has been found since adoption	CUL - 1 CUL - 2 CUL - 3 CUL - 4 CUL - 5

		the annexation into the City already discussed in the Prior MND	similar to those which existed at the time of adoption of the Prior MND.	of the Prior MND which identifies new potentially significant impacts or mitigation measures.	
--	--	---	--	---	--

Discussion

The Prior MND determined that the proposed Project would have less than significant impacts with mitigation on cultural resources. No additional construction or operational activities will occur other than as stated in the Prior MND. There are no changes to the Project that would cause an increase in impacts beyond what was previously analyzed. The only change to the Project is to effectuate the annexation into the City already discussed in the Prior MND. Therefore, the impacts remain less than significant.

Prior MND Mitigation Measures

CUL - 1 CUL – 2, CUL – 3, CUL – 4 CUL – 5

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 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 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.

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 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 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 excavation and/or construction activities, the procedure identified above for the discovery of unknown resources shall be followed.

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 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 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.

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 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.

CUL-5 :The project applicant or subsequent developer shall retain the Dumna Wo Wah Tribal Government to observe and monitor all earth-moving, grading, boring, and sub-surface activities on all undisturbed land. Prior to issuance of a grading permit, evidence shall be provided for placement in the Project file that a Native American monitor has been retained. In the event that subsurface archaeological resources/human remains are encountered during the course of grading and/or excavation, all development shall temporarily cease in these areas until the archaeological resources are properly assessed and subsequent recommendations are determined by a qualified archaeologist. In the event that human remains are discovered, there shall be no disposition of such human remains, other than in

November 19, 2025

accordance with the procedures and requirements set forth in California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 and Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. These code provisions require notification of the County Coroner and the Native American Heritage Commission, who in turn must notify those persons believed to be most likely descended from the deceased Native American for appropriate disposition of the remains. Excavation or disturbance may continue in other areas of the Project Site that are not reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent remains or archaeological resources. Copies of a subsequent archaeological study or report, detailing the nature of any archaeological discovery, remedial actions taken, and disposition of any accessioned remains shall be submitted to the Southern San Joaquin Valley Information Center at CSU Bakersfield

Conclusion

The conclusions from the Prior MND remain unchanged.

6. Energy

Environmental Issue Area	Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Mitigation Measures
<i>Would the project:</i>					
a. Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?	No impact.	No. The Project will not result in inefficient or wasteful use of energy during construction or operation. The only change to the Project is to effectuate the annexation into the City already discussed in the Prior MND.	No. The Project will not result in inefficient or wasteful use of energy during construction or operation. The Project site conditions are substantially similar to those which existed at the time of adoption of the Prior MND.	No. The Project will not result in inefficient or wasteful use of energy during construction or operation. No new information has been found since adoption of the Prior MND which identifies new potentially significant impacts or mitigation measures.	None.
b. Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	No impact.	No. The Project does not conflict with any applicable energy use plans. The only change to the Project is to effectuate the annexation into	No. The Project does not conflict with any applicable energy use plans. The Project site conditions are substantially similar to those	No. The Project does not conflict with any applicable energy use plans. No new information has been found since adoption of the Prior MND which	None.

		the City already discussed in the Prior MND.	which existed at the time of adoption of the Prior MND.	identifies new potentially significant impacts or mitigation measures.	
--	--	--	---	--	--

Discussion

a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?

The proposed project does not propose any new development or construction not already analyzed in the Prior MND. The only change to the Project is to effectuate the annexation into the City already discussed in the Prior MND. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources. Therefore, the project would have ***no impact***.

b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?

The proposed project would be required to comply with the CALGreen Code (CCR Title 24, Part 11) and the California Energy Code (CCR Title 24, Part 6), which includes provisions related to insulation and design aimed at minimizing energy consumption.

California passed the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 (AB 32). AB 32 requires that statewide GHG emissions be reduced to 1990 levels by 2020. Under AB 32, CARB must adopt regulations by January 1, 2011 to achieve reductions in GHGs to meet the 1990 emission cap by 2020. On December 11, 2008, CARB adopted its initial Scoping Plan, which functions as a roadmap of CARB's plans to achieve GHG reductions in California required by AB 32 through subsequently enacted regulations. CARB's 2017 Climate Change Scoping Plan builds on the efforts and plans encompassed in the initial Scoping Plan. The current plan has identified new policies and actions to accomplish the State's 2030 GHG limit. Below is a list of applicable strategies in the Scoping Plan and the Project's consistency with those strategies.

- Energy Efficiency – Pursuit of comparable investment in energy efficiency from all retail providers of electricity in California. Maximize energy efficiency building and appliance standards.
 - The Project is consistent with this reduction measure. Though this measure applies to the State to increase its energy standards, the Project would comply with this measure through existing regulations applicable to the Project. The Project would not conflict with or obstruct this reduction measure.

The proposed project does not propose any new development or construction beyond that analyzed in the Prior MND. The only change to the Project is to effectuate the annexation into the City already

discussed in the Prior MND. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict or obstruct state and local plans for energy efficiency and renewable energy, and the impact would be ***no impact***.

7. Geology and Soils

Environmental Issue Area	Prior MND Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Prior MND Mitigation Measures
<i>Would the project:</i>					
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.	No Impact	No. The project would not be exposed to fault rupture. The only change to the Project is to effectuate the annexation into the City already discussed in the Prior MND.	No. The project would not be exposed to fault rupture. However, current building code regulations will be required to be implemented to address potential ground shaking. The Project site conditions are substantially similar to those which existed at the time of adoption of the Prior MND.	No. The project would not be exposed to fault rupture. However, current building code regulations will be required to be implemented to address potential ground shaking. No new information has been found since adoption of the Prior MND which identifies new potentially significant impacts or mitigation measures.	None.
ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?	No Impact.	No. The project would not increase	No. The project would not increase exposure to	No. The project would not increase exposure to	None.

		exposure to risks associated with strong seismic ground shaking. The only change to the Project is to effectuate the annexation into the City already discussed in the Prior MND.	risks associated with strong seismic ground shaking. However, current building code regulations will be required to be implemented to address potential ground shaking. The Project site conditions are substantially similar to those which existed at the time of adoption of the Prior MND.	risks associated with strong seismic ground shaking. However, current building code regulations will be required to be implemented to address potential ground shaking. No new information has been found since adoption of the Prior MND which identifies new potentially significant impacts or mitigation measures.	
iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	No Impact.	No. The project would not increase exposure to seismic-related ground failure including liquefaction. The only change to the Project is to effectuate the annexation into the City already discussed in the Prior MND.	No. The project would not increase exposure to seismic-related ground failure including liquefaction. The Project site conditions are substantially similar to those which existed at the time of adoption of the Prior MND.	No. The project would not increase exposure to seismic-related ground failure including liquefaction. No new information has been found since adoption of the Prior MND which identifies new potentially significant impacts or mitigation measures.	None.

iv. Landslides?	No Impact.	No. The project would not increase exposure to landslides. The only change to the Project is to effectuate the annexation into the City already discussed in the Prior MND.	No. The project would not increase exposure to landslides. The Project site conditions are substantially similar to those which existed at the time of adoption of the Prior MND.	No. The project would not increase exposure to landslides. No new information has been found since adoption of the Prior MND which identifies new potentially significant impacts or mitigation measures.	None.
b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	No Impact.	No. The project would not result in soil erosion or the loss of topsoil. The only change to the Project is to effectuate the annexation into the City already discussed in the Prior MND.	No. The project would not result in soil erosion or the loss of topsoil. The Project site conditions are substantially similar to those which existed at the time of adoption of the Prior MND.	No. The project would not result in soil erosion or the loss of topsoil. No new information has been found since adoption of the Prior MND which identifies new potentially significant impacts or mitigation measures.	None.
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?	No Impact.	No. The project would not increase exposure to risks associated with unstable geologic units or soils. The only change to the Project is to effectuate the annexation into the City already discussed in the Prior MND.	No. The project would not increase exposure to risks associated with unstable geologic units or soils. The Project site conditions are substantially similar to those which existed at the time of adoption of the Prior MND.	No. The project would not increase exposure to risks associated with unstable geologic units or soils. No new information has been found since adoption of the Prior MND which identifies new potentially significant impacts or	None.

November 19, 2025

				mitigation measures.	
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?	No Impact.	No. The project would not increase exposure to risks associated with expansive soil. The only change to the Project is to effectuate the annexation into the City already discussed in the Prior MND.	No. The project would not increase exposure to risks associated with expansive soil. The Project site conditions are substantially similar to those which existed at the time of adoption of the Prior MND.	No. The project would not increase exposure to risks associated with expansive soil. No new information has been found since adoption of the Prior MND which identifies new potentially significant impacts or mitigation measures.	None.
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.	No. The project would not implement septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems. The only change to the Project is to effectuate the annexation into the City already discussed in the Prior MND.	No. The project would not implement septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems. The Project site conditions are substantially similar to those which existed at the time of adoption of the Prior MND.	No. The project would not implement septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems. No new information has been found since adoption of the Prior MND which identifies new potentially significant impacts or mitigation measures.	None.
f. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	No impact.	No. The Project would not destroy a paleontological resource or geologic feature. The only change to the Project is	No. The project would not destroy a paleontological resource or geologic feature. The Project site conditions are	No. The project would not destroy a paleontological resource or geologic feature. No new information has	None.

November 19, 2025

		to effectuate the annexation into the City already discussed in the Prior MND.	substantially similar to those which existed at the time of adoption of the Prior MND.	been found since adoption of the Prior MND which identifies new potentially significant impacts or mitigation measures.	
--	--	--	--	---	--

Discussion

The Prior MND determined that the proposed Project would have no impacts with on Geology and Soils. No additional construction or operational activities will occur other than as stated in the Prior MND. There are no changes to the Project that would cause an increase in impacts beyond what was previously analyzed. The only change to the Project is to effectuate the annexation into the City already discussed in the Prior MND. Therefore, there remain no impacts.

Conclusion

The conclusions from the Prior MND remain unchanged.

8. Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Environmental Issue Area	Prior MND Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Prior MND Mitigation Measures
<i>Would the project:</i>					
a. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	Less Than Significant.	No. The project would not generate a significant amount of greenhouse gas emissions. The only change to the Project is to effectuate the annexation into the City already discussed in the Prior MND.	No. The project would not generate a significant amount of greenhouse gas emissions. The Project site conditions are substantially similar to those which existed at the time of adoption of the Prior MND.	No. The project would not generate a significant amount of greenhouse gas emissions. No new information has been found since adoption of the Prior MND which identifies new potentially significant impacts or mitigation measures.	None.
b. Conflict with an applicable plan, policy	No Impact.	No. The project would not conflict	No. The project would not conflict with an	No. The project would not conflict with an	None.

November 19, 2025

or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?		with an applicable GHG reduction plan. The only change to the Project is to effectuate the annexation into the City already discussed in the Prior MND.	applicable GHG reduction plan. The Project site conditions are substantially similar to those which existed at the time of adoption of the Prior MND.	applicable GHG reduction plan. No new information has been found since adoption of the Prior MND which identifies new potentially significant impacts or mitigation measures.	
--	--	---	---	---	--

Discussion

The Prior MND determined that the proposed Project would have less than significant impacts regarding greenhouse gas emissions. No additional construction or operational activities will occur other than as stated in the adopted MND. There are no changes to the Project that would cause an increase in impacts beyond what was previously analyzed. The only change to the Project is to effectuate the annexation into the City already discussed in the Prior MND. Therefore, the impacts remain less than significant.

Conclusion

The conclusions from the Prior MND remain unchanged.

9. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Environmental Issue Area	Prior MND Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Prior MND Mitigation Measures
<i>Would the project:</i>					
a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	No Impact.	No. The project would not create new or increased impact involving hazardous materials. The only change to the Project is to effectuate the annexation into the City already discussed in the Prior MND.	No. The project would not create new or increased impact involving hazardous materials. The Project site conditions are substantially similar to those which existed at the time of adoption of the Prior MND.	No. The project would not create new or increased impact involving hazardous materials. No new information has been found since adoption of the Prior MND which identifies new potentially significant impacts or mitigation	None.

				measures.	
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?	No Impact..	No. The project would not create additional significant hazard to the public or environmental through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions. The only change to the Project is to effectuate the annexation into the City already discussed in the Prior MND.	No. The project would not create additional significant hazard to the public or environmental through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions. The Project site conditions are substantially similar to those which existed at the time of adoption of the Prior MND.	No. The project would not create additional significant hazard to the public or environmental through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions. No new information has been found since adoption of the Prior MND which identifies new potentially significant impacts or mitigation measures.	None.
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. There continues to be no school within one-quarter mile of the site. The only change to the Project is to effectuate the annexation into the City already discussed in the Prior MND.	No. There continues to be no school within one-quarter mile of the site. The Project site conditions are substantially similar to those which existed at the time of adoption of the Prior MND.	No. There continues to be no school within one-quarter mile of the site. No new information has been found since adoption of the Prior MND which identifies new potentially significant impacts or mitigation measures.	None.

November 19, 2025

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?	No Impact.	No. The project is not designated as a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. The only change to the Project is to effectuate the annexation into the City already discussed in the Prior MND.	No. The project is not designated as a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. The Project site conditions are substantially similar to those which existed at the time of adoption of the Prior MND.	No. The project is not designated as a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. No new information has been found since adoption of the Prior MND which identifies new potentially significant impacts or mitigation measures.	None.
e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	No Impact.	No. The only change to the Project is to effectuate the annexation into the City already discussed in the Prior MND.	No. The Project site conditions are substantially similar to those which existed at the time of adoption of the Prior MND.	No. The project is not within an airport land use plan area. No new information has been found since adoption of the Prior MND which identifies new potentially significant impacts or mitigation measures.	None.
f. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	No Impact.	No. The project would not impair emergency evacuation or response. The only change to the Project is to effectuate the annexation into the City already discussed in the Prior MND.	No. The project would not impair emergency evacuation or response. The Project site conditions are substantially similar to those which existed at the time of adoption of the Prior MND.	No. The project would not impair emergency evacuation or response. No new information has been found since adoption of the Prior MND which identifies new potentially significant impacts or	None.

November 19, 2025

				mitigation measures.	
g. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?	No Impact.	No. The project site is not located in an area susceptible to extreme fire hazards or wildland fires. The only change to the Project is to effectuate the annexation into the City already discussed in the Prior MND.	No. The project site is not located in an area susceptible to extreme fire hazards or wildland fires. The Project site conditions are substantially similar to those which existed at the time of adoption of the Prior MND.	No. The project site is not located in an area susceptible to extreme fire hazards or wildland fires. No new information has been found since adoption of the Prior MND which identifies new potentially significant impacts or mitigation measures.	None.

Discussion

The Prior MND determined that the proposed Project would have no impacts with hazard and hazards material beyond those analyzed in the MEIR SCH No. 2012111015 for the Fresno General Plan. No additional construction or operational activities will occur other than as stated in the Prior MND. There are no changes to the Project that would cause an increase in impacts beyond what was previously analyzed. The only change to the Project is to effectuate the annexation into the City already discussed in the Prior MND. Therefore, there remain no impacts. Please see the MMRP adopted with the Prior MND for the MEIR mitigation measures incorporated by reference.

Conclusion

The conclusions from the Prior MND remain unchanged.

10. Hydrology and Water Quality

Environmental Issue Area	Prior MND Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Prior MND Mitigation Measures
<i>Would the project:</i>					

November 19, 2025

a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?	No Impact.	No. The project would not violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. The only change to the Project is to effectuate the annexation into the City already discussed in the Prior MND.	No. The project would not violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. The Project site conditions are substantially similar to those which existed at the time of adoption of the Prior MND.	No. The project would not violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. No new information has been found since adoption of the Prior MND which identifies new potentially significant impacts or mitigation measures.	None
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.	No. The project would not substantially deplete groundwater resources or impair groundwater recharge. The only change to the Project is to effectuate the annexation into the City already discussed in the Prior MND.	No. The project would not substantially deplete groundwater resources or impair groundwater recharge. The Project site conditions are substantially similar to those which existed at the time of adoption of the Prior MND.	No. The project would not substantially deplete groundwater resources or impair groundwater recharge. No new information has been found since adoption of the Prior MND which identifies new potentially significant impacts or mitigation measures.	None
c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would:	No Impact.				
i. result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	No Impact.	No. The project would not substantially alter the existing site drainage pattern and it would not alter	No. The project would not substantially alter the existing site drainage pattern and it would not alter	No. The project would not substantially alter the existing site drainage pattern and it would not alter	None.

		the course of a stream or river or result in erosion or siltation on or off site. The only change to the Project is to effectuate the annexation into the City already discussed in the Prior MND.	the course of a stream or river or result in erosion or siltation on or off site. The Project site conditions are substantially similar to those which existed at the time of adoption of the Prior MND.	the course of a stream or river or result in erosion or siltation on or off site. No new information has been found since adoption of the Prior MND which identifies new potentially significant impacts or mitigation measures.	
ii. substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	Less than significant impact.	No. The project would not substantially increase the rate of runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off- site. The only change to the Project is to effectuate the annexation into the City already discussed in the Prior MND.	No. The project would not substantially increase the rate of runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off- site. The Project site conditions are substantially similar to those which existed at the time of adoption of the Prior MND.	No. The project would not substantially increase the rate of runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off- site. No new information has been found since adoption of the Prior MND which identifies new potentially significant impacts or mitigation measures.	None.
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?	Less than significant impact.	No. The project would not increase the rate of runoff in a manner that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff. The only change	No. The project would not increase the rate of runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off- site. The Project site conditions are substantially similar to those which existed at the time of adoption of the Prior MND.	No. The project would not increase the rate of runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off- site. No new information has been found since adoption of the Prior MND which identifies new potentially significant impacts or mitigation measures.	None

		to the Project is to effectuate the annexation into the City already discussed in the Prior MND.			
iv. Impede or redirect flood flows?	No Impact.	No. The project would not impede or redirect flood flows. The only change to the Project is to effectuate the annexation into the City already discussed in the Prior MND.	No. The project would not impede or redirect flood flows. The Project site conditions are substantially similar to those which existed at the time of adoption of the Prior MND.	No. The project would not impede or redirect flood flows. No new information has been found since adoption of the Prior MND which identifies new potentially significant impacts or mitigation measures.	None.
d. In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	Less than Significant Impact.	No. The project would not release pollutants due to project inundation. The only change to the Project is to effectuate the annexation into the City already discussed in the Prior MND.	No. The project would not release pollutants due to project inundation. The Project site conditions are substantially similar to those which existed at the time of adoption of the Prior MND.	No. The project would not release pollutants due to project inundation. No new information has been found since adoption of the Prior MND which identifies new potentially significant impacts or mitigation measures.	None.
e. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	Less than Significant Impact.	No. The project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan. The only change to the Project is to effectuate the	No. The project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management. The Project site conditions are substantially similar to those	No. The project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan. No new information has been found since adoption	None.

November 19, 2025

		annexation into the City already discussed in the Prior MND.	which existed at the time of adoption of the Prior MND.	of the Prior MND which identifies new potentially significant impacts or mitigation measures.	
--	--	--	---	---	--

Discussion

The Prior MND determined that the proposed Project would have no impacts with hydrology and water quality beyond those analyzed in the MEIR SCH No. 2012111015 for the Fresno General Plan. No additional construction or operational activities will occur other than as stated in the Prior MND. There are no changes to the Project that would cause an increase in impacts beyond what was previously analyzed. The only change to the Project is to effectuate the annexation into the City already discussed in the Prior MND. Therefore, the impacts remains less than significant. Please see the MMRP adopted with the Prior MND for the MEIR mitigation measures incorporated by reference.

Conclusion

The conclusions from the Prior MND remain unchanged.

11. Land Use and Planning

Environmental Issue Area	Prior MND Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Prior MND Mitigation Measures
<i>Would the project:</i>					
a. Physically divide an established community?	No Impact.	No. The project would not divide an established community. The only change to the Project is to effectuate the annexation into the City already discussed in the Prior MND.	No. The project would not divide an established community. The Project site conditions are substantially similar to those which existed at the time of adoption of the Prior MND.	No. The project would not divide an established community. No new information has been found since adoption of the Prior MND which identifies new potentially significant impacts or mitigation measures.	None.
b. Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan,	Less Than Significant Impact.	No. The project is consistent	No. The project is consistent	No. The project is consistent	None

November 19, 2025

policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?		with the allowable land use. The only change to the Project is to effectuate the annexation into the City already discussed in the Prior MND.	with the allowable land use. The Project site conditions are substantially similar to those which existed at the time of adoption of the Prior MND.	with the allowable land use. No new information has been found since adoption of the Prior MND which identifies new potentially significant impacts or mitigation measures.	
--	--	---	---	---	--

Discussion

The Prior MND determined that the proposed Project would have no impacts with land use and planning beyond those analyzed in the MEIR SCH No. 2012111015 for the Fresno General Plan. No additional construction or operational activities will occur other than as stated in the Prior MND. There are no changes to the Project that would cause an increase in impacts beyond what was previously analyzed. The only change to the Project is to effectuate the annexation into the City already discussed in the Prior MND. Therefore, the impacts remain less than significant.

Conclusion

The conclusions from the Prior MND remain unchanged.

12. Mineral Resources

Environmental Issue Area	Prior MND Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Prior MND Mitigation Measures
<i>Would the project:</i>					
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?	No Impact.	No. The project would not result in the loss of known mineral resources. The only change to the Project is to effectuate the annexation into the City	No. The project would not result in the loss of known mineral resources. The Project site conditions are substantially similar to those which existed at the time of	No. The project would not result in the loss of known mineral resources. No new information has been found since adoption of the Prior MND	None.

November 19, 2025

		already discussed in the Prior MND	adoption of the Prior MND.	which identifies new potentially significant impacts or mitigation measures.	
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.	No. The project would not result in the loss of known mineral resources. The only change to the Project is to effectuate the annexation into the City already discussed in the Prior MND	No. The project would not result in the loss of known mineral resources. The Project site conditions are substantially similar to those which existed at the time of adoption of the Prior MND.	No. The project would not result in the loss of known mineral resources. No new information has been found since adoption of the Prior MND which identifies new potentially significant impacts or mitigation measures.	None.

Discussion

The Prior MND determined that the proposed Project would have no impacts on mineral resources beyond those analyzed in the MEIR SCH No. 2012111015 for the Fresno General Plan. No additional construction or operational activities will occur other than as stated in the Prior MND. There are no changes to the Project that would cause an increase in impacts beyond what was previously analyzed. The only change to the Project is to effectuate the annexation into the City already discussed in the Prior MND. Therefore, there remain no impacts.

Conclusion

The conclusions from the Prior MND remain unchanged.

13. Noise

Environmental Issue Area	Prior MND Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Prior MND Mitigation Measures
<i>Would the project:</i>					

a. Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in the ambient noise levels in vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	Less Than Significant..	No. The project would not expose persons to or generate noise levels in excess of standards established by the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies. The only change to the Project is to effectuate the annexation into the City already discussed in the Prior MND	No. The project would not expose persons to or generate noise levels in excess of standards established by the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies. The Project site conditions are substantially similar to those which existed at the time of adoption of the Prior MND.	No. The project would not expose persons to or generate noise levels in excess of standards established by the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies. No new information has been found since adoption of the Prior MND which identifies new potentially significant impacts or mitigation measures.	None.
b. Generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels?	Less Than Significant.	No. The project would not expose persons to excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels. The only change to the Project is to effectuate the annexation into the City already discussed in the Prior MND	No. The project would not expose persons to excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise. The Project site conditions are substantially similar to those which existed at the time of adoption of the Prior MND.	No. The project would not expose persons to excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise. No new information has been found since adoption of the Prior MND which identifies new potentially significant impacts or mitigation measures.	None.

November 19, 2025

c. For a project located within a private airstrip or 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.	No. The project is not within the established airport noise contour. The only change to the Project is to effectuate the annexation into the City already discussed in the Prior MND	No. The project is not within the established airport noise contour. The Project site conditions are substantially similar to those which existed at the time of adoption of the Prior MND.	No. The project is not within the established airport noise contour. No new information has been found since adoption of the Prior MND which identifies new potentially significant impacts or mitigation measures.	None.
--	------------	---	--	--	-------

Discussion

The Prior MND determined that the proposed Project would have less than significant impacts. No additional construction or operational activities will occur other than as stated in the Prior MND. There are no changes to the Project that would cause an increase in impacts beyond what was previously analyzed. The only change to the Project is to effectuate the annexation into the City already discussed in the Prior MND. Therefore, the impacts remain less than significant.

Conclusion

The conclusions from the Prior MND remain unchanged.

14. Population and Housing

Environmental Issue Area	Prior MND Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Prior MND Mitigation Measures
<i>Would the project:</i>					
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)?	Less Than Significant.	No. The project would not induce substantial unplanned growth in the project area. The only change to the Project is to effectuate the annexation into the City already discussed in the Prior MND	No. The project would not induce substantial unplanned growth in the project area. The Project site conditions are substantially similar to those which existed at the time of adoption of the Prior MND.	No. The project would not induce substantial unplanned growth in the project area. No new information has been found since adoption of the Prior MND which identifies new potentially significant impacts or mitigation measures.	None.

November 19, 2025

b. Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	No Impact.	No. The project will not displace existing people or housing. The only change to the Project is to effectuate the annexation into the City already discussed in the Prior MND	No. The project will not displace existing people housing. The Project site conditions are substantially similar to those which existed at the time of adoption of the Prior MND.	No. The project will not displace existing people housing. No new information has been found since adoption of the Prior MND which identifies new potentially significant impacts or mitigation measures.	None.
---	------------	--	--	--	-------

Discussion

The Prior MND determined that the proposed Project would have less than significant. No additional construction or operational activities will occur other than as stated in the Prior MND. There are no changes to the Project that would cause an increase in impacts beyond what was previously analyzed. The only change to the Project is to effectuate the annexation into the City already discussed in the Prior MND. Therefore, the impacts remain less than significant.

Conclusion

The conclusions from the Prior MND remain unchanged.

15. Public Services

Environmental Issue Area	Prior MND Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Prior MND Mitigation Measures
<i>Would the project:</i>					

November 19, 2025

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?	No Impact.	No. The project would not result in a need for new or expanded fire protection facilities. The only change to the Project is to effectuate the annexation into the City already discussed in the Prior MND	No. The project would not result in a need for new or expanded fire protection facilities. The Project site conditions and surrounding areas are substantially similar to those which existed at the time of adoption of the Prior MND.	No. The project would not result in a need for new or expanded fire protection facilities. No new information has been found since adoption of the Prior MND which identifies new potentially significant impacts or mitigation measures.	None
Police protection?	No Impact.	No. The project would not result in a need for new or expanded police protection facilities. The only change to the Project is to effectuate the annexation into the City already discussed in the Prior MND	No. The project would not result in a need for new or expanded police protection facilities. The Project site conditions and surrounding areas are substantially similar to those which existed at	No. The project would not result in a need for new or expanded police protection facilities. No new information has been found since adoption of the Prior MND which identifies new potentially	None

			the time of adoption of the Prior MND.	significant impacts or mitigation measures.	
Schools?	No Impact.	No. The project would not result in a need for new or expanded school facilities. The only change to the Project is to effectuate the annexation into the City already discussed in the Prior MND	No. The project would not result in a need for new or expanded school facilities. The Project site conditions and surrounding areas are substantially similar to those which existed at the time of adoption of the Prior MND.	No. The project would not result in a need for new or expanded school facilities. No new information has been found since adoption of the Prior MND which identifies new potentially significant impacts or mitigation measures.	None

Parks?	Less Than Significant.	No. The project would not result in a need for new or expanded park facilities. The only change to the Project is to effectuate the annexation into the City already discussed in the Prior MND	No. The project would not result in a need for new or expanded park facilities. The Project site conditions and surrounding areas are substantially similar to those which existed at the time of adoption of the Prior MND.	No. The project would not result in a need for new or expanded park facilities. No new information has been found since adoption of the Prior MND which identifies new potentially significant impacts or mitigation measures.	None
Other public facilities?	No Impact.	No. The project would not result in a need for new or expanded other facilities. The only change to the Project is to effectuate the annexation into the City already discussed in the Prior MND	No. The project would not result in a need for new or expanded other facilities. The Project site conditions and surrounding areas are substantially similar to those which existed at the time of adoption of the	No. The project would not result in a need for new or expanded other facilities. No new information has been found since adoption of the Prior MND which identifies new potentially significant impacts or mitigation measures.	None

November 19, 2025

Prior MND.

Discussion

The Prior MND determined that the proposed Project would have no impacts on Public Services beyond those analyzed in the MEIR SCH No. 2012111015 for the Fresno General Plan. No additional construction or operational activities will occur other than as stated in the Prior MND. There are no changes to the Project that would cause an increase in impacts beyond what was previously analyzed. The only change to the Project is to effectuate the annexation into the City already discussed in the Prior MND. Therefore, the impacts remain less than significant. Please see the MMRP adopted with the Prior MND for the MEIR mitigation measures incorporated by reference.

Conclusion

The conclusions from the Prior MND remain unchanged.

16. Recreation

Environmental Issue Area	Prior MND Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Prior MND Mitigation Measures
<i>Would the project:</i>					
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?	No Impact.	No. The project would not result in the deterioration of an existing park. The only change to the Project is to effectuate the annexation into the City already discussed in the Prior MND.	No. The project would not result in the deterioration of an existing park. The Project site conditions and surrounding areas are substantially similar to those which existed at the time of adoption of the Prior MND.	No. The project would not result in the deterioration of an existing park. No new information has been found since adoption of the Prior MND which identifies new potentially significant impacts or mitigation measures.	None.

November 19, 2025

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.	No. The project would not result in a need for new or expanded park facilities. The only change to the Project is to effectuate the annexation into the City already discussed in the Prior MND.	No. The project would not result in a need for new or expanded park facilities. The Project site conditions and surrounding areas are substantially similar to those which existed at the time of adoption of the Prior MND.	No. The project would not result in a need for new or expanded park facilities. No new information has been found since adoption of the Prior MND which identifies new potentially significant impacts or mitigation measures.	None.
---	------------	---	---	---	-------

Discussion

The Prior MND determined that the proposed Project would have no impacts. No additional construction or operational activities will occur other than as stated in the adopted MND. There are no changes to the Project that would cause an increase in impacts beyond what was previously analyzed. The only change to the Project is to effectuate the annexation into the City already discussed in the Prior MND. Therefore, there remain no impacts.

Conclusion

The conclusions from the Prior MND remain unchanged.

17. Transportation/Traffic

Environmental Issue Area	Prior MND Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Prior MND Mitigation Measures
<i>Would the project:</i>					
a. Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?	Less Than Significant.	No. The project would not conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy regarding the circulation system. The only change to the Project is to	No. The project would not conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy regarding the circulation system. The Project site conditions and	No. The project would not conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy regarding the circulation system. No new information has been found	None.

November 19, 2025

		effectuate the annexation into the City already discussed in the Prior MND.	surrounding areas are substantially similar to those which existed at the time of adoption of the Prior MND.	since adoption of the Prior MND which identifies new potentially significant impacts or mitigation measures.	
b. Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	No Impact	No. Please see discussion below. The only change to the Project is to effectuate the annexation into the City already discussed in the Prior MND.	No. Please see discussion below. The Project site conditions and surrounding areas are substantially similar to those which existed at the time of adoption of the Prior MND.	No. Please see discussion below. No new information has been found since adoption of the Prior MND which identifies new potentially significant impacts or mitigation measures.	None.
c. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	No Impact.	No. The project would not increase hazards due to a design feature. The only change to the Project is to effectuate the annexation into the City already discussed in the Prior MND.	No. The project would not increase hazards due to a design feature. The Project site conditions and surrounding areas are substantially similar to those which existed at the time of adoption of the Prior MND.	No. The project would not increase hazards due to a design feature. No new information has been found since adoption of the Prior MND which identifies new potentially significant impacts or mitigation measures.	None.
d. Result in inadequate emergency access?	No Impact.	No. The project would not result in inadequate emergency access. The only change to the Project is to effectuate the annexation into the City already discussed in the Prior MND.	No. The project would not result in inadequate emergency access. The Project site conditions and surrounding areas are substantially similar to those which existed at the time of	No. The project would not result in inadequate emergency access. No new information has been found since adoption of the Prior MND which identifies new potentially significant impacts or	None.

			adoption of the Prior MND.	mitigation measures.	
--	--	--	-------------------------------	-------------------------	--

Discussion

Senate Bill (SB) 743 requires that relevant CEQA analysis of transportation impacts be conducted using a metric known as vehicle miles traveled (VMT) instead of Level of Service (LOS). VMT measures how much actual auto travel (additional miles driven) a proposed project would create on California roads. If the project adds excessive car travel onto our roads, the project may cause a significant transportation impact.

The State CEQA Guidelines were amended to implement SB 743, by adding Section 15064.3. Among its provisions, Section 15064.3 confirms that, except with respect to transportation projects, a project's effect on automobile delay shall not constitute a significant environmental impact. Therefore, LOS measures of impacts on traffic facilities is no longer a relevant CEQA threshold for transportation impacts.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3(b)(4) states that “[a] lead agency has discretion to evaluate a project's vehicle miles traveled, including whether to express the change in absolute terms, per capita, per household or in any other measure. A lead agency may use models to estimate a project's vehicle miles traveled and may revise those estimates to reflect professional judgment based on substantial evidence. Any assumptions used to estimate used to estimate vehicle miles traveled and any revision to model outputs should be documented and explained in the environmental document prepared for the project. The standard of adequacy in Section 15151 shall apply to the analysis described in this section.”

After adoption of the Prior MND, on June 25, 2020, the City of Fresno adopted CEQA Guidelines for Vehicle Miles Traveled Thresholds pursuant to Senate Bill 743 to be effective of July 1, 2020. The thresholds described therein are referred to herein as the City of Fresno VMT Thresholds. The City of Fresno VMT Thresholds document was prepared and adopted consistent with the requirements of CEQA Guidelines Sections 15064.3 and 15064.7. The December 2018 Technical Advisory on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA (Technical Advisory) published by the Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR), was utilized as a reference and guidance document in the preparation of the Fresno VMT Thresholds.

The City of Fresno VMT Thresholds Section 3.0 regarding Project Screening discusses a variety of projects that may be screened out of a VMT analysis including specific development and transportation projects. For development projects, conditions may exist that would presume that a development project has a less than significant impact. These may be size, location, proximity to transit, or trip-making potential. For transportation projects, the primary attribute to consider with transportation projects is the potential to increase vehicle travel, sometimes referred to as “induced travel.”

The City of Fresno VMT Thresholds Section 3.1 regarding Development Projects states that if a project generates fewer than 500 average daily trips (ADT), then it is eligible to screen out of a VMT analysis.

The only change to this Project at this time is annex the land already discussed in the Prior MND. However,

November 19, 2025

as stated in the Prior MND, the applicant intends to develop this property into multi-family housing at some point in the future. Assuming a maximum housing unit number of 17, as permitted by the zoning, the ADT for this Project would be approximately 160. Therefore, the proposed Project is eligible to screen out of a full VMT analysis.

In conclusion, the proposed project will result in **no impact** concerning consistency with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3(b).

The Prior MND determined that the proposed Project would have less than significant impacts. No additional construction or operational activities will occur other than as stated in the Prior MND. There are no changes to the Project that would cause an increase in impacts beyond what was previously analyzed. The only change to the Project is to effectuate the annexation into the City already discussed in the Prior MND. Therefore, the impacts remain less than significant.

Conclusion

The conclusions from the Prior MND remain unchanged.

18. Tribal Cultural Resources

Environmental Issue Area	Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Mitigation Measures
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:	No Impact.	No. There are no identified Tribal Cultural Resources in the area. The only change to the Project is to effectuate the annexation into the City already discussed in the Prior MND.	No. There are no identified Tribal Cultural Resources in the area. The Project site conditions and surrounding areas are substantially similar to those which existed at the time of adoption of the Prior MND.	No. There are no identified Tribal Cultural Resources in the area. No new information has been found since adoption of the Prior MND which identifies new potentially significant impacts or mitigation measures.	None.

November 19, 2025

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	No Impact.	No. There are no structures or historical resources on the project site. The only change to the Project is to effectuate the annexation into the City already discussed in the Prior MND.	No. There are no structures or historical resources on the project site. The Project site conditions and surrounding areas are substantially similar to those which existed at the time of adoption of the Prior MND.	No. There are no identified Tribal Cultural Resources in the area. No new information has been found since adoption of the Prior MND which identifies new potentially significant impacts or mitigation measures.	None.
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)	No Impact.	No. There are no identified Tribal Cultural Resources in the area. The only change to the Project is to effectuate the annexation into the City already discussed in the Prior MND.	No. There are no identified Tribal Cultural Resources in the area. The Project site conditions and surrounding areas are substantially similar to those which existed at the time of adoption of the Prior MND.	No. There are no identified Tribal Cultural Resources in the area. No new information has been found since adoption of the Prior MND which identifies new potentially significant impacts or mitigation measures.	None.

Discussion

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**

As previously discussed in Section V, Cultural Resources, the project site does not contain historical resources listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in any local listing for Fresno County or the City of Fresno. Furthermore, the area surrounding the project site does not contain any listed historical resources. The site is currently built up with two

single-family, so it is unlikely that unknown cultural resources will be discovered. As a result, ***no impact*** would occur.

- 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.**

The State requires lead agencies to consider the potential effects of proposed projects and consult with California Native American tribes during the local planning process for the purpose of protecting Traditional Tribal Cultural Resources through the CEQA Guidelines. Pursuant to PRC Section 21080.3.1, the lead agency shall begin consultation with the California Native American tribe that is traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographical area of the proposed project. Such significant cultural resources are either sites, features, places, cultural landscapes, sacred places, and objects with cultural value to a tribe which is either on or eligible for inclusion in the California Historic Register or local historic register, or, the lead agency, at its discretion, and support by substantial evidence, choose to treat the resources as a Tribal Cultural Resources (PRC Section 21074(a)(1-2)).

Additional information may also be available from the California Native American Heritage Commission's Sacred Lands File per PRC Section 5097.96 and the California Historical Resources Information System administered by the California Office of Historic Preservation. Please also note that PRC Section 21082.3(c) contains provisions specific to confidentiality.

Assembly Bill (AB) 52, which became law January 1, 2015, requires that, as part of the CEQA review process, public agencies provide early notice of a project to California Native American Tribes to allow for consultation between the tribe and the public agency. The purpose of AB 52 is to provide the opportunity for public agencies and tribes to consult and consider potential impacts to Tribal Cultural Resources (TCR's), as defined by the Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 2107(a). Under AB 52, public agencies shall reach out to California Native American Tribes who have requested to be notified of projects in areas within or which may have been affiliated with their tribal geographic range. Pursuant to Assembly Bill 52 (AB 52), the Dumna Wo Wah and Table Mountain Rancheria tribes were invited to consult. The contacted Tribes did not provide a response to invitations to consult.

The proposed project does not currently propose new development or construction. There are no changes to the Project that would cause an increase in impacts beyond what was previously analyzed. The only change to the Project is to effectuate the annexation into the City already discussed in the Prior MND. Thus, impacts to unknown archaeological historical resources result in ***no impact***.

19. Utilities and Service Systems

Environmental Issue Area	Prior MND Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Prior MND Mitigation Measures
<i>Would the project:</i>					
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.	No. The only change to the Project is to effectuate the annexation into the City already discussed in the Prior MND.	No. The Project site conditions and surrounding areas are substantially similar to those which existed at the time of adoption of the Prior MND.	No. No new information has been found since adoption of the Prior MND which identifies new potentially significant impacts or mitigation measures.	None
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.	No. As discussed in the Prior MND, the City's Department of Public Utilities determined that there are adequate sanitary sewer and water services available to serve the proposed Project. The only change to the Project is to effectuate the annexation into the City already discussed in the Prior	No. As discussed in the Prior MND, the City's Department of Public Utilities determined that there are adequate sanitary sewer and water services available to serve the proposed Project. The Project site conditions and surrounding areas are substantially similar to those which existed at the time of adoption of	No. As discussed in the Prior MND, the City's Department of Public Utilities determined that there are adequate sanitary sewer and water services available to serve the proposed Project. No new information has been found since adoption of the Prior MND which identifies new potentially significant impacts or mitigation measures.	None

		MND.	the Prior MND.		
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?	No impact.	No. As discussed in the Prior MND, the City's Department of Public Utilities determined that there are adequate sanitary sewer and water services available to serve the proposed Project. The only change to the Project is to effectuate the annexation into the City already discussed in the Prior MND.	No. As discussed in the Prior MND, the City's Department of Public Utilities determined that there are adequate sanitary sewer and water services available to serve the proposed Project. The Project site conditions and surrounding areas are substantially similar to those which existed at the time of adoption of the Prior MND.	No. As discussed in the Prior MND, the City's Department of Public Utilities determined that there are adequate sanitary sewer and water services available to serve the proposed Project. No new information has been found since adoption of the Prior MND which identifies new potentially significant impacts or mitigation measures.	None.
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?	Less Than Significant.	No. The project would not generate excess solid waste. The only change to the Project is to effectuate the annexation into the City already discussed in the Prior MND.	No. The project would not generate excess solid waste. The Project site conditions and surrounding areas are substantially similar to those which existed at the time of adoption of the Prior MND.	No. The project would not generate excess solid waste. No new information has been found since adoption of the Prior MND which identifies new potentially significant impacts or mitigation measures.	None.

November 19, 2025

e. Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	No impact.	No. The project would comply with applicable statutes and regulations related to solid waste. . The only change to the Project is to effectuate the annexation into the City already discussed in the Prior MND.	No. The project would comply with applicable statutes and regulations related to solid waste. The Project site conditions and surrounding areas are substantially similar to those which existed at the time of adoption of the Prior MND.	No. The project would comply with applicable statutes and regulations related to solid waste. No new information has been found since adoption of the Prior MND which identifies new potentially significant impacts or mitigation measures.	None.
--	------------	---	---	---	-------

Discussion

The Prior MND determined that the proposed Project would have no impacts on utilities and service systems beyond those analyzed in the MEIR SCH No. 2012111015 for the Fresno General Plan. No additional construction or operational activities will occur other than as stated in the Prior MND. There are no changes to the Project that would cause an increase in impacts beyond what was previously analyzed. The only change to the Project is to effectuate the annexation into the City already discussed in the Prior MND. Therefore, the impacts remain less than significant.

Conclusion

The conclusions from the Prior MND remain unchanged.

20. Wildfire

Environmental Issue Area	Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Mitigation Measures

a. Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	No Impact.	No. Please see analysis below. The only change to the Project is to effectuate the annexation into the City already discussed in the Prior MND.	No. Please see analysis below. The Project site conditions and surrounding areas are substantially similar to those which existed at the time of adoption of the Prior MND.	No. Please see analysis below. No new information has been found since adoption of the Prior MND which identifies new potentially significant impacts or mitigation measures.	None.
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 wildfire?	No Impact.	No. Please see analysis below. The only change to the Project is to effectuate the annexation into the City already discussed in the Prior MND.	No. Please see analysis below. The Project site conditions and surrounding areas are substantially similar to those which existed at the time of adoption of the Prior MND.	No. Please see analysis below. No new information has been found since adoption of the Prior MND which identifies new potentially significant impacts or mitigation measures.	None.
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?	No Impact.	No. Please see analysis below. The only change to the Project is to effectuate the annexation into the City already discussed in the Prior MND.	No. Please see analysis below. The Project site conditions and surrounding areas are substantially similar to those which existed at the time of adoption of the Prior MND.	No. Please see analysis below. No new information has been found since adoption of the Prior MND which identifies new potentially significant impacts or mitigation measures.	None.

November 19, 2025

d. Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire instabilities, or drainage changes?	No impact.	No. Please see analysis below. The only change to the Project is to effectuate the annexation into the City already discussed in the Prior MND.	No. Please see analysis below. The Project site conditions and surrounding areas are substantially similar to those which existed at the time of adoption of the Prior MND.	No. Please see analysis below. No new information has been found since adoption of the Prior MND which identifies new potentially significant impacts or mitigation measures.	None.
---	------------	--	--	--	-------

Discussion

a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

The City of Fresno's Police and Fire Departments are tasked with all local emergency response efforts. In addition, the City's full-time Emergency Preparedness Officer (EPO) is responsible for ensuring that Fresno's emergency response plans are up-to-date and implemented properly. The EPO also facilitates cooperation between City departments and other local, State and federal agencies that would be involved in emergency response operations.

The proposed project does not currently include any new construction or development. It is not anticipated that new or different impairments would occur that may physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. The only change to the Project is to effectuate the annexation into the City already discussed in the Prior MND. All future development projects within the project area will be submitted to the City and reviewed in compliance with Federal, State and local regulations related to emergency access. The project would not result in environmental impacts and therefore, has ***no impact***.

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?

The subject area is in an urban area and is not located within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (VHFHSZ).¹ The subject area does not possess physical characteristics that would exacerbate wildfire risks. The only change to the Project is to effectuate the annexation into the City already discussed in

¹ California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE). 2008. Fresno County Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones in LRA. Available online at: <https://osfm.fire.ca.gov/divisions/wildfire-planning-engineering/wildland-hazards-building-codes/fire-hazard-severity-zones-maps/> (accessed June 20, 2023)

the Prior MND. Therefore, the proposed project would not exacerbate wildfire risks and potentially expose project occupants to pollutants from a wildfire. The impact would be ***no impact***.

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?

The project site is located in a developed area of the City of Fresno, and it would not require the installation or maintenance of infrastructure that would increase the risk of fire or result in temporary or ongoing environmental impacts, outside of what is already implemented according to City plans. The only change to the Project is to effectuate the annexation into the City already discussed in the Prior MND. As a result, ***no impact*** would occur.

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?

The subject area is located on a relatively flat area and is not located adjacent to any hills. In general, the potential for land sliding or slope failure in Fresno is very low and the project site would not be susceptible to landslides. The subject area is also not located on a flood hazard zone and would not be susceptible to flooding because of post-fire drainage changes. As discussed above, the subject area is not located within a VHFHSZ. The only change to the Project is to effectuate the annexation into the City already discussed in the Prior MND. Therefore, the proposed project would not expose people or structures to significant risks, and ***no impact*** would occur.

21. Mandatory Findings of Significance

Environmental Issue Area	Prior MND Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Prior MND Mitigation Measures

November 19, 2025

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 plan 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?	No Impact.	No. Please see analysis below. The only change to the Project is to effectuate the annexation into the City already discussed in the Prior MND.	No. Please see analysis below. The Project site conditions and surrounding areas are substantially similar to those which existed at the time of adoption of the Prior MND.	No. Please see analysis below. No new information has been found since adoption of the Prior MND which identifies new potentially significant impacts or mitigation measures.	None.
b. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a projects 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.	No. Please see analysis below. The only change to the Project is to effectuate the annexation into the City already discussed in the Prior MND.	No. Please see analysis below. The Project site conditions and surrounding areas are substantially similar to those which existed at the time of adoption of the Prior MND.	No. Please see analysis below. No new information has been found since adoption of the Prior MND which identifies new potentially significant impacts or mitigation measures.	None.
c. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	Less than significant Impact.	No. Please see analysis below. The only change to the Project is to effectuate the annexation into the City already discussed in the Prior MND.	No. Please see analysis below. The Project site conditions and surrounding areas are substantially similar to those which existed at the time of adoption of the Prior MND.	No. Please see analysis below. No new information has been found since adoption of the Prior MND which identifies new potentially significant impacts or mitigation measures.	None.

Discussion

The Prior MND determined that the proposed Project would have less than significant impacts. No additional construction or operational activities will occur other than as stated in the Prior MND. There are no changes to the Project that would cause an increase in impacts beyond what was previously analyzed. The only change to the Project is to effectuate the annexation into the City already discussed in the Prior MND. Therefore, the impacts remain less than significant.

Conclusion

The conclusions from the Prior MND remain unchanged.

Project Conclusion

Environmental Assessment No. R-17-020, a Mitigated Negative Declaration (“MND”) dated April 20, 2018 was prepared for a project that included a Pre-zone Application No. R-17-020. The Prior MND was tiered from the General Plan Master Environmental Impact Report (“MEIR” SCH No. 2012111015). This Addendum to the Prior MND addresses the environmental effects associated with the annexation component of the Project to determine if there are any new or increased environmental impacts due to implementation of the Project within the current regulatory and environmental setting. The conclusions of the analysis in this Addendum remain consistent with those made in the Prior MND. No new significant impacts will result, and no substantial increase in severity of impacts will result from those previously identified in the Prior MND and MEIR.

This consists of a minor technical change such that an addendum to R-17-020 is appropriate pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15164 and Public Resources Code Section 21166.

Therefore, the City of Fresno has determined that an Addendum to Environmental Assessment R-17-020 is appropriate given that none of the conditions described in Section 15162 of the CEQA Guidelines calling for preparation of a subsequent MND have occurred; and, new information added is only for the purposes of providing minor changes or additions, in accordance with Section 15164 of the CEQA Guidelines.

CEQA Section 15162 provides that when a mitigated negative declaration has been adopted for a project, no subsequent mitigated negative declaration shall be prepared for that project unless the lead agency determines, on the basis of substantial evidence in the light of the whole record, one or more of the following:

FINDINGS PURSUANT TO SECTION 15162 OF THE CEQA GUIDELINES.


- (1) *Substantial changes are proposed in the project which would require major revisions of the previous Mitigated Negative Declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects;*

Finding (1):	The analysis above concluded that there are no new significant environmental impacts or substantial increases in the severity of previously identified significant effects that would necessitate major revisions to the Prior MND, as there have been no changes to the project or its surrounding environment. The only change to the Project is to effectuate the annexation into the City already discussed in the Prior MND.
<i>(2) Substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous Mitigated Negative Declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or,</i>	
Finding (2):	There have been no substantial changes to the surrounding area or project site which would otherwise affect the circumstances under which the project is undertaken. The severity of environmental issues identified in the Prior MND approved on April 20, 2018, have not substantially increased since the preparation of the initial study. The only change to the Project is to effectuate the annexation into the City already discussed in the Prior MND.
<i>(3) New information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous Mitigated Negative Declaration was adopted, shows any of the following: (A) The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous Mitigated Negative Declaration; (B) Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous Mitigated Negative Declaration; (C) Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative; and, (D) Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous Mitigated Negative Declaration, would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.</i>	
Finding (3):	This Addendum is relative to the Prior MND and assesses if there are any new or increased environmental impacts due to implementation of the Project within the current regulatory and environmental setting for the project that was not previously specified in the Prior MND dated April 20, 2018. This addendum did not identify new information regarding significant effects not previously discussed in the Prior MND, and potential effects previously examined are not substantially more severe than originally discussed. No mitigation measures which were previously identified have been found infeasible, nor has it been determined that identified mitigation measures would not substantially reduce significant effects of the project. No mitigation measures have been added or modified, nor are they considerably different from those analyzed in the previous Mitigated Negative Declaration.

Addendum to a Mitigated Negative Declaration

Environmental Assessment No. P24-02150

November 19, 2025

	The addendum contains no additional information regarding proposed mitigation measures and does not change or effect the previous findings of the Prior MND. Therefore, no new information identifies significant or substantially more severe effects than originally discussed.
ADDENDUM PREPARED BY: Rob Holt, Supervising Planner	SUBMITTED BY:  Rob Holt, Supervising Planner CITY OF FRESNO PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
DATE: November 19, 2025	