

FINAL INITIAL STUDY

PROPOSED AMENDMENT NO. 2 TO THE REDEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR THE AIRPORT AREA REVITALIZATION REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT

PREPARED FOR:

Redevelopment Agency of the City of Fresno
2344 Tulare, Suite 200
Fresno, CA 93721
Contact: David Martin
(559) 621-7630

PREPARED BY:

ICF International
5558 California Avenue, Suite 310
Bakersfield, CA 93309
Contact: Steven Esselman
(661) 859-1852

August 2010



ICF International. 2010. Proposed Amendment No. 2 to the Redevelopment Plan for the Airport Area Revitalization Redevelopment Project. Final Initial Study. August. (ICF 00348.10.) Bakersfield, CA. Prepared for Redevelopment Agency of the City of Fresno, Fresno, CA.

Contents

List of Figures	ii
List of Acronyms and Abbreviations	iii
	Page
Environmental Checklist	1
Environmental Factors Potentially Affected	6
Determination	6
Evaluation of Environmental Impacts.....	7
I. Aesthetics	8
II. Agricultural and Forestry Resources	10
III. Air Quality	12
IV. Biological Resources	15
V. Cultural Resources	17
VI. Geology and Soils.....	19
VII. Greenhouse Gas Emissions.....	22
VIII. Hazards and Hazardous Materials	27
IX. Hydrology and Water Quality	32
X. Land Use and Planning.....	36
XI. Mineral Resources	37
XII. Noise	38
XIII. Population and Housing.....	41
XIV. Public Services	43
XV. Recreation.....	46
XVI. Transportation/Traffic	47
XVII. Utilities and Service Systems	50
XVIII. Mandatory Findings of Significance.....	54
XIX. Earlier Analysis.....	56
Citations and References	57
List of Preparers	59

Appendix A Summary of Eminent Domain Process

Figures

	Follows Page
1 Regional Location.....	2
2 Project Vicinity.....	6

Acronyms and Abbreviations

Agency	Redevelopment Agency of the City of Fresno
Airport Plan	<i>Fresno Yosemite International Airport and Environs Specific Plan</i>
Alquist-Priolo Act	Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone Act
Amendment or Project	Amendment No. 2
AQAP	Air Quality Attainment Plan
BAAQMD	Bay Area Air Quality Management District
BAU	business as usual
BMPs	best management practices
Caltrans	California Department of Transportation
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
CCAA	California Clean Air Act
CCR	California Code of Regulations
City	City of Fresno
CNEL	community noise exposure level
CSSHS	California State Scenic Highway System
CUP	conditional use permit
CVRWQCB	Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board
DTSC	California Department of Toxic Substance Control
EIR	environmental impact report
EPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
FIRM	Flood Insurance Rate Map
FMC	Fresno Municipal Code
FMFCD	Fresno Metropolitan Flood Control District
FMMP	Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program
Fresno COG	Fresno Council of Governments
General Plan	City of Fresno 2025 Fresno General Plan
GHG	greenhouse gas
IS	Initial Study
Local Register	Local Register of Historic Resources
LOS	level of service
LUFT	leaking underground fuel tank

MEIR	Master EIR
MND	Mitigated Negative Declaration
NAHC	Native American Heritage Commission
NPDES	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
NWI	National Wetlands Inventory
POTW	publicly owned treatment works
Project Area	Redevelopment Plan for the Airport Area
Program EIR	<i>Final Program EIR 98-01, Central City Commercial Revitalization Redevelopment Project Area; Airport Area Revitalization Redevelopment Project Area; Southeast Fresno Redevelopment Project Area; South Fresno Industrial Redevelopment Project Area (SCH No. 990011008)</i>
SJVAB	San Joaquin Valley Air Basin
SJVAPCD	San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District
SR-168	State Route 168
SR-180	State Route 180
SWPPP	Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan
SWRCB	State Water Resources Control Board
UBC	Uniform Building Code
UWMP	Urban Water Management Plan
WDR	Waste Discharge Requirements
WWTP	wastewater treatment plant

Environmental Checklist

- 1. Project Title:** Proposed Amendment No. 2 to the Redevelopment Plan for the Airport Area Revitalization Redevelopment Project
- 2. Co-Lead Agency Name and Address:** Redevelopment Agency of the City of Fresno
2344 Tulare, Suite 200
Fresno, CA 93721
City of Fresno
Attn: Planning & Community Development Department
2600 Fresno Street, 3rd Floor
Fresno, CA 93721
- 3. Contact Person and Phone Number:** Mr. David Martin, (559) 621-7630
- 4. Project Location:** The Project Area includes four non-contiguous areas (Subareas A through D) of approximately 1,119 total acres adjacent to and within the vicinity of Fresno Yosemite International Airport within the City of Fresno. See Figures 1 and 2.
- 5. Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** Same as Co-Lead Agencies (see "2, Co-Lead Agencies Names and Addresses" above)
- 6. General Plan Designation:** Medium Low Density Residential; Medium High Density Residential; Neighborhood Commercial; Community-Recreational Commercial; Community Commercial; Commercial Mixed-Use (Level 2); Light Industrial; Public Facilities (Airport); Open Space (Golf Course); Open Space (Ponding Basin); Open Space (Neighborhood Park)
- 7. Zoning:** Medium Density Multiple Family Residential District (R-3); Low Density Multiple Family Residential District (R-2); Single Family Residential Districts (R-1, R-1-A); Single Family Residential-Agricultural District (R-A); Exclusive Twenty Acre Agricultural District (AE-20); Residential and Professional Office District (R-P); Open Conservation District (O); Commercial and Light Manufacturing District (C-M); Commercial Recreation District (C-R); Neighborhood Shopping Center District (C-1), Light Manufacturing District (M-1); Industrial Park Manufacturing District (M-1-P), Heavy Industrial District (M-3); Heavy Commercial District (C-6); Off-Street Parking District (P); Regional Shopping Center District (C-3); Community Shopping Center District (C-2); Administrative and Professional Office District (C-P)
- 8. Description of Project:**

The Redevelopment Agency of the City of Fresno (the "Agency") and the City of Fresno (the "City") are proposing Amendment No. 2 (the "Amendment" or "Project") to the Redevelopment Plan for the Airport Area Revitalization Redevelopment Project. The Redevelopment Plan for the Airport Area (the "Project Area") was originally adopted by City Council Ordinance 99-44 on June 29, 1999, followed by the override of the Mayor's veto on July 19, 1999. The City and the Agency prepared a Program Environmental Impact Report to evaluate the potentially significant effects of the adoption

and implementation of the *Final Program EIR 98-01, Central City Commercial Revitalization Redevelopment Project Area; Airport Area Revitalization Redevelopment Project Area; Southeast Fresno Redevelopment Project Area; South Fresno Industrial Redevelopment Project Area* (SCH No. 990011008). (City of Fresno and City of Fresno Redevelopment Agency 1999) (the "Program EIR"). The Program EIR was certified by the City on June 29, 1999. The Draft Program EIR language is incorporated by reference into the Final Program EIR and these two documents under separate cover collectively make up the Program EIR (the "Program EIR") (All specific page references to the Program EIR in this document shall refer to page numbers in the Draft Program EIR). The Redevelopment Plan will remain in effect until July 19, 2030 (31 years from the date the Redevelopment Plan was originally adopted). However, the Agency's existing authority to use eminent domain to acquire real property within the Project Area will expire on August 20, 2011 (approximately 12 years from the date the Redevelopment Plan was originally adopted). The purpose of the Amendment is to extend the Agency's eminent domain authority for a period of 12 years following the adoption of the Ordinance for the Amendment. Under the proposed Amendment, the Agency shall not acquire, by eminent domain, any property in Subarea A, except vacant land, or in any part of Subareas B, C, and D on which any person lawfully resides. Please see Figure 2 for the location of Subareas A through D.

The Amendment is being proposed because significant blight remains within the Project Area, and the use of eminent domain may be necessary in order to eliminate this remaining blight. The authority to use eminent domain to acquire real property provides the Agency with a valuable tool for assembling land in order to revitalize and redevelop the Project Area. Landowners are paid full market value for any property that is acquired by eminent domain. Land assembly assists the Agency in implementing redevelopment activities such as constructing or rehabilitating affordable housing projects and promoting new or assisting with the expansion or rehabilitation of existing commercial or industrial development.

Eminent domain is used only occasionally by the Agency within all of its redevelopment areas throughout the City, and only when all other means of assembling land are unsuccessful. Since the inception of the Project Area under California Community Redevelopment Law (Health and Safety Code Section 33000, et seq.) in 1999, the power of eminent domain has never been used in the Project Area to acquire property. However, the Agency proposes to continue to have this authority because, although it is a tool of last resort, an otherwise viable redevelopment project may be thwarted by the inability to negotiate the acquisition of property.

The Amendment will enable the Agency to undertake and carry out redevelopment activities that will implement and fulfill the Redevelopment Plan for the Project Area. Redevelopment activities within the Project Area are required by the Redevelopment Plan and the California Community Redevelopment Law (Health and Safety Code Section 33000 et seq.) to be consistent with the City of Fresno 2025 Fresno General Plan ("General Plan"). Redevelopment activities are intended to eliminate blighting conditions and stimulate and promote new development and redevelopment consistent with the uses permitted by the City's adopted land use policies as they may be amended.

Project Purpose and Objectives

As described in the Program EIR, the Agency has the following existing objectives for undertaking redevelopment activities within the Project Area (City of Fresno and City of Fresno Redevelopment Agency 1999, 3-1.4 to 3.1-5):

- Allow for the removal of blighted conditions within the Project Area, including substandard and abandoned buildings, properties that do not comply with development and zoning standards, vacant and underutilized parcels and buildings, and small or irregular parcels that would be difficult to otherwise develop.
- Remove conflicts between adjoining and nearby land uses which prevent economic development. Examples include nonconforming uses, noise and vibration, air emissions including odors, site drainage, risk of upset and human health, lighting, and traffic and circulation.
- Improve depreciated or stagnant property values or impaired investments, including but not

necessarily limited to properties containing hazardous waste and requiring remediation.

- Improve housing conditions through construction of new units and the rehabilitation of existing units to alleviate residential overcrowding and reduce the number of substandard residential units.
- Facilitate the acquisition of usable development sites as projects warrant.
- Encourage public and private sector investment and development in the redevelopment project areas by providing incentives that help facilitate the successful implementation of the respective project.
- Foster the creation of private sector employment opportunities.
- Improve the public infrastructure to support new development, including water, sewer, storm drainage.
- Enhance amenities in the Project Area, including but not limited to off-street parking, landscaping and streetscape, lighting, and sidewalks.
- Improve the public's health, safety, and welfare by reducing crime in the Project Area.
- Implement the City's adopted land use plans, including the General Plan and Edison Community Plan.

The primary objective of the Project is to allow the Agency to preserve and extend its eminent domain powers within the Project Area for 12 years following adoption of the amendment as part of a comprehensive economic development strategy to alleviate the conditions of blight¹ affecting the Project Area. The provisions of the California Redevelopment Law (Health and Safety Code Section 33000, et seq.) relative to tax increment limits, the time limits on the effectiveness of a redevelopment plan, and the use of eminent domain require the Agency to take these actions in order to continue undertaking effective redevelopment activities within the Project Area.

CEQA and Tiering

This is an Initial Study (IS) that will be used in the public review and decision making process for the proposed Project. This IS tiers from, relies on, and incorporates by reference the Program EIR. The City and the Agency prepared the Draft Program EIR in April 1999 and Final Program EIR in June 1999 to evaluate the potentially significant effects of the adoption and implementation of four redevelopment plans in the City, including the Redevelopment Plan for the Project Area. The Program EIR was certified by the City on June 29, 1999.

Tiering this review from the Program EIR is consistent with Public Resources Code Section 21166 and State California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Sections 15162 and 15168. As stated in State CEQA Guidelines Section 15168(c), "subsequent activities in the program must be examined in the light of the program EIR to determine whether an additional environmental document must be prepared." The proposed Amendment to the Redevelopment Plan is narrowly focused and appropriately falls within the CEQA tiering guidance for subsequent projects under a program EIR.

As stated in State CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a), where an EIR has been certified for a project, the determination of whether a subsequent EIR must be prepared only if a determination is made that one of the following circumstances exist:

- (1) Substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects;
- (2) Substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or
- (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 EIR was certified as complete or the negative declaration was adopted, shows any of the following:

¹ As defined by Health & Safety Code Section 33030 (effective January 1, 2008).

- (A) The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR or negative declaration;
- (B) Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR;
- (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 alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.

A subsequent EIR would be required if the initial study were to find the later project to cause new or more severe significant effects on the environment that were not adequately addressed in the original EIR.² A subsequent negative declaration would be required when the initial study shows that the new or more severe significant effect on the environment can be mitigated below the level of significance by specific measures.³

The Lead Agency determined that an Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) rather than a Subsequent EIR is the appropriate level of environmental analysis for this Project because this IS determined that substantial changes are not proposed by the Project and, in fact, this Project results in a reduced scope of eminent domain authority than what was disclosed in the previous Program EIR; therefore, the circumstances described in CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a)(1) do not exist. This IS determined that the significant effects previously examined would not be substantially more severe than shown in the previous Program EIR due to the reduced scope of eminent domain authority than what was disclosed in the previous Program EIR; therefore, the circumstances described in CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a)(2) do not exist. Also, this IS determined that new information, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous Program EIR was certified as complete, would not 1) result in significant new effects not discussed in the previous Program EIR; 2) result in significant effects that are substantially more severe; 3) result in mitigation found to not be feasible in the previous Program EIR that is now feasible and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project; or 4) result in mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous Program EIR and would now substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment. Therefore, the circumstances described in CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a)(3) do not exist.

The Program EIR found that measures incorporated into existing regulations mitigated nearly all identified impacts from proposed redevelopment-assisted projects in the Project Area to a less than significant level. Potentially significant and unavoidable impacts, however, were found with respect to long term air quality impacts and cumulative traffic and circulation impacts resulting from vehicular traffic associated with the Redevelopment Plan.⁴ Section 15168 allows use of tiering even where the action on the prior project and EIR did not include mitigation for every significant effect. This approach recognizes that not all effects can be mitigated at each step of the process. There will be some effects for which mitigation will not be feasible at an early step of approving a particular development project, and the section would allow a Lead Agency to defer mitigation of that kind of effect to a later step.⁵

The authority to exercise eminent domain power was previously considered in the Program EIR as one of the tools available to the agency to acquire property in order to implement the Redevelopment Plan. This Amendment to extend the use of eminent domain power, if approved,

² CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a).

³ CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(b).

⁴ City of Fresno and the Redevelopment Agency of the City of Fresno, Final Program EIR 98-01, June 1999, pp. 2-3 to 2-4.

⁵ CEQA Guidelines Section 15168.

would expire 12 years from the date of approval, well before the Redevelopment Plan's June 29, 2029 expiration date. Amending the Redevelopment Plan to extend the existing eminent domain power in the Project Area will continue to provide the Agency with the authority it may need in order to acquire property for redevelopment projects. The Amendment itself does not approve specific development or construction but is intended to maintain a necessary tool for the promotion of redevelopment activities in the Project Area. While it is unknown at this time how or when development projects made possible by the Amendment will occur, redevelopment activities are required by the Redevelopment Plan to be consistent with the City's General Plan and must conform to all other applicable land development plans and policies in the Project Area. The Amendment makes no changes that affect this consistency.

Since the adoption of the Program EIR, new regulations, local standards, and statutes have gone into effect, and there are new circumstances that result in new information. However, the Agency has found no substantial evidence that the Amendment will cause a significant impact on the environment that was not analyzed previously in the Program EIR. Therefore, and pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15162, a negative declaration will be prepared for the Project.

Eminent Domain

The use of eminent domain power for redevelopment purposes is based upon state law and the "takings clause" of the Fifth Amendment of the U.S. Constitution which states: "nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation." The use of redevelopment to acquire private property and transfer it to another land owner in order to combat blight through eminent domain has been held Constitutional by the U.S. Supreme Court in decisions dating back to *Berman v. Parker* in 1954.⁶ More recently, it was upheld in the case of *Kelo v. City of New London* in 2005.⁷ In any case of eminent domain, the landowner whose property is being acquired is paid full market value for it. A description of how eminent domain works under California Redevelopment Law and the safeguards provided to the property owner is found in Appendix A of this initial study (IS).

Citations

In accordance with State CEQA Guidelines Section 15148, this IS cites applicable analyses that are current and valid. Please see the environmental factor sections of the IS below for cites. The complete cites may be found in "Citations and References" at the end of the IS.

9. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:

The Project Area is located within the vicinity of Fresno Yosemite International Airport and is surrounded by built land uses, including various residential, commercial, public facilities, and industrial land uses as well as some open space. Figure 2 shows the location of the Project Area.

10. Other Public Agencies Whose Approval is Required:

- Fresno Housing and Community Development Commission – consider recommendation to the City Council and Agency Board
- City Redevelopment Agency Board—consent to and hold a Joint Public Hearing to Consider Amendment

⁶ *Berman v. Parker* (1954) 348 U.S. 26

⁷ *Kelo v. City of New London* (2005) 545 U.S. 469

Environmental Factors Potentially Affected

The environmental factors checked below would potentially be affected by this project (i.e., the project would involve at least one impact that is a “Potentially Significant Impact”), as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- | | | |
|---|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input type="checkbox"/> Agricultural and Forestry | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Geology/Soils |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions | <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards and Hazardous Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology/Water Quality |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use/Planning | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Population/Housing | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic | <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities/Service Systems | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance |

Determination

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions to the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have an impact on the environment that is “potentially significant” or “potentially significant unless mitigated” but at least one effect (1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards and (2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis, as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the project, nothing further is required.



Signature

August XX, 2010

Date

David Martin

Printed Name

Fresno Redevelopment Agency


For

Evaluation of Environmental Impacts

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer should be explained if it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including offsite as well as onsite, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is required.
4. “Negative Declaration: Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated” applies when the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from a “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less-than-Significant Impact.” The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less-than-significant level. (Mitigation measures from Section XVII, “Earlier Analyses,” may be cross-referenced.)
5. Earlier analyses may be used if, pursuant to tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration [Section 15063(c)(3)(D)]. In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a. Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where earlier analyses are available for review.
 - b. Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c. Mitigation Measures. For effects that are “Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated,” describe the mitigation measures that were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, when appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
7. Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
8. This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project’s environmental effects in whatever format is selected.

9. The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a. the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b. the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level.

I. Aesthetics	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings along a scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- a. **No Impact.** The Project Area is located within the highly urbanized vicinity of Fresno Yosemite International Airport and is surrounded by built land uses, including various residential, commercial, public facilities, and industrial land uses as well as some open space. The Project Area includes a mixture of structures of various ages, designs, and heights. The major transportation corridors are developed with heavy commercial uses and exhibit high visual clutter and a general lack of aesthetic qualities. Due to the level topography of the Project Area, there are no scenic vistas or view points in the area (City of Fresno 1999, , p.1.4-16  The Program EIR concluded that aesthetic impacts would not be significant. No new or more severe aesthetic effects have been identified. Therefore, future development in the Project Area would not block or preclude views to any area containing important or visually appealing landforms. Because no scenic vistas would be affected by the Amendment, there would be no impact.
- b. **No Impact.** As discussed in I.a., above, and as described in the Program EIR, there are no scenic vistas or view points in the area. Also, the Project Area is not adjacent to or near any state highway that is designated or eligible to be listed on the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) State Scenic Highway System (CSSHS). The CSSHS designates highways depending on the quantity of natural landscape that can be seen by travelers, the scenic quality of the landscape from a given segment of roadway, and the extent to which development intrudes upon the traveler’s enjoyment of the view. The Project site is not located within or adjacent to any such landscape. There are no officially designated State Scenic Highways in Fresno, and the nearest eligible State Scenic Highways are State Route 168 (SR-168) and State Route 180 (SR-180) (California Department of Transportation 2009), which are well outside the City limits east of Fresno. Therefore, the Project would not substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings along a scenic highway and there would be no impact.
- c. **No Impact.** The Project involves an amendment to the Redevelopment Plan to allow the Agency to continue implementing its eminent domain power as part of a comprehensive economic development strategy to alleviate the conditions of blight in the Project Area. As described in

the Program EIR, the removal of physical blight including vacant and dilapidated buildings, graffiti, trash, and vacant lots would enhance the appearance of the proposed Project Area. This would be a beneficial effect (City of Fresno 1999, p. 1.4-17). As a continuation of the Program EIR, the Project would beneficially enhance the existing visual character or quality of the Project Area by eliminating blight. Additionally, future development in the Project Area would have to be consistent with the City's current General Plan and applicable community and specific plan policies and requirements related to development standards and urban design as well as the City's Urban Design Guidelines (City of Fresno 1999, p. 1.4-17). As a result, future development under the Amendment would result in new and renovated land uses that are compatible with the Project Area. Therefore, the Project would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the Project Area and its surroundings and there would be no impact.

- d. **Less-than-Significant Impact.** The Amendment could potentially result in future development within the Project Area that would create new sources of light or glare. While it is unknown at this time how or when development projects made possible by the Amendment will occur, redevelopment activities are required by the Redevelopment Plan to be consistent with the City's General Plan and must conform to all other applicable land development plans and policies in the Project Area. Additionally, the lighting for future development would be designed in accordance with City development standards and would be subject to additional environmental review, if required by CEQA. Further, future projects would be reviewed to ensure compliance with the City's Urban Design Guidelines (City of Fresno 1999, p. 1.4-17) and the City typically places conditions on projects that require lights to be shielded so that adjoining properties are not illuminated (City of Fresno 2002, p. 2). The Amendment makes no changes that affect this consistency. The Program EIR concluded that aesthetic impacts would not be significant, and no new or more severe effects have been identified. Therefore, the Project would not create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area and impacts would be less than significant.

II. Agricultural and Forestry Resources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>In determining whether impacts on agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts on forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment Project, and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in the Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:</p>				
<p>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?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or conflict with a Williamson Act contract?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>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))?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>d. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>e. Involve other changes in the existing environment that, 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?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

a. **No Impact.** The Program EIR did not identify any agricultural land in the Project Area (City of Fresno 1999, p. 1.4-12). No portion of the Project Area is designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance under the California Department of Conservation Division of Land Resource Protection's Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP). According to the *Fresno County Important Farmland 2008* map for east

Fresno County, the entire Project Area is designated as “Urban and Built-Up Land” (California Department of Conservation 2008). Therefore, the Project would not convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland) to nonagricultural use and there would be no impact.

- b. **No Impact.** As stated above, the Program EIR did not identify any agricultural land in the Project Area. According to the *City of Fresno 2025 Fresno General Plan Land Use and Circulation Map* (City of Fresno 2009a), no portion of the Project Area is currently designated for agricultural use by the City. The Williamson Act applies to parcels consisting of at least 20 acres of Prime Farmland or at least 40 acres of land not designated as Prime Farmland. The purpose of the act is to preserve agricultural and open space lands by discouraging premature and unnecessary conversion to urban uses. The Williamson Act enables local governments to enter into contracts with private landowners for the purpose of restricting specific parcels of land for use as agricultural or related open space (California Department of Conservation 2007). The Project Area does not contain any land currently under a Williamson Act Land Use Contract (California Department of Conservation 2007). Therefore, the Project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract and there would be no impact.
- c. **No Impact.** According to the *City of Fresno 2025 Fresno General Plan Land Use and Circulation Map* (City of Fresno 2009a), no portion of the Project Area is currently designated for 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)). Therefore, the Project would not conflict with existing zoning for forest use and there would be no impact.
- d. **No Impact.** As stated above, no portion of the Project Area is designated for forest land, nor are forest uses present in the Project Area. Therefore, the Project would not result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use and there would be no impact.
- e. **No Impact.** As discussed above, the Project Area is not designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance by the California Department of Conservation; is not zoned for agriculture; or is not currently under a Williamson Act Contract. Furthermore, the Project Area is not designated for forest land, timberland, or zoned Timberland Production. Therefore, the Project would not involve other changes in the existing environment that, due to their location or nature, could individually or cumulatively result in loss of farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use and there would be no impact.

III. Air Quality	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
When available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is a nonattainment area for an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- a. **No Impact.** The California Clean Air Act (CCAA) requires nonattainment districts with severe air quality problems to provide for a 5% reduction in nonattainment emissions per year. The San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD) prepared an Air Quality Attainment Plan (AQAP) for the San Joaquin Valley Air Basin (SJVAB) in compliance with the requirements of the CCAA. The SJVAPCD encourages local jurisdictions to design all developments in ways that reduce air pollution from vehicles. As stated in the Program EIR, future development in the Project Area must be consistent with the City’s General Plan, as well as applicable community and specific plans, which support the goals and policies of the state and regional air quality programs (City of Fresno 1999, p. 1.4-5). The Program EIR concluded that air quality impacts would not be significant, and no new or more severe effects have been identified. While it is unknown at this time how or when development projects made possible by the Amendment will occur, redevelopment activities are also required by the Redevelopment Plan to be consistent with the City’s General Plan and must conform to all other applicable land development plans and policies in the Project Area. The Amendment makes no changes that affect this consistency. Therefore, the Project is consistent with the applicable air quality management plan and would result in no impact.
- b. **Less-than-Significant Impact.** The Program EIR describes that future development in the Project Area would result in construction- and operations-related air quality impacts, and establishes mitigation to comply with current Fugitive Dust rules established by the SJVAPCD as well as other established construction-period mitigation that includes site watering, high-wind considerations, transport covering, disturbance minimization, construction vehicle speed limits,

sweeping requirements, and proper engine maintenance requirements (City of Fresno 1999, DEIR, p. 1.4-10 to 1.4-11). The 1999 Program EIR also establishes mitigation for operations-related air quality effects by requiring that all future development within the Project Area comply with current review and permitting procedures developed by the SJVAPCD as well as comply with other established long-term mitigation, which includes site design criteria for commercial and industrial areas, required circulation improvements, building design criteria, and pedestrian and bicycle access accommodation (City of Fresno 1999, p. 1.4-11 to 1.4-12). The Program EIR also acknowledged that although the mitigation measures would temper air quality effects, long-term air quality effects resulting from vehicular traffic associated with the Redevelopment Plan would remain significant.

While it is unknown at this time how or when development projects made possible by the Amendment will occur, redevelopment activities are required by the Redevelopment Plan to be consistent with the City's General Plan and must conform to all other applicable land development plans and policies in the Project Area. Additionally, future development would be designed in accordance with City development standards and would be subject to additional environmental review, if required by CEQA. The Amendment makes no changes that affect this consistency. Further, mitigation is required for future development within the Project Area to comply with current review and permitting procedures developed by the SJVAPCD as well as comply with other established long-term mitigation. Therefore, the Project would not result in any new or more severe effects that were not already analyzed and disclosed in the Program EIR, and impacts would be less than significant.

- c. **Less-than-Significant Impact.** The San Joaquin Valley is in nonattainment for criteria pollutants including ozone. The SJVAPCD has adopted thresholds for operational and area sources, which are reactive organic gases, oxides of nitrogen, and particulate matter. In addition, SJVAPCD Rule 2210 also includes thresholds for stationary sources as well. A number of these thresholds and standards have become more stringent since the Program EIR was certified, as outlined in SJVAPCD Rule 2210. CEQA defines cumulative impacts as two or more individual effects that, when considered together, are considerable or that compound or increase other environmental impacts. The Program EIR acknowledges that “[c]umulative effects related to the build-out of the redevelopment area would be significant” (City of Fresno 1999, p. 1.4-12).

While it is unknown at this time how or when development projects made possible by the Amendment will occur, redevelopment activities are required by the Redevelopment Plan to be consistent with the City's General Plan and must conform to all other applicable land development plans and policies in the Project Area. Additionally, future development would be designed in accordance with all applicable development standards and would be subject to additional environmental review, if required by CEQA. The Amendment makes no changes that affect this consistency. Although thresholds and standards have become more stringent since the certification of the Program EIR, mitigation is required for future development within the Project Area to comply with current review and permitting procedures developed by the SJVAPCD as well as comply with other established long-term mitigation. Therefore, the Project would not result in any new or more severe effects that were not already analyzed in the Program EIR, and impacts would be less than significant.

- d. **Less-than-Significant Impact.** Sensitive receptors include people within schools, daycare centers, medical facilities, and other facilities that house or provide services for young children, elderly persons, or people with existing respiratory health problems. There are also residents within the Project Area that could be considered sensitive receptors. Industrial and commercial uses are not considered sensitive receptors, however the people within them are. Construction activities associated with future development have the potential to generate dust and other airborne pollutants from construction emissions. These activities also have the potential to expose workers and current and future residents to air emissions that would likely be produced by construction activities. Future operations within the Project Area also have the potential to contribute to regional ozone levels and deterioration of ambient air quality.

The Program EIR acknowledges that future development in the Project Area could result in traffic congestion which may generate localized carbon monoxide hot spots at intersections that may affect sensitive receptors; also, cumulative impacts from PM10 could be significant if sensitive receptors are exposed to a harmful level of emissions due to the concentration of several demolition or construction projects in one area (City of Fresno 1999, p 1.4-9). Although the mitigation measures included in the Program EIR would temper air quality effects, long-term air quality effects would be significant, depending on project size and operational characteristics. Cumulative effects related to the build-out of the redevelopment area would also be significant (City of Fresno 1999, p 1.4-12). While it is unknown at this time how or when development projects made possible by the Amendment will occur, redevelopment activities are required by the Redevelopment Plan to be consistent with the City's General Plan and must conform to all other applicable land development plans and policies in the Project Area, including those related to potential impacts on sensitive receptors. Additionally, future development would be designed in accordance with all applicable development standards and would be subject to additional environmental review, if required by CEQA. The Amendment makes no changes that affect this consistency. Significant impacts of the Project were disclosed in the Program EIR and have not changed; therefore, the Project would not result in a new or more severe effects that were not already analyzed in the Program EIR, and impacts would be less than significant.

- e. **Less-than-Significant Impact.** Future development associated with implementation of the Project may generate detectable odors from heavy-duty equipment exhaust and paving activities. These odors are expected to be infrequent, of short duration, and dissipate relatively quickly. Future operational odors could occur as a result of the Project, and particularly industrial operations. If continually prevalent, odors may be considered objectionable by some individuals living in the area. Such odors are common in urban areas and were found in the Project Area in 1999 when the Program EIR was certified. The Program EIR did not specifically address the effects of odors but concluded that air quality impacts would not be significant. The Amendment could result in future development within the Project Area that may create similar odors. While it is unknown at this time how or when development projects made possible by the Amendment will occur, redevelopment activities are required by the Redevelopment Plan to be consistent with the City's General Plan and must conform to all other applicable land development plans and policies in the Project Area, including those related to odors. Additionally, future development would be designed in accordance with City development standards and would be subject to additional environmental review, if required by CEQA. The Amendment makes no changes that affect this consistency. Therefore, the Project would not result in new or more severe impacts relative to the Program EIR's conclusions, and impacts would be less than significant.

IV. Biological Resources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marshes, vernal pools, coastal wetlands, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

- a. **No Impact.** The Project Area is located within the highly urbanized vicinity of Fresno Yosemite International Airport and is surrounded by built land uses, including various residential, commercial, public facilities, and industrial land uses as well as some open space. According to the Program EIR, native habitat has been removed from the Project Area, and no state or federally listed rare or endangered species are found in the Project Area. Animal species that are dependent on native habitat have been expatriated. Animal species that remain are tolerant of human activities, and urban development has introduced a large number of non-native plant and animal species (City of Fresno 1999, , p. 1.4-12). This situation has not changed. Therefore, no impact would result from the Project.

- b. **No Impact.** As stated in IV.a., above, and in the Program EIR, native habitat has been removed from the Project Area, and no state or federally listed rare or endangered species are found in the Project Area. Animal species that are dependent on native habitat have been expatriated. Animal species that remain are tolerant of human activities, and urban development has introduced a large number of non-native plant and animal species. The situation has not changed. Therefore, no impact would result from the Project.
- c. **Less-than-Significant Impact.** No wetland resources were identified in the Program EIR. The National Wetlands Inventory (NWI) wetlands mapper for the Project Area was reviewed in 2010 for current wetland resources. The NWI search determined that there three small freshwater ponds and a small freshwater emergent wetland area located on or adjacent to Palm Lakes Municipal Golf Course property within the Project Area, north of the airport (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service 2010). The Amendment could potentially result in future development within the Project Area near these ponds. While it is unknown at this time how or when development projects made possible by the Amendment will occur, redevelopment activities are required by the Redevelopment Plan to be consistent with the City's General Plan and must conform to all other applicable land development plans and policies in the Project Area. Additionally, future development would be designed in accordance with City development standards and would be subject to additional environmental review, if required by CEQA. The Amendment makes no changes that affect this consistency. Therefore, the Project would not have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means, and impacts would be less than significant.
- d. **No Impact.** Although some wildlife species may on occasion pass through the Project Area, there is no conclusive evidence that any portion of the Project Area serves as an important linkage between extant wildlife habitats. Surrounding urban development further diminishes the possibility that the Project Area is important for terrestrial wildlife movement, and severs linkage between the open space in the Project Area and surrounding open areas. The Project Area is not considered an integral part of a regional wildlife corridor and the Program EIR found no significant impacts related to biological resources would result from the Redevelopment Plan. The situation has not changed since certification of the Program EIR. Therefore, no impact would result from the Project.
- e. **No Impact.** The City of Fresno has a tree preservation ordinance and future development would have to comply with this ordinance. The Program EIR found no significant impacts related to biological resources would result from the Redevelopment Plan. The situation has not changed since certification of the Program EIR. Therefore, no impact would result from the Project.
- f. **No Impact.** There is no adopted habitat conservation plan, natural community conservation plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan that is applicable to the Project Area. There would be no impact.

V. Cultural Resources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

a. **Less-than-Significant Impact.** The Program EIR found no known historic resources in the Project Area (City of Fresno 1999, , p. 3.2.8-1). The Agency has confirmed with Fresno Historic Preservation) Project Manager that there are currently no known historic surveys for the Project Area or properties eligible for listing on the Local Register of Historic Resources (Local Register) within the area at this time (Hattersley-Drayton *pers. comm.*) There may, however, be buildings and other resources not listed in the Program EIR and are currently unknown to the Historic Preservation Project Manager that are now eligible for listing as historic resources. The Amendment could result in future development within the Project Area that may affect these potential resources. While it is unknown at this time how or when development projects made possible by the Amendment will occur, redevelopment activities are required by the Redevelopment Plan to be consistent with the City’s General Plan and must conform to all other applicable land development plans and policies in the Project Area. In particular, future development as a result of the project must conform to the City’s Historic Preservation Ordinance (Fresno Municipal Code 12-1601 et. seq.). The Historic Preservation Ordinance establishes the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) to aid the City Council in considering historic resources as well as the Local Register. Adopted in 1979 and substantially amended in 1999 , the ordinance defines a historic resource as any building, structure, object, or site that is at least 50 years of age, possesses historic integrity, and is associated with significant events, individuals, or patterns of history. Before any building or structure is designated a historic resource, it has to be “designated as such by the [City] Council pursuant to the provisions of the Historic Preservation Ordinance” [Fresno Municipal Code 12-1603(o)]. Additionally, pursuant to General Plan Policy G-11-c and the Planning Department’s Demolition Policy, for any possible demolition in the City, the Historic Preservation Project Manager receives the proposed demolition permits from for review. If a structure proposed to be demolished is 45 years or older, the Historic Preservation Project Manager researches whether the structure is eligible for consideration on the Local Register in accordance with the Historic preservation Ordinance. This assures that prior to the demolition of any structure not currently defined as a “Historic Resource” under the Historic Preservation Ordinance it is sufficiently considered and, if warranted, designated as a Historic Resource. Future development as a result of the project

would be required to comply with the ordinance and are subject to the demolition permit review process. Additionally, future development would be designed in accordance with City development standards and would be subject to additional environmental review, if required by CEQA. The Amendment makes no changes that affect this consistency. Further, Mitigation Measure 5.2.8-2 in the Program EIR requires that the City and Agency evaluate each structure on a proposed development site to determine its eligibility for listing on the City's Official Local List of Historic Places. Compliance with the City's General Plan, other applicable land development plans and policies, Mitigation Measure 5.2.8-2 of the Program EIR, demolition permit review process, and Historic Preservation Ordinance would ensure that potential historic resources are adequately considered for eligibility on the Local Register and, if warranted, preserved. It is also important to emphasize that future development as a result of the project would have to undergo separate environmental clearance and that consideration of historic resources, in compliance with the previously mentioned plans, policies, mitigation, and ordinance, would be required as part of their subsequent CEQA analysis. Therefore, the Project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource, and impacts would be less than significant.

- b. **Less-than-Significant Impact.** The Program EIR determined that the Project Area does not contain any known archaeological resources (City of Fresno 1999, , p. 3.2.8-1). As stated above, future development would be designed in accordance with City standards and would be subject to additional environmental review, if required by CEQA. The Amendment makes no changes that affect this consistency. In addition, Mitigation Measure 5.2.8-1 in the Program EIR requires that, if previously unknown archaeological resources are discovered during future development, operations shall cease after discovery and a qualified archaeologist shall be contacted to determine the significance of a find. Compliance with Mitigation Measure 5.2.8-1 of the Program EIR for unknown archaeological resources would ensure that archaeological resources are adequately considered and identified, analyzed, and, if warranted, curated. It is also important to emphasize that future development as a result of the Project would have to undergo separate environmental clearance and that consideration of archaeological resources, and compliance with the previously mentioned mitigation would be required as part of their subsequent CEQA analysis. Therefore, the Project would not cause a new or more severe adverse change in the significance of an archeological resource, and impacts would be less than significant.
- c. **Less-than-Significant Impact.** The Program EIR determined that the Project Area does not contain any known paleontological resources (City of Fresno 1999, , p. 3.2.8-1). As discussed in V.b, above, there is mitigation for previously unknown archeological resources that reduce impacts to less than significant levels, including that the Museum of Paleontology shall be contacted regarding animal fossils, and significant fossils shall be preserved. Therefore, the Project would not directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature, and impacts would be less than significant.
- d. **Less-than-Significant Impact.** The Program EIR concluded that there are no known sacred uses in the Project, which would include Native American burial grounds (City of Fresno 1999, , p. 3.2.8-1). Mitigation Measure 5.2.8-1 in the Program EIR requires that, if human remains are discovered during future development, operations shall cease after discovery, and that the County Coroner and the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC), if the remains are thought to be Native American in origin, shall be immediately contacted. Additionally, if human remains were discovered, further excavation or disturbance would be prohibited pursuant to Section 7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code. If Native American remains were

identified, Section 7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code and Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code provide specific measures for addressing the remains. Therefore, the Project would not result in a new or more severe impact than those identified in the Program EIR, and impacts would be less than significant.

VI. Geology and Soils	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
1. 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.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2. Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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 an onsite or offsite landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems in areas where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

- a. **1.) No Impact.** The Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone Act (Alquist-Priolo Act) was passed in 1972 to mitigate the hazard of surface faulting to structures used for human occupancy. Under the Alquist-Priolo Act, the California State Geologist identifies areas in the state of California that are at risk from surface fault rupture. The Alquist-Priolo Act’s main purpose is to prevent the construction of buildings used for human occupancy on the trace of active faults (California Geological Survey 2007a), which may be subject to fault rupture from a seismic event. According to California Geological Survey Special Publication No. 42 (California Geological Survey 2007b), the entire county of Fresno does not contain any earthquake fault zones, as defined by the Alquist-Priolo Act (California Geological Survey 2007a). No substantive changes have occurred since certification of the Program EIR. Therefore, no impact would result from the Project.

2.) Less-than-Significant Impact. According to the Program EIR, the Fresno area is susceptible to earthquakes generated on faults on the western edge of the San Joaquin Valley or in the Sierra Nevada Mountain Range to the east. However, these faults are not considered to constitute significant risk for the metropolitan area (City of Fresno 1999, , p. 1.4-2). Structures built within the Project Area would be required to be constructed in accordance with the City's established building procedures (City of Fresno 1999 , p. 1.4-2), including compliance with the California Building Code and the preparation of a preliminary soils report prior to grading. Recommendations in the preliminary soils report must be incorporated into future development design. The California Building Code would require adherence to all modern earthquake standards, including those relating to soil characteristics. No substantive changes have occurred since certification of the Program EIR, and a less-than-significant impact would result from the Project.

3.) Less-than-Significant Impact. Seismic-induced liquefaction occurs when loose, water-saturated sediments of relatively low density are subjected to extreme shaking that causes soil to lose strength or stiffness because of increased pore water pressure. The loss could cause a failure or the inability of the subsurface layers to support overlying structures and is generally characterized by settlement, uplift on structures, and an increase in lateral pressure on buried structures. The Program EIR states that the Project Area does not contain unique geologic or physical features and is absent of geologic hazards such as landslides, mudslides, and ground failure (such as liquefaction) (City of Fresno 1999, , p. 1.4-2). Also, as stated in VI.a.2, development would be required to implement soil treatment measures as described in a preliminary soils report. No substantive changes have occurred since certification of the Program EIR, and a less-than-significant impact would result from the Project.

4.) No Impact. A strong earthquake could trigger landslides or slope failures on steep slopes. The common types of landslides induced by earthquakes are bluff and stream bank failures, rock falls, and soil slips on steep slopes. Because the Project Area is located on flat topography and is not located adjacent to any steep slopes or areas that would otherwise be subject to landslides, impacts from seismically induced landslides would not occur, and there would be no impact.

- b. **Less-than-Significant Impact.** Future construction activities have the potential to result in erosion, sedimentation, and the discharge of construction debris from the Project site. Clearing of vegetation and grading activities, for example, could lead to exposed or stockpiled soils susceptible to peak storm water runoff flows and wind forces. The compaction of soils by heavy equipment may minimally reduce the infiltration capacity of soils (exposed during construction) and increase runoff and erosion potential. The presence of large amounts of raw materials for construction, including concrete, asphalt, and slurry, may lead to stormwater runoff contamination. If uncontrolled, these materials could lead to erosion problems, including sediment-laden runoff and wind-driven erosion. The Program EIR, however, found potential impacts related to grading and earthwork to be less-than-significant (City of Fresno 1999, , p. 1.4-2).

All construction activities associated with the Redevelopment Plan would be conducted in accordance with the requirements of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) construction stormwater program. As described in the Program EIR, projects involve grading or other surface displacement, that are greater than five acres in area are required to obtain an NPDES Permit. The NPDES construction stormwater program also requires the development of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) to be implemented for each

future development that disturbs at least 1 acre (or less than 1 acre if part of a larger common plan of development or sale) to ensure that stormwater flows do not result in sedimentation or pollutant conveyance off site. The purpose of the NPDES Permit is to prevent soil erosion and other contaminants from entering the "Waters of the U.S." This is typically handled through the review and approval process of the grading and drainage plans. Standard requirements included maintaining drainage on-site during construction (City of Fresno 1999, , p. 1.4-2). Future construction activities would not result in substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil as future development would have to conform to the NPDES requirements, as well as all applicable City and regional regulatory requirements to reduce erosion potential. No substantive changes have occurred since certification of the Program EIR, and a less-than-significant impact would result from the Project.

- c. **Less-than-Significant Impact.** See VI.a.3 for more information. Therefore, the Project would not 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 an onsite or offsite landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse. No substantive changes have occurred since certification of the Program EIR, and a less-than-significant impact would result from the Project.
- d. **Less-than-Significant Impact.** See VI.a.3 for more information. Therefore, if future development within the Project Area were to be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (UBC) (1994), recommendations from the preliminary soils report would mitigate soil hazard impacts. No substantive changes have occurred since certification of the Program EIR, and a less-than-significant impact would result from the Project.
- e. **No Impact.** Future development within the Project Area would not use septic tanks or other alternative wastewater disposal systems to dispose of wastewater. Future development would be connected to, and served by, the existing sewer system within the Project Area, the flow from which would be treated at one of the City's existing or future new or expanded wastewater treatment plants. See "Utilities and Service Systems" below for information about sewer systems and wastewater treatment facilities. No substantive changes have occurred since certification of the Program EIR, and no impact would result from the Project.

VII. Greenhouse Gas Emissions	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- a. **Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.** The Program EIR did not discuss potential impacts of the Redevelopment Plan with respect to global warming and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, as this was not required by the CEQA Statute or Guidelines at the time. A discussion of GHG impacts is now required by the State CEQA Guidelines. It is the intent of the State Legislature (as expressed in its adoption of Assembly Bill 32, the California Climate Solutions Act of 2006) that global warming poses significant adverse effects to the environment of the state of California and the entire world.

Unlike criteria pollutant impacts, which are local and regional in nature, climate change impacts occur at a global level. The relatively long lifespan and persistence of GHGs require climate change to be considered a cumulative and a global impact. All future development would generate some quantity of GHGs during its construction and operational period, and would contribute to cumulative global GHG emissions. Scientific tools and appropriate methodologies are available for estimating GHG emissions from many GHG sources associated with operations, and future CEQA analyses in support of these should include an inventory of each future development’s GHG emissions that is as thorough as possible. The Amendment itself, however, does not approve specific development or construction and it is unknown at this time how or when development projects made possible by the Amendment will occur. Therefore, a comparison of direct and indirect GHG emissions generated by the Amendment with the most recent GHG inventories is currently not possible.

The state has adopted several statutes and regulations for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions. The most comprehensive is AB 32, which is designed to reduce statewide GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020. Likewise, the City’s General Plan and the SJVAPCD have developed measures to reduce GHG emissions from individual development projects. In addition, the City’s air quality update (City of Fresno 2009b), adopted in May 2009, includes Policy G-1B-a(2) whereby “after protocols and parameters for GHG analysis, inventorying, and benchmarking are ratified by the State of California and SJVAPCD, the City shall participate in GHG emission inventory and benchmarking efforts to evaluate the current status of emissions for the incorporated City and for City facilities and shall use this information to set appropriate targets for the City’s proportionate responsibility to achieve GHG reductions in order to achieve compliance with AB 32 mandates to roll back GHG levels to 1990 levels.” However, at the time of writing of this document, the City has not yet performed a GHG inventory or prepared an associated plan to achieve reduction targets.

The December 2009 GHG guidance adopted by SJVAPCD does not establish specific thresholds for land use or development projects. Rather, the guidelines outline a process for evaluating project-level GHG emissions. For projects that fail to comply with an approved GHG reduction plan, SJVAPCD recommends implementing “best performance standards” (BPS) to reduce project-specific GHG emissions by at least 29% compared with business as usual (BAU), consistent with GHG emissions-reduction goals of AB 32.

Redevelopment activities are required by the Redevelopment Plan to be consistent with the City’s General Plan and must conform to all other applicable land development plans and policies in the Project Area. In the absence of a specific threshold, future redevelopment activities in the Project Area will comply with the City’s General Plan and the applicable guidance from SJVAPCD and, by inference, the AB 32 scoping plan by requiring development projects to conform to the provisions of SJVAPCD’s guidance. Accordingly, prior to the Agency’s approval and issuance of development project-related entitlements, the Agency will require redevelopment activities to conform to that guidance.

To reduce project-level GHG emissions, specific developments shall implement any combination of the measures below above to reduce project-specific GHG emissions by at least 29% compared with BAU.

Mitigation Measures

MM-1. Implement GHG Reduction Measures Identified in Planning Documents Adopted by Fresno County and the SJVAPCD to Achieve at Least a 29% Reduction in GHG Emissions Relative to business as usual (BAU).

The Agency will require project applicants to implement any combination of GHG reduction measures necessary to achieve a combined 29% reduction in emissions relative to BAU, consistent with the City’s General Plan and SJVAPCD guidelines.

Available BPS and their reduction potentials have been proposed by the SJVAPCD and are summarized below.

City of Fresno General Plan

The following measures as listed in the air quality update to the general plan (City of Fresno 2009b), shall be pursued, where feasible:

- Encourage development proponents to offset or mitigate emissions by removing older, less-efficient and higher emitting vehicles from service;
- Develop a policy for emission credits generated through City facilities, programs, and policies;
- Increase efforts to incorporate GHG emission reductions into land use decisions, facility design, and operational measures subject to Agency jurisdiction;
- Consider strengthening Agency standards for purchasing low-polluting and climate friendly goods and services;
- Prioritize energy and water conservation through various measures;
- Maintain current levels of achievement for recycling and reuse;
- Make transportation services more efficient; and
- Continue to enhance landscaping consistent with energy and water conservation principles.

SJVAPCD GHG Guidance

Appendix J of the Final SJVAPCD GHG Guidance (2009) identifies several GHG emissions reduction measures. Each of these strategies has been assigned a land use type for which a reduction point value can be claimed. Point values are used to approximate the emission reduction factor associated with particulate control measures.

The following BPS have been selected from Appendix J because they are the most applicable to projects that may be developed in the plan area. Reduction potentials, as well as land use types, are also provided. Please refer to Appendix J of the Final SJVAPCD GHG Guidance (2009) for the stipulations and requirements of each measure.

GHG Reduction Measure^a	Applicable Land Use	CO₂e Point Reduction
Bike Parking	C, M	0.625
End-of-Trip Facilities	C, M	0.625
Bike Parking at Multi-Unit Residential	R	0.625
Pedestrian Network	C, M, R	0.5-1
Pedestrian Barriers Minimized	C, M, R	1
Bus Shelter for Existing or Planned Transit Service	C, M, R	0.25-0.5
Traffic Calming	C, M, R	0.25-1
Paid Parking	C, M, R	0.6-5
Minimum Parking	C, M, R	3
Pedestrian Pathway through Parking	C, M, R	0.5
Office/Mixed Use Proximate to Transit	C, M	0.2-1.5
Orientation toward Existing of Planned Transit, Bikeway, or Pedestrian Corridor	C, M, R	0.25-0.5
Residential Density ^b	R	0-6
Neighborhood Electric Vehicle Access	C, M, R	0.5-1.5
Urban Mixed Use ^c	M	1-9
Suburban Mixed Use	C, M, R	3
Other Mixed Use	M, R	1
Energy Star Roof	C, M, R	0.5
On-site Renewable Energy System	C, M, R	1
Exceed Title 24	C, M, R	1
Solar Orientation	R	0.5
Non-Roof Surfaces	C, M, R	1
Green Roof	C, M, R	0.5

(C) Commercial, (M) Mixed Use, (R) Residential

^a The SJVAPCD stresses that the BPS outlined above are still undergoing development through a public review and input process.

^b Reduction potential dependent on the presence of existing or planned transit.

^c Reduction potential dependent on the jobs-to-housing ratio.

Future developers, whether the Agency or another entity, may use other reduction measures and is not limited to those identified by the SJVAPCD in order to reach a 29% reduction. The Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) has also identified several feasible mitigation measures as well as estimated their reduction potentials. The table below identifies available measures in addition to those presented by the SJVAPCD. Note that the reduction potentials are still being reviewed by the BAAQMD and may change with improved guidance on quantifying mitigation. The reduction potentials are therefore provided as an estimate of what may be achieved through implementation of the measure.

GHG Reduction Measure^a	Sector	CO₂e Point Reduction
Free Transit Passes to Employees and Residents	Resident/Employee	25% transit
Employee Telecommuting	Mobile-Source Worker	1%–100%
Compressed Work Schedule	Mobile-Source Worker	1%–40%
Electrically Powered Landscape Equipment and Outdoor Electrical Outlets	Residential Landscape Emissions	Same % as land equipment emissions
Low-VOC Architectural Coatings	Building Operations	Same % as ROG emissions
Plant Shade Trees within 40 feet of the South Side or within 60 feet of the West Side of Properties	R/C Air-Conditioning Electricity	30%
Require Smart Meters or Programmable Thermostats	R/C Electricity or Natural Gas	10%
Meet Green Building Standards in All New Construction	R/C Electricity or Natural Gas	3%–17%
Install Solar Water Heaters	R/C Natural Gas Water Heating	70%
Install Tankless Water Heaters	R/C Natural Gas Water Heating	35%
HVAC Duct Sealing	R/C Air-Conditioning Electricity	30%
Provide Necessary Infrastructure and Treatment to Allow Use of 50% Greywater/ Recycled Water in Residential and Commercial Uses for Outdoor Irrigation	R/C Electricity (water consumption)	SFR: 37.5%, MFR: 29%, C: 6%

(C) Commercial, (R) Residential, (SFR) Single-Family Residential, (MFR) Multifamily Residential

^a Reduction potentials have not been scaled to project-specific emissions or resource sectors (e.g., natural gas, electricity). “Reduction potentials should be scaled proportionally to their sector of project-generated emissions. For example, if a measure would result in a 50% reduction in residential natural gas consumption but only 20% of a project’s emissions are associated with natural gas consumption and only 10% of a project’s emissions are from residential land uses, then the scaled reduction would equal 1% (50% * 20% * 10% = 1%)” (BAAQMD 2010).

Level of Significance after Mitigation

Adoption of the measures described above, when fully incorporated into future development projects within the Project Area, would lessen GHG emissions from within the project area and achieve a reduction target of 29% below BAU, as stated in the SJVAPCD GHG guidance and, by inference, AB 32. Impacts would, therefore, be less than significant.

- b. **Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.** See VII.a., above. Adoption of MM-1 described above, when fully incorporated into future development projects within the Project Area, would lessen GHG emissions from within the project area and achieve a reduction target of 29% below BAU, as stated in the SJVAPCD GHG guidance and, by inference, AB 32. Impacts would, therefore, be less than significant.

VIII. Hazards and Hazardous Materials	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Emit hazardous emissions or involve handling hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Be located on a site that 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Be located within an airport land use plan area or, where such a plan has not been adopted, be within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, and result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Be located within the vicinity of a private airstrip and result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

- a. **Less-than-Significant Impact.** Hazardous substances typically used for construction, such as paints, solvents, and cleaners, would be transported and used for future development. Also, grading and construction activities would require the transport, storage, use, and/or disposal of hazardous materials such as fuels and greases for the fueling/servicing of construction equipment. Substances may also be stored in temporary storage tanks/sheds that would be located on site. Although these types of materials are not acutely hazardous, they are classified as hazardous materials and create the potential for accidental spillage, which could expose workers. Compliance with the requirements set forth in U.S. Code and California Health and Safety Code, under the direct oversight of Fresno Fire Department and Fresno County Health Department, would be required for future development.

Operations of future development, depending on the type of development, could require the use or storage of acutely hazardous materials. Regardless of the development, some amount of hazardous materials may be used for regular maintenance and cleaning of commercial businesses and residences, but these materials are usually not considered a significant risk to health and safety, and use, handling, and storage of hazardous materials would be expected to be in compliance with the appropriate safety standards. According to the Program EIR, heavier commercial and industrial uses that involve warehousing, manufacturing, processing, rendering, or fabrication or other operation that may include hazardous materials, are required to obtain a conditional use permit (CUP) from the City. The purpose of the CUP process is to ensure that the public's health safety and welfare are protected. Projects are routed to responsible agencies for their review and comment. For example, projects are routed to the City of Fresno Fire Department and the Fresno County Health Department for review and recommended conditions to insure compliance with applicable health and safety regulations. In the event hazardous materials would be stored on-site (including solvents, pesticides and other chemicals) a business response plan is required by Fresno County Health Department. (City of Fresno 1999, p. 1.4-15).

While it is unknown at this time how or when development projects made possible by the Amendment will occur, redevelopment activities are required by the Redevelopment Plan to be consistent with the City's General Plan and must conform to all other applicable land development plans and policies in the Project Area. The proposed redevelopment activities would not generate significant effects related to Hazards, and redevelopment activities would have a beneficial effect on the remediation and reuse of sites that may contain hazardous wastes (City of Fresno 1999, p. 1.4-15). Additionally, all future development would have to fully comply with applicable federal, state, and local law regarding the transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials. Future development would be designed in accordance with City development standards and would be subject to additional environmental review, if required by CEQA. The Amendment makes no changes that affect this consistency. Therefore, the Project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials, and impacts would be less than significant.

- b. **Less-than-Significant Impact.** As discussed above, hazardous substances would be used in the construction and operation of future development within the Project Area. The risk of accidental release or explosion is possible. However, as described in VII.a., all future development would have to fully comply with applicable federal, state, and local law regarding the transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials. Future development would also require Fresno Fire Department, City of Fresno Development Department, and Fresno County Health Department review, and conditions could be placed on development to ensure compliance with applicable codes and regulation. Additionally, for future development that has a reasonable possibility of releasing hazardous materials into the environment, the City would require the development of a business response plan and, if necessary, a Risk Management and Prevention Program. The proposed redevelopment activities would not generate significant effects related to Hazards, and redevelopment activities would have a beneficial effect on the remediation and reuse of sites that may contain hazardous wastes (City of Fresno 1999, p. 1.4-15). No substantive changes have occurred since certification of the Program EIR. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

- c. **Less-than-Significant Impact.** There are no schools within the Project Area (City of Fresno 2009a). Schools may be developed in the future. However, as discussed in VII.a and VII.b, all future development would have to fully comply with applicable federal, state, and local law regarding the transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials. Future development would also require Fresno Fire Department, City of Fresno Development Department, and Fresno County Health Department review, and conditions could be placed on development to ensure compliance with applicable codes and regulation. Additionally, for future development that has a reasonable possibility of releasing hazardous materials into the environment, the City would require the development of a business response plan and, if necessary, a Risk Management and Prevention Program. With proper implementation of necessary plans and programs, future development within the Project Area would not emit hazardous emissions or involve handling hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste that would result in a significant adverse risk to a nearby proposed school. The proposed redevelopment activities would not generate significant effects related to hazards, and redevelopment activities would have a beneficial effect on the remediation and reuse of sites that may contain hazardous wastes (City of Fresno 1999, p. 1.4-15). No substantive changes have occurred since certification of the Program EIR. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.
- d. **Less-than-Significant Impact.** The Project Area contains an active site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 (Cortese List): 1) Fresno Air Terminal/Old Hammer Field. This site is considered "active" by the California Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC), but is not a "Super Fund" site (California Department of Toxic Substance Control 2009). This site was active during the preparation of the Program EIR (California Department of Toxic Substance Control 2009). Remediation of this site is governed by the DTSC, which is charged with conducting and overseeing cleanups for sites found on the Cortese List. The Cortese List also displays a number of leaking underground fuel tank (LUFT) cleanup sites.

The Program EIR acknowledges that older commercial and industrial properties may contain underground storage tanks, and that former uses may have used or stored hazardous materials in manners that are not consistent with today's standards and regulations. As a result, there may be localized sites that contain hazardous wastes. Older structures may also have been constructed with materials containing asbestos. As standard course of project development, Phase 1- Initial Site Assessments for hazardous wastes are required by the City of Fresno and by Fresno County Health Department. Should the Phase 1 Initial Site Assessment determine that hazardous materials may exist on a site, a Phase II Study is then conducted to determine the extent of any hazardous wastes and the level of the remediation efforts that would be required. Fresno County Health Department is actively involved in the review and conditioning of demolition and construction permits to ensure health and safety concerns are addressed. With regards to asbestos, an asbestos removal plan is required to be approved by Fresno County Health Department and the SJVAPCD prior to the issuance of a demolition or construction plan (City of Fresno 1999, p. 1.4-15).

Additionally and in recognition that redevelopment and reuse is important in the remediation of future hazardous waste sites, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has established the "Brownfield" grants program to further redevelopment activities on such sites. Brownfields are those sites that have or are suspected to have hazardous wastes but are not contaminated to the extent of being a "Super Fund" site (City of Fresno 1999, p. 1.4-15), and funding through this program could be used within the Project Area for future development on contaminated sites.

These redevelopment activities would have a beneficial effect on the remediation and reuse of sites that may contain hazardous wastes (City of Fresno 1999, p. 1.4-16). No substantive changes have occurred since certification of the Program EIR. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

- e. **Less-than-Significant Impact.** The Project Area is located adjacent to and within the vicinity of Fresno Yosemite International Airport. It is also located within the *Fresno Yosemite International Airport and Environs Specific Plan* (the "Airport Plan") area, formerly known as the *Fresno Air Terminal Airport and Environs Specific Plan*, adopted in September 1992 and amended on June 24, 1997, before the certification of the Program EIR. As described in the Program EIR, the Redevelopment Plan for the Project Area has adopted the Airport Plan to protect the airport from encroachment from non-compatible land uses, including uses that may result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the Project Area. The Airport Plan establishes an Airport Review Area that requires referral of projects to the Airport Land Use Commission to determine consistency with the Airport Plan (City of Fresno 1999, p. 1.4-15). The Airport Referral Area covers the majority of the Project Area with the exception of the commercial centers at Shields and Cedar Avenues and the industrial area south of McKinley between Maple and Chestnut Avenues (City of Fresno 1999, p. 3.2.1-7).

As further described in the Program EIR, the Airport Plan regulates development on airport property and within the Specific Plan Area. The Airport Plan includes restrictions on the location and height of uses based on the proximity to the airport and its location with respect to the runways. The Airport Referral Area includes all property that is either subject to the 60 db community noise exposure level (CNEL) noise contour or greater and/or is affected by an airport safety zone. Within the Airport Review Area, the Airport Plan is the controlling land use document (City of Fresno 1999, p. 3.2.1-7). Because future development would be required to comply with the Airport Plan, future development would not result in building heights in close proximity that could affect landing and takeoff approaches nor expose people to undue hazards. No substantive changes have occurred since certification of the Program EIR. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

- f. **No Impact.** The Project Area is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip and therefore, would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the Project Area. See VII.e for more information. There would be no impact.
- g. **Less-than-Significant Impact.** Future construction within the Project Area could cause temporary detours and lane closures on streets, but it is the City's standard practice to coordinate construction activities with emergency service providers and encroachment permits would be required within City right-of-ways. As described in the Program EIR, future development within the Project Area is required to comply with Fresno Fire Department, City of Fresno Development Department, and Fresno County Health Department codes and regulations, including applicable emergency response and evacuation plans (City of Fresno 1999, p. 1.4-15). The proposed redevelopment activities would not generate significant effects related to Hazards, and redevelopment activities would have a beneficial effect on the remediation and reuse of sites that may contain hazardous wastes (City of Fresno 1999, p. 1.4-15). No substantive changes have occurred since certification of the Program EIR. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

- h. **No Impact.** The Project Area is surrounded by existing urban development and is not located adjacent to a wildland area. The future development would consist of residential, commercial, and industrial development with appreciable amounts of impervious surfaces and therefore, is not susceptible to wildland fires. Additionally, periodic weed abatement efforts are required in the Project Area in accordance with City standards. Therefore, wildland fires do not have the potential to affect the site, and no impacts would occur.

IX. Hydrology and Water Quality	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge, resulting in a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level that would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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 that would result in substantial erosion or siltation onsite or offsite?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding onsite or offsite?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area, as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect floodflows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j. Contribute to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

- a. **Less-than-Significant Impact.** Future construction activities have the potential to result in erosion, sedimentation, and the discharge of construction debris from the Project site. Clearing of vegetation and grading activities, for example, could lead to exposed or stockpiled soils susceptible to peak storm water runoff flows and wind forces. The compaction of soils by heavy equipment may minimally reduce the infiltration capacity of soils (exposed during construction) and increase runoff and erosion potential. The presence of large amounts of raw materials for construction, including concrete, asphalt, and slurry, may lead to stormwater runoff contamination. If uncontrolled, these materials could lead to water quality problems, including sediment-laden runoff, prohibited non-stormwater discharges, and ultimately the degradation of downstream receiving water bodies. Construction activities that disturb greater than 1 acre would be required to obtain coverage under the Statewide General Construction NPDES permit and prepare a SWPPP to minimize the potential runoff water quality impacts associated with construction. By obtaining coverage under the statewide NPDES General Permit for Construction Activities (Permit No. CAS000002) and the related preparation of a SWPPP, future site-specific construction activities would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements during the construction period and impacts would be less than significant.

Nonpoint source pollution is caused by surface runoff that picks up and carries away natural and human-made pollutants, depositing them into lakes, rivers, wetlands, coastal waters, and groundwater. Surface parking areas especially contribute to nonpoint source pollution (e.g., oil, grease, radiator fluid, pesticides, and excess fertilizer from landscape maintenance activities) washed into stormwater conveyance structures during rain events. As a result, urban development can result in the pollution of offsite drainages and aquifers. Future development must comply with the NPDES permit (NPDES No. CA0083500) and Waste Discharge Requirements (WDR) order (Order No. 5-01-048) issued by the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (CVRWQCB) for stormwater conveyance flows in Fresno County (Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board 2001). These 2001 NPDES and WDR standards are more protective than the 1999 stormwater quality standards. Future development in the Project Area would be subject to the requirements of the NPDES permit and WDR order, which are met in the Fresno area through compliance with the City and Fresno Metropolitan Flood Control District grading and drainage standards (City of Fresno 1999, , p. 1.4-4).

The Program EIR found effects related to hydrology would be less than significant (City of Fresno 1999, , p. 1.4-4). No substantive changes have occurred since certification of the Program EIR, and a less-than-significant impact would result from the Project.

- b. **Less-than-Significant Impact.** Future development within the Project Area would incrementally increase the demand for potable water. The majority of the water supply for the Fresno area is obtained through percolated and recharged groundwater (70% to 85% during low-demand winter periods and high-demand summer periods, respectively) (City of Fresno 2009a). According to the City's Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP), there are "no projected supply shortfalls" in water supply contingent upon the timely implementation of the Planned Supply Projects and Programs (UWMP, 4-15) (a significant portion of which is obtained from groundwater) for normal, single dry, and multiple dry year scenarios ending in 2010, 2015, 2020, and 2030 provided that future development is consistent with the General Plan (City of Fresno 2008a). The UWMP was adopted on August 19, 2008, after the certification of the Program EIR. If proposed future development within the Project Area is consistent with the General Plan and future updates, then development has been accounted for in the UWMP,

provided that development does not exceed land use based water allocations identified in the UWMP by constructing high water use characteristics, e.g., water features, excessive amount of landscaping, over densification. The Redevelopment Plan's expiration date (6/29/2029) and the Amendment's expiration date (12 years from approval) are within the 2030 date analyzed in the UWMP. Therefore, water supply has been adequately analyzed in the UWMP for the Project Area, and a less-than-significant impact would result from the Project.

- c. **Less-than-Significant Impact.** As discussed in VI.b and VIII.a, compliance with the Statewide General Construction NPDES permit is required for direct or indirect discharges of stormwater runoff to waters of the United States from future construction that causes soil disturbance over 1 acre. Adherence to the Statewide General Construction NPDES permit requires that any site-specific project applicant develop and implement a SWPPP. A SWPPP includes Best Management Practices (BMPs) to stop all products of erosion as a result of runoff from moving off site into receiving waters during construction.

The Project Area is essentially flat ground with modest potential for runoff. Future construction and placement of commercial structures, landscaping, parking lots, and other impermeable surfaces would alter the existing drainage patterns of the Project Area by preventing precipitation from entering the soil column. However, implementation of the City and Fresno Metropolitan Flood Control District (FMFCD) grading and drainage standards would prevent operational runoff from the Project site from exceeding existing peak flows. Increased impervious surfaces would also virtually eliminate erosion potential because there would be minimal soil surface area exposed to erosion processes, and landscaping in areas not paved over would anchor and stabilize soils to further reduce erosion potential.

As discussed in the Program EIR, the storm drain system has been designed by FMFCD to accommodate build-out of the Project Area. The majority of the permanent storm drain facilities have been constructed in the Project Area. Development projects are reviewed by the City of Fresno and the Fresno Metropolitan Flood Control District for compliance with drainage requirements. Future Development is required to participate in the completion of the drainage system, and the Program EIR found effects related to hydrology would be less than significant (City of Fresno 1999, p. 1.4-4). No substantive changes have occurred since certification of the Program EIR, and a less-than-significant impact would result from the Project.

- d. **Less-than-Significant Impact.** See response to VIII.c. No substantive changes have occurred since certification of the Program EIR, and a less-than-significant impact would result from the Project.
- e. **Less-than-Significant Impact.** The Project Area is essentially flat ground with minimal potential for runoff. Future construction would create bare ground that would be exposed to potential erosion; any erosion off site would create a significant impact because it could flow into downstream water bodies. The federal Clean Water Act regulates the discharge of pollutants to waters of the United States in accordance with state and local NPDES permits. As discussed in VI.b, compliance with the Statewide General Construction NPDES permit is required for direct or indirect discharges of stormwater runoff to waters of the United States from construction projects that cause soil disturbance over 1 acre and potential runoff. Adherence to the Statewide General Construction NPDES permit requires that any site-specific project applicant develop and implement a SWPPP.

As discussed in the Program EIR, the storm drain system has been designed by the FMFCD to accommodate build-out of the Project Area. The majority of the permanent storm drain facilities have been constructed in the Project Area. Development projects are reviewed by the City of Fresno and the Fresno Metropolitan Flood Control District for compliance with drainage requirements. Future Development is required to participate in the completion of the drainage system. Proposed redevelopment activities would also aid in the construction of infrastructure consistent with the FMFCD drainage plans and the City's Water Resources Management Plan. The redevelopment activities would assist in removal of underground storage tanks and the clean-up of sites that otherwise would be continuing threats to groundwater quality (City of Fresno 1999, p. 1.4-4). There is no evidence indicating that this is not still the case. Because no substantive changes have occurred since certification of the Program EIR, a less-than-significant impact would result from the Project.

- f. **Less-than-Significant Impact.** See responses to VIII.a and VIII.e. No substantive changes have occurred since certification of the Program EIR, and a less-than-significant impact would result from the Project.
- g. **No Impact.** According to the Program EIR, the Redevelopment Plan areas analyzed are located in Flood Zone B (areas between the 100-year flood and the 500-year flood) or Zone C (areas of minimal flooding), and the Program EIR found effects related to hydrology would be less than significant (City of Fresno 1999, , p. 1.4-4). Flood Zone A areas (areas subject to 100-year floods) are limited to the canals and ponding basins within the Project Area (City of Fresno 1999, , p. 1.4-3). According to Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) No. 0619C1590H (Federal Emergency Management Agency 2009), the Project Area is mostly designated Zone X⁸ with limited areas designated Zone A, consistent with the Program EIR. Zone X is not within the 100-year floodplain. Also, the Best Available Data maps for the Fresno area compiled by the Department of Water Resources do not show any additional risk of flooding (California Department of Water Resources 2008). Therefore, the Project would not place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area, as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary, FIRM, or other flood hazard delineation map and there would be no impact.
- h. **Less-than-Significant Impact.** As discussed in VIII.g, portions of the Project Area are within the 100-year flood plain (City of Fresno 1999; Federal Emergency Management Agency 2009). Future development, if proposed in areas subject to shallow flooding, would meet the requirements of the City and the Fresno Metropolitan Flood Control District. With these requirements, the impacts are not new or more severe than in the 1999 Program EIR. Therefore, a less-than-significant impact would result from the Project.
- i. **Less-than-Significant Impact.** See response to VII.h. A surface water body does not traverse the Project Area, and the area is not within a dam failure flood inundation zone. Therefore, the Project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam and impacts would be less than significant.
- j. **No Impact.** The Project Area is not located near any significantly sized enclosed body of water or coastal area and is, therefore, not susceptible to a seiche or tsunami. The site is not located at the foot of any significant topographical feature with the potential for mudflow. No impacts would occur.

⁸ Zone X is a zone with areas of 0.2% annual flood chance (500-year floodplain).

X. Land Use and Planning	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, a general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

- a. **No Impact.** The Project Area is located within the highly urbanized vicinity of Fresno Yosemite International Airport and is surrounded by built land uses, including various residential, commercial, public facilities, and industrial land uses as well as some open space. Development under the Project would be urban infill, consistent with the General Plan. As such, the Project does not have the capacity to divide an established community and there would be no impact.
- b. **No Impact.** As described in the Program EIR, no land use changes are proposed to the City's General Plan or applicable community and specific plans in the Project Area, including the McLane Community Plan (City of Fresno 1979), Roosevelt Community Plan (City of Fresno 1992a), or the Airport Plan (City of Fresno 1992b). The proposed redevelopment actions and activities are considered to be implementation tools of the City's adopted land use plans. The redevelopment activities would facilitate continued development within the Project Area consistent with the City's adopted land use plans. The redevelopment activities would assist in the removal of physical and economic blighted conditions in the Project Area. In certain locations in the Project Area, the redevelopment activities may expedite the conversion of non-conforming uses to uses that are consistent with the City's adopted land plans (City of Fresno 1999, p. 3.2.1-1). Future development within the Project Area would need to be consistent with the City's adopted land use plans and policies. As such, the Project would not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigation an environmental effect and no impacts would occur.
- c. **No Impact.** As discussed in IV.f above, there is no adopted habitat conservation plan, natural community conservation plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan that is applicable to the Project Area. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan and there would be no impact.

XI. Mineral Resources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

- a. **No Impact.** According to the Program EIR, the most significant mineral resources within the City are sand and gravel. These resources are located principally along the San Joaquin River, outside of the Plan Area. Gas and oil resources are not found within the greater Fresno-Clovis Metropolitan Area (City of Fresno 1999, p. 1.4-13). The *City of Fresno 2025 Fresno General Plan Land Use and Circulation Map* does not show any General Plan mineral resource land use designations within the Project Area (City of Fresno 2009a). Therefore, the Project would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state, and there would be no impact.
- b. **No Impact.** No portion of the Project Area is designated as a locally important mineral resource recovery site as determined by the California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology (City of Fresno 2002, p. VO-1) site. Also, see X.a above for more information. Therefore, there is no impact.

XII. Noise	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Expose persons to or generate noise levels in excess of standards established in a local general plan or noise ordinance or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Expose persons to or generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Be located within an airport land use plan area, or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport and expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Be located in the vicinity of a private airstrip and expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

- a. **Less-than-Significant Impact.** The 1999 Program EIR concludes that construction activities, because they are short-term and intermittent, would not result in significant noise impacts (City of Fresno 1999, p. 3.2.4-1). The Program EIR requires that future development within the Project Area adhere to City standards, which include and the City's current performance standards found in the zoning ordinance, noise ordinance, the City's General Plan and relevant specific plans. Adherence to the City's performance standards would reduce noise effects to a level of less than significance. In addition, development within the Airport Plan area is required to be consistent with the Airport Plan's land use/noise compatibility matrix. The City also requires locating potential noise generating uses away from sensitive land uses/receptors (e.g., educational facilities, hospitals, churches, and residential land uses).

The Program EIR found that adherence to the City's performance standards contained in its zoning ordinance and its noise ordinance would reduce noise effects to a level of less than significance (City of Fresno 1999, p. 3.2.4-1). Continued implementation of the Airport Plan acts to mitigate noise, and addition mitigation to further attenuate noise was incorporated to further reduce potential noise impact to less-than-significant levels. These include: evaluation of industrial uses for their noise effects on adjoining noise sensitive uses and consideration of operational controls to reduce noise; muffling construction vehicles and equipment; limiting

construction operations adjacent to noise sensitive uses to between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m.; continued implementation of the noise control techniques recommended in the Noise Element of the Fresno General Plan; and special permit applications for commercial, industrial, and public facilities (City of Fresno 1999, p. 3.2.4-6).

The Amendment could potentially result in future development within the Project Area that would create new sources of noise. While it is unknown at this time how or when development projects made possible by the Amendment will occur, redevelopment activities are required by the Redevelopment Plan to be consistent with the City's General Plan and must conform to all other applicable land development plans and policies in the Project Area, including applicable noise standards. Additionally, future development would be designed in accordance with City development standards and would be subject to additional environmental review, if required by CEQA. The Amendment makes no changes that affect this consistency. Therefore, the Project would not result in a new or more severe impact in the context of the Program EIR, and impacts would be less than significant.

- b. **Less-than-Significant Impact.** Similar to noise generation (see XI.a above for more information), the Program EIR requires that future development within the Project Area adhere to City standards, which include locating potential vibrational (or ground-borne noise) generating uses (typically trucking and manufacturing operations) away from sensitive land uses/receptors (City of Fresno 1999, p. 3.2.4-1). Also, similar to noise generation, future construction could generate short-term vibration (or ground-borne noise) generation, such as by the use of earthmoving equipment, jack hammers, and pile drivers, but such activities would be short-term and intermittent and would not be significant (City of Fresno 1999, p. 3.2.4-1). Future development would be required to comply with applicable City standards regarding vibration (or ground-borne noise) generation for the construction and operational periods. No substantive changes have occurred since certification of the Program EIR, and impacts would be less than significant.
- c. **Less-than-Significant Impact.** See XI.a for more information. As discussed above, with inclusion of migration measures, the Program EIR concluded that noise impacts resulting from the Redevelopment Plan would be less-than-significant. While it is unknown at this time how or when development projects made possible by the Amendment will occur, redevelopment activities are required by the Redevelopment Plan to be consistent with the City's General Plan and must conform to all other applicable land development plans and policies in the Project Area, including applicable noise standards. Additionally, future development would be designed in accordance with City development standards and would be subject to additional environmental review, if required by CEQA. The Amendment makes no changes that affect this consistency. Therefore, the Project would not result in new or more severe impacts in the context of the Program EIR, and impacts would be less than significant.
- d. **Less-than-Significant Impact.** Temporary noise impacts could occur from future construction within the Project Area. As discussed in XII.a, future construction would also be required to adhere to applicable standards and established mitigation. No substantive changes have occurred since certification of the Program EIR indicating that the Amendment would result in a new or more severe impact from temporary or intermittent noise from construction. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

- e. **Less-than-Significant Impact.** As discussed in VIII.e, the Project Area is located within the vicinity of Fresno Yosemite International Airport and within the Airport Plan area. As discussed above in XII.a., future development within the Airport Plan area is required to be consistent with the Airport Plan's land use/noise compatibility matrix, and continued implementation of the Airport Plan acts to mitigate noise. Because future development would be required to comply with the Airport Plan and all other City noise standards, future development would not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels. No substantive changes have occurred since certification of the Program EIR. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.
- f. **No Impact.** As discussed in VII.f, the Project Area is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip and therefore, would not expose people located in the vicinity of a private airstrip and residing or working in the Project Area to excessive noise levels. There would be no impact.

XIII. Population and Housing	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Displace a substantial number of existing housing units, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Displace a substantial number of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

a. **Less-than-Significant Impact.** The Program EIR concludes that the provision of new housing would result in population gains in the area from new housing units, but that effects to population would be generally positive, and not environmentally significant (City of Fresno 1999, p. 3.2.2-3). Proposed redevelopment activities would be consistent with the goals and implementation strategies of the City's Housing Element of the General Plan, the residential land use policies of the General Plan, and relevant community and specific plans to meet the City's housing needs, including affordable housing. Future development may also bring additional people into the greater Fresno area as a result of job opportunities created by future development. Future development is required to be consistent with population forecasts adopted by the Council of Fresno County Governments in order to accommodate Fresno's fair share of the regional growth forecast. Additionally, the Project would not result in the extension of infrastructure (e.g., extending roads, potable water lines, sewer lines, etc. into open space on the fringe of the City) that would facilitate future development in nonurban areas and therefore, would not induce population growth.

While it is unknown at this time how or when development projects made possible by the Amendment will occur, redevelopment activities are required by the Redevelopment Plan to be consistent with the City's General Plan and must conform to all other applicable land development plans and policies in the Project Area. Additionally, future development would be designed in accordance with City development standards and would be subject to additional environmental review, if required by CEQA. The Amendment makes no changes that affect this consistency. Therefore, the Project would not result in a new or more severe impact in the context of the Program EIR, and impacts would be less than significant.

b. **Less-than-Significant Impact.** The proposed Airport Area Revitalization Redevelopment Project Area was found to affect approximately 28 residential units that are non-conforming with respect to the property's planned industrial use. State law and Agency procedures require the payment of just compensation, including relocation assistance for those displaced as a result of redevelopment activities, whenever eminent domain is used to acquire property. Redevelopment law also requires replacement on a one-for-one basis of any low- and moderate income housing unit removed or destroyed by the Agency. The Redevelopment Agency is

required to provide that a minimum of 20-percent of tax increment funds be aside for low and moderate housing projects. The Redevelopment Plan includes a low- and moderate-income program aimed at stabilizing housing conditions and increasing the supply of affordable housing. Therefore, the Program EIR concludes that effects related to housing would be mitigated to a level of less than significant (City of Fresno 1999, p. 3.2.2-1).

While it is unknown at this time how or when development projects made possible by the Amendment will occur, redevelopment activities are required by the Redevelopment Plan to be consistent with the City's General Plan and must conform to all other applicable land development plans and policies in the Project Area, including those related to housing relocation. No substantive changes have occurred since certification of the Program EIR, and impacts would be less than significant.

- c. **Less-than-Significant Impact.** As discussed in XIII.b., above, future actions as a result of the Project could displace people within the Project Area. These actions include removal of nonconforming residential units. However, displaced people as a result of future actions by the Agency within the Project Area are entitled to just compensation and relocation assistance (City of Fresno 1999, p. 3.2.2-1). No substantive changes have occurred since certification of the Program EIR, and impacts would be less than significant.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

XIV. Public Services

Would the project:

- a. Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities or a 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 following public services:

Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- a. **Less-than-Significant Impact.** The need for public services is primarily driven by population growth. As population grows, so does the need for additional public services (facilities and personnel) to meet necessary service ratios, school class size requirements, and the goal of ample recreational opportunities for a healthier citizenry. As discussed in XIII.a, the Project would not induce substantial population growth. Future development within the Project Area would generate an incremental increase in the need for some public services (City of Fresno 1999, p. 3.2.5-1). The following discussions further describe the Project’s effect on specific public services:

Fire Protection

The Program EIR found that construction activities as a result of future development may increase the potential for fires, but are not considered to be significant. City of Fresno Fire Department regulations require that for large projects, a fire inspector be on site until completion of the shell structure (City of Fresno 1999, p. 3.2.5-4). Operations of future development within the Project Area would incrementally increase demand for fire protection services within the Project Area, but the Program EIR found that staffing and equipment levels would be sufficient to accommodate future development in the Project Area (City of Fresno 1999, p. 3.2.5-4). Additionally, all future structures and site improvements would have to be constructed in accordance with the most current building, safety, and fire codes adopted by the City. Fire flows in the Project Area are adequate to accommodate development projects, and the Fire Department reviews and conditions development projects to insure fire safety (City of Fresno 1999, p. 3.2.5-4). Removal of blighted conditions through rehabilitation/conservation, demolition, and construction of new structures as a result of the Project would also reduce the fire safety threat caused by vacant, abandoned, or substandard structures. This would be a beneficial effect (City of Fresno 1999, p. 3.2.5-4). No substantive changes have occurred since certification of the Program EIR, and a less-than-significant impact would result from the Project.

Police Protection

The Program EIR found that construction activities may result in potential equipment theft, trespassing, or vandalism, but this would not affect police protection service. Operations of future development would increase human activity, resulting in an incrementally increased need for police protection services due to the increased potential for theft, vandalism, and other crimes (City of Fresno 1999, p. 3.2.5-5). However, design considerations for future development to be approved by the City would include security lighting, call boxes, and other required security measures, which would reduce the potential for crime. In addition, the removal of blighted conditions would have the anticipated effect of lowering police calls and therefore would have a beneficial effect on police services. (City of Fresno 1999, p. 3.2.5-5). The Program EIR found that impacts from the Redevelopment Plan on police services would be less-than-significant. No substantive changes have occurred since certification of the Program EIR, and a less-than-significant impact would result from the Project.

Schools

As described in the Program EIR, there are no school facilities in the Project Area (City of Fresno 1999, p. 3.2.7-2). Nonetheless, redevelopment projects may affect schools through the addition or removal of residential units, and future residential projects may increase the number of school aged children that need to be served. In addition, non-residential development may result in a small increase in the number of school-age children as a result of an increase in employment opportunities and families that might relocate to the Fresno area because of those opportunities. However, the Fresno Unified School District has enacted developer's fees to offset the effects residential and non-residential development projects may have related to school facilities. Also, state law establishes a formula to offset property tax revenues lost to the Fresno Unified School District due to the fact that the Agency receives the tax increment generated by future development (City of Fresno 1999, p. 3.2.7-2). The Program EIR found impact on school facilities to be less than significant. No substantive changes have occurred since certification of the Program EIR, and a less-than-significant impact would result from the Project.

Parks

The Program EIR states that there are no publicly maintained parks located within the Project Area, only that a neighborhood park is planned to be located south of Olive Avenue on Minnewawa Avenue, and that impacts to park and recreational facilities would be less than significant (City of Fresno 1999, p. 3.2.5-2 to 3.2.5-5). However, the Palm Lakes Municipal Golf Course property is located in the Plan Area, just north of the airport. Therefore, future development in the Plan Area has the potential to effect park and recreational facilities. While it is unknown at this time how or when development projects made possible by the Amendment will occur, redevelopment activities are required by the Redevelopment Plan to be consistent with the City's General Plan and must conform to all other applicable land development plans and policies in the Project Area, including the City's Park Master Plan and payment of any required park and recreation fees. Additionally, future development would be designed in accordance with City development standards and would be subject to additional environmental review, if required by CEQA. The Amendment makes no changes that affect this consistency. Therefore, the Project would not result in any additional effects that were not already analyzed in the Program EIR, and impacts would be less than significant.

Other Facilities

The demand for emergency services would incrementally increase as a result of future development as a result of increased human activities in the Project Area. However, the Program EIR determined that emergency service providers have adequate capacity to accommodate future development without affecting response times (City of Fresno 1999, p. 3.2.5-5). Also, redevelopment projects that include road reconstruction, widening, and other improvements would decrease the need for continual and incremental repairs. This would be a beneficial effect but is not considered to be environmentally significant. Due to the fact that the Agency collects a property tax increment from future development, and because this would result in fiscal effects to a number of other public services, including public schools and library services (City of Fresno 1999, p. 3.2.7-2), state redevelopment law establishes a formula to offset these lost revenues. However, as explained in the Program EIR, potential financial effects are not considered to be significant as they would not represent a significant physical change or effect on the environment (City of Fresno 1999, p. 3.2.5-6). No substantive changes have occurred since certification of the Program EIR, and a less-than-significant impact would result from the Project.

XV. Recreation	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- a. **Less-than-Significant Impact.** As discussed in XIII.a, the Program EIR concludes that future development may result in small population gains in the Project Area due to the construction of new housing units, which would result in the increased use of existing neighborhood and regional parks. While it is unknown at this time how or when development projects made possible by the Amendment will occur, redevelopment activities are required by the Redevelopment Plan to be consistent with the City’s General Plan and must conform to all other applicable land development plans and policies in the Project Area, including the City’s Park Master Plan and payment of any required park and recreation fees. Future development would be designed in accordance with City development standards and would be subject to additional environmental review, if required by CEQA. The Amendment makes no changes that affect this consistency. Therefore, the Project would not result in any additional effects that were not already analyzed in the Program EIR, and impacts would be less than significant.
- b. **Less-than-Significant Impact.** As discussed in XIV.a, park and recreational areas would need to be provided within the Project Area in accordance the City s General Plan and must conform to all other applicable land development plans and policies in the Project Area, including the City’s Park Master Plan and payment of any required park and recreation fees. Future development would be designed in accordance with City development standards and would be subject to additional environmental review, if required by CEQA. The Amendment makes no changes that affect this consistency. Therefore, the Project would not result in any additional effects that were not already analyzed in the Program EIR, and impacts would be less than significant.

XVI. Transportation/Traffic	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation, including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including, but not limited to, intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to, level-of-service standards and travel demand measures or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Substantially increase hazards because of a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- a. **Less-than-Significant Impact.** Transportation planning within the Project Area is the responsibility of the City, Caltrans, Fresno County, and the Fresno Council of Governments (Fresno COG). Future development may entail abandonment and/or realignment of certain streets, alleys, or other right-of-ways. Any changes in the Project Area’s existing circulation system would have to comply with the current General Plan and future updates, objectives of the Redevelopment Plan, relevant community plans or other future adopted plans, and City design standards. Future development would be reviewed on a case-by-case basis for compliance with these plans, strategies, and standards.

The City's adopted circulation plan is the City's primary long range transportation planning tool. The Circulation Elements of the General Plan and relevant community plans establishes the relationship between planned land uses and the necessary circulation system to support those

land uses in the Project Area. In summary of the Circulation Elements, the elements establish a hierarchy of streets, ranging from local streets upward to freeways. The City of Fresno has adopted standards for each street classification (City of Fresno 1999, p. 3.2.3-1).

Since 1998, there have been a number of circulation improvements within the Project Area. Although, these topics were not analyzed in the Program EIR, these changes were intended to reduce traffic congestion within the Project Area and were done in compliance with applicable plans, strategies, and standards. Therefore, the Project would not result in a new or more severe impact as a result of these changes.

Future development that produces 100 or more peak-hour trips would be required to prepare a traffic analysis to evaluate its contribution to increased peak-hour vehicle delay at major street intersections adjacent or proximate to the future development in accordance with Mitigation Measure B-4 of the 2025 Fresno General Plan Master EIR (MEIR).

The extension of the eminent domain power within the Redevelopment Plan Area may result in intensification of land uses within the Project Area. The Program EIR concludes that the short-term, construction-related traffic effects as a result of future development would be less than significant by complying with established City and Agency procedures that call for the coordination of construction plans, temporary street closures, and detour plans with affected agencies as well as notification of users (City of Fresno 1999, p. 3.2.3-9). The Program EIR concluded that long-term traffic impacts would be reduced with the continued construction of public improvements, including but not limited to street widening and extensions, intersection improvements, railroad grade improvements, provision of public parking, and construction of curb, gutter, sidewalk, and streetscape improvements such as lighting and landscaping (City of Fresno 1999, p. 3.2.3-9). Implementing improvements in conformance with the current General Plan and applicable community plans or other future plans would reduce long-term traffic impacts as a result of future development in the Project Area to a less-than-significant level. The Program EIR concludes, however, that even with sufficient mitigation for the long-term, the contribution of future development within the Project Area would result in a significant and unavoidable cumulative traffic impact due to the decline in level of service (LOS) at several local intersections in the Project Area (City of Fresno 1999, p. 1.4-16). The cumulative impacts of the Project were disclosed in the Program EIR and have not changed; therefore, the Project would not result in a new or more severe impact as a result of these changes. Impacts would be less than significant.

- b. **Less-than-Significant Impact.** As discussed in XVI.a, by complying with applicable plans, strategies, and standards, future development in the Project Area would not significantly impact traffic, and therefore related LOS, during the construction and operational periods, but it would result in a significant and unavoidable cumulative traffic impact due to the decline of LOS at local intersections in the Project Area. However, the cumulative significance of this impact was disclosed in the Program EIR; therefore, the Project would not result in a new or more severe impact in this area.
- c. **No Impact.** As discussed in VIII.e, a significant portion of the northwestern part of the Project Area is located within the Airport Plan area, but because future development would be required to comply with the Airport Plan, future development would not result in building heights in close proximity that could affect landing and takeoff approaches. Additionally, the Project would not appreciably increase population (see XIII.a above) that would result in a significant

increase in air traffic levels, and the project would not require the airport to change locations. Discussions about airport hazards and airport-related noise have been discussed above. No substantive changes have occurred since certification of the Program EIR indicating that the Project would result in a new or more severe impact. Therefore, no impact on air traffic patterns would result from the Project.

- d. **Less-than-Significant Impact.** Future development would be required to comply with Caltrans and/or City road design standards, which would ensure that hazardous design features or incompatible uses would not occur. Future development would also remove existing hazardous road conditions in order to be compliant with these standards. No substantive changes have occurred since certification of the Program EIR indicating that the Project would result in a new or more severe impact. Therefore, a less-than-significant impact is anticipated from the Project.
- e. **No Impact.** Future development would be required to comply with City of Fresno Fire Department standards for adequate emergency access. Future development would also assist in removing currently inadequate access points within the Project Area in order to be compliant with these standards. No substantive changes have occurred since certification of the Program EIR indicating that the Project would result in a new or more severe impact. Therefore, no impact would result from the Project.
- f. **Less-than-Significant Impact.** As discussed in XVI.a, any changes in the Project Area's existing circulation system would have to comply with the current General Plan or other future adopted plans, and City design standards. Future development would be reviewed on a case-by-case basis for compliance with these plans, strategies, and standards. Agency-allowed redevelopment activities include alternative transportation improvements projects, such as streetscape improvements, street lights, pedestrian walkways, bridges, sidewalks, traffic signals, utility undergrounding, bicycle paths, street medians, trails, and trolley crossings. These allowed improvements would support alternative transportation in the area. The Project would extend eminent domain power to provide assistance in implementing City strategies and policies found in the current General Plan or other future adopted plans to improve pedestrian, bicycle, and transit access in the Project Area. No substantive changes have occurred since certification of the Program EIR indicating that the Project would result in a new or more severe impact. Therefore, a less-than-significant impact would result from the Project.

XVII. Utilities and Service Systems	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or would new or expanded entitlements be needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

a. **Less-than-Significant Impact.** Future development within the Project Area would generate additional wastewater that would need to be treated before properly disposed or recycled. This wastewater water would be treated at the Fresno/Clovis Regional Water Reclamation Facility in accordance with specific effluent water quality requirements specified in the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board's (CVRWQCB) Tulare Lake Basin Plan, the Waste Discharge Requirements (WDR) order (Order No. 2006-0003-DWQ, Statewide General Waste Discharge Requirements for Sanitary Sewer Systems, State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB), May 2, 2006), and in compliance with California Code of Regulations (CCR) Title 22 requirements for recycled water quality. By law, the facility must comply with CVRWQCB, SWRCB, and CCR requirements or make improvements and pay fines if found to be out of compliance. In the Sewer System Management Plan, the City has developed a comprehensive strategy to address necessary improvements within the existing wastewater distribution system in order to ensure applicable wastewater treatment requirements are met (City of Fresno 2009c). Water quality requirements in these documents are more stringent than requirements

placed on the Project in 1999. No substantive changes have occurred since certification of the Program EIR indicating that the Project would result in a new or more severe impact. Therefore, a less-than-significant impact would result from the Project.

- b. **Less-than-Significant Impact.** The Program EIR acknowledges that sections of the wastewater distribution system (sewer system) are antiquated and in need of repair or replacement (City of Fresno 1999, p. 3.2.6-3). As described in the Program EIR, although the trunk sewer lines that serve the Project Area have been completed and are adequate in capacity to accommodate planned land uses, there are deficiencies in the sewer main system that serves the area (City of Fresno 1999, p. 3.2.6-3). Several of the sewer lines are experiencing increasingly high maintenance and are in need of replacement. Sections of the sewer system in the Project Area would not be able to support planned land uses as a result of future redevelopment activities (City of Fresno 1999, p. 1.4-16). Additionally, the City's recent Sewer System Management Plan includes a number of necessary rehabilitation and capacity upgrade sewer system projects that are necessary in the Project Area (City of Fresno 2009c).

Future development within the Project Area would be required to obtain a sewer permit from the City director of development to connect to the existing sewer system and pay a sewer connection charge in accordance with City Municipal Code Section 6-304. During operations, future development would also have to pay a sewer service charge in accordance with City Municipal Code Section 6-305. In accordance with City Municipal Code Section 6-337, a sewer service fund has been established where sewer connection and sewer service charges are deposited to pay for acquisition, construction, and reconstruction of the publicly owned treatment works (POTW), including wastewater treatment plant (WWTP) expansions and new construction. Necessary sewer capital improvements in the Project Area outlined in the Sewer System Management Plan would also be funded through the sewer service fund. Future POTW acquisition, construction, and reconstruction (WWTP and sewer capital improvements) would be subject to additional CEQA analysis that includes mitigating environmental impacts to the greatest extent feasible, which is out of the scope of this documentation. Obtaining a sewer permit and paying necessary charges in accordance with City Municipal Code, coupled with future WWTP CEQA review, would result in a less-than-significant impact due to the construction of new wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, including sewer capital improvements.

The Program EIR acknowledges that sections of the City's wastewater collection system are in need of replacement due to age but that compliance with the City Municipal Code would reduce impacts to less than significant. As discussed above, future development would have to comply with the City Municipal Code. Therefore, pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15162, no new or more severe impacts on wastewater treatment facilities would result as part of the Project that have not already been disclosed in the Program EIR.

Please note that, unlike potable water, wastewater impacts are primarily the product of the capacity and condition of the conveyance facilities as well as the treatment plant's capacity rather than the availability of the water supply (see XVII.d for more information about water supply). Unlike water supply, where future development would either have to comply with the UWMP or be required to have sufficient water supplies for implementation during the site review process, wastewater adequacy does not have a project-level discretionary process that ensures that sufficient facilities are present prior to development. The Sewer System

Management Plan is the City's planning document to address and prioritize current and future wastewater capacity and conveyance needs.

- c. **Less-than-Significant Impact.** The Program EIR concluded that the stormwater drainage facilities have been completed within the Project Area and are sized to adequately convey stormwater flows for current development (City of Fresno 1999, p. 3.2.6-6). The Project Area is essentially flat ground with minimal potential for runoff. Future construction would create bare ground that would be exposed to potential erosion (during construction); any erosion off site would create a significant impact because it could flow into downstream water bodies. The federal Clean Water Act regulates the discharge of pollutants to waters of the United States in accordance with state and local NPDES permits. As discussed in VI.b, compliance with the Statewide General Construction NPDES permit is required for direct or indirect discharges of stormwater runoff to waters of the United States from construction projects that cause soil disturbance of at least 1 acre (or less than 1 acre if part of a larger common plan of development or sale). Adherence to the Statewide General Construction NPDES permit requires that the applicant develop and implement a SWPPP. No substantive changes have occurred since certification of the Program EIR indicating that the Project would result in a new or more severe impact. As discussed in VI.b and IX.e, future development would have to conform to requirements of the City and Fresno Metropolitan Flood Control District (i.e., the District's master plan); individual development's stormwater conveyance needs would have to be reviewed and approved by the City (City of Fresno 1999, p. 1.4-4). A future development's stormwater drainage system improvements would have to be reviewed and approved by the Fresno Metropolitan Flood Control District for conformance with the District's master plan prior to improvement construction. Therefore, the Project may require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities. However, this was contemplated in the Program EIR, and no substantive changes have occurred since certification of the Program EIR indicating that the Project would result in a new or more severe impact. Therefore, a less-than-significant impact is anticipated.
- d. **Less-than-Significant Impact.** As discussed in IX.b, the City's Department of Public Utilities notes that, if proposed future development within the Project Area is consistent with the General Plan and future updates, then development has been accounted for in the UWMP provided that development does not exceed land use based water allocations identified in the UWMP by constructing high water use characteristics, e.g., water features, excessive amount of landscaping, over densification. Future development that may exceed land based water allocations would be subject to the City's Special Permit review process, set forth in Fresno Municipal Code (FMC) Sections 12-405 and 12-406. In accordance with FMC, the City could place water conservation conditions on future developments or require the purchasing of additional water entitlements necessary to offset the water demand of future developments not covered in the UWMP as part of the issuance of a special permit. Required compliance with FMC Sections 12-405 and 12-406, as necessary, would result in future development compliance with the UWMP, which relies predominantly on groundwater pumping for current and anticipated water supplies. Additionally, the Redevelopment Plan's expiration date (6/29/2029) and the Amendment's expiration date (12 years from approval) are within the 2030 date analyzed in the UWMP. Since redevelopment within the Project Area is required to be compliance with the General Plan, and because the General Plan has already accounted for the Project in its analysis, water supply has been analyzed for these Constituent Project Areas under the UWMP. Therefore, the Project would have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from

existing entitlements and resources, nor would new or expanded entitlements be needed. Impacts would be less than significant.

- e. **Less-than-Significant Impact.** See response to XVII.b. As set forth therein, the Project would not result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that 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. Impacts would be less than significant.
- f. **Less-than-Significant Impact.** Future development would increase the amount of solid waste generated in the City but was determined to be less than significant in the Program EIR (City of Fresno 1999, 3.2.6-6). Mitigation has been adopted by the current General Plan that requires adequate solid waste facilities and services for the collection, transfer, recycling, and disposal of solid waste for existing and planned development within the City (City of Fresno 2002). In order to effectuate the General Plan mandate, the City has recently adopted industrial, commercial, and multifamily recycling requirements as well as construction recycling requirements outlined in the City's Zero Waste Strategic Action Plan (City of Fresno 2008b). This plan's purpose is to achieve 75% diversion by 2012 and zero-waste status by 2025 (City of Fresno 2009c). Future development's compliance with the action plan would allow future development to be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the Project's solid waste disposal needs. The requirements in the City's Zero Waste Strategic Action Plan are more stringent than the requirements placed on the Project in 1999. No substantive changes have occurred since certification of the Program EIR indicating that the Project would result in a new or more severe impact. Therefore, no analysis is required in the Subsequent EIR.
- g. **Less-than-Significant Impact.** As discussed in the Program EIR, future development would comply with all local, state, and federal requirements for integrated waste management (e.g., recycling) and solid waste disposal (City of Fresno 1999, p. 3.2.6-4). Future development would also comply with all local, state, and federal requirements hazardous wastes or materials that require special disposal; see Hazards and Hazardous materials above for more information. Therefore, the Project would comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. No substantive changes have occurred since certification of the Program EIR indicating that the Project would result in a new or more severe impact. Therefore, impacts from the Project would be less-than-significant.

XVIII. Mandatory Findings of Significance	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

a. **Less-than-Significant Impact.** As discussed in Biological Resources above, there is no change to the Project or its circumstances, nor new information that the Project would result in a new or more severe impact (compared to those discussed in the Program EIR) that would degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, or substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal because there are no native habitats or wetlands within the Project Area. Therefore, the lack of suitable habitat, significant disturbance in the Project Area, and unsuitable hydrology or other critical resources precludes rare or endangered plants or animals. The Project would also not eliminate important examples of the major periods of California prehistory because the Project Area does not contain any known archaeological or paleontological resources, and appropriate mitigation is in place in the event that previously unknown resources are discovered (see V.b and V.c). Also, as discussed in V.a, the Program EIR found no known no known historic resources in the Project Area. Although there may be buildings and other resources not listed in the Program EIR that are now eligible for listing as historic resources, the Program EIR requires that the City and Agency to evaluate each structure on a proposed development site to determine its eligibility for listing on the City's Official Local List of Historic Places. Should a structure be determined to be eligible for listing, the project shall be processed in accordance with the City's established procedures and building codes with respect to preserving potential historic resources. Therefore, the Project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource, and impacts would be less than significant.

- b. **Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.** As discussed in Air Quality and Traffic, the Program EIR acknowledges that the Redevelopment Plan would result in cumulatively considerable air quality and traffic impacts. However, the cumulative impacts of the Redevelopment Plan were disclosed in the Program EIR and have not changed; therefore, the Project would not result in a new or more severe impact as a result of these changes. The Program EIR did not discuss potential impacts of the Redevelopment Plan with respect to global warming and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, as this was not required by the CEQA Statute or Guidelines at the time. All future development would generate some quantity of GHGs during its construction and operational period, and would contribute to cumulative global GHG emissions. However, adoption of MM-2, when fully incorporated into future development projects within the Project Area, would lessen GHG emissions from within the project area and achieve a reduction target of 29% below BAU, as stated in the SJVAPCD GHG guidance and, by inference, AB 32. With application of this mitigation, impacts would be less than significant.
- c. **Less-than-Significant Impact.** As discussed above, redevelopment activities could cause substantial adverse air quality and traffic effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly. However, these effects were disclosed in the Program EIR and have not changed; therefore, the Project would not result in a new or more severe impact as a result of these changes. Impacts would be less than significant.

XIX. Earlier Analysis

Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, one or more effects have been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a discussion should identify the following on attached sheets.

- a. **Earlier analyses used.** Identify earlier analyses and state where they are available for review.
- b. **Impact adequately addressed.** Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in the earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
- c. **Mitigation measures.** For effects that are “potentially significant unless mitigated,” describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.

Authority: Public Resources Code Sections 21083 and 21083.05.

Reference: Section 65088.4, Government Code; Sections 21080(c), 21080.1, 21080.3, 21082.1, 21083, 21083.05, 21083.3, 21093, 21094, 21095, and 21151, Public Resources Code; *Sundstrom v. County of Mendocino* (1988), 202 Cal. App. 3d 296; *Leonoff v. Monterey Board of Supervisors* (1990) 222 Cal.App.3d 1337; *Eureka Citizens for Responsible Govt. v. City of Eureka* (2007) 147 Cal.App.4th at 1109; *San Franciscans Upholding the Downtown Plan v. City and County of San Francisco* (2002) 102 Cal.App.4th 656.

Citations and References

- Bay Area Air Quality Management District. 2010. *Greenhouse Gas Reduction Measures*.
- California Department of Conservation. 2007. Williamson Act Program. Last updated: June 24, 2007. Available: <[http://www.consrv.ca.gov/DLRP/lca/basic_contract_provisions/index.htm#What%20is%20the%20California%20Land%20Conservation%20\(Williamson\)%20Act](http://www.consrv.ca.gov/DLRP/lca/basic_contract_provisions/index.htm#What%20is%20the%20California%20Land%20Conservation%20(Williamson)%20Act)>. Accessed: June 28, 2010.
- California Department of Conservation. 2008. Rural Land Mapping Edition, Fresno County Important Farmland 2008, Sheet 2 of 2. June 2010.
- California Department of Toxic Substance Control. 2009. Envirostor, Hazardous Waste and Substance List. Available: <http://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/search.asp?cmd=search&reporttype=CORTESE&site_type=CSITES%2COPEN%2CFUDS%2CCLOSE&status=ACT%2CBKLG%2CCOM&reporttitle=HAZARDOUS%20WASTE%20AND%20SUBSTANCES%20SITE%20LIST>. Accessed: June 30, 2010.
- California Department of Transportation. 2009. California Scenic Highway Mapping System, Fresno County. Available: <http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/scenic_highways/index.htm>. Accessed: June 30, 2010.
- California Department of Water Resources. 2008. Preliminary 100- and 200- Year Floodplains Based Upon Best Available Data. Available: <http://www.water.ca.gov/floodmgmt/lrafmo/fmb/fes/best_available_maps/fresno/fre_h7.pdf>. Accessed: July 9, 2010.
- California Geological Survey. 2007a. Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zones. Available: <<http://www.consrv.ca.gov/CGS/rghm/ap/index.htm>>. Accessed: June 30, 2010.
- California Geological Survey. 2007b. Special Publication No. 42. Fault-Rupture Hazard Zones in California, Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act with Index to Earthquake Fault Zones Maps. Interim Revision. Available: <<ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dmg/pubs/sp/Sp42.pdf>>. Accessed: June 30, 2010.
- Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board. 2001. Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board, Order No. 5-01-048, NPDES No. CA0083500, Waste Discharge Requirements for Fresno Metropolitan Control District, City of Fresno, City of Clovis, County of Fresno, and California State University Fresno, Urban Storm Water Discharges, Fresno County. Order Approved: March 21, 2009.
- City of Fresno. 1979. *McLane Community Plan*. May.
- City of Fresno. 1992a. *Roosevelt Community Plan*. April. Prepared by the City of Fresno Development Department, Planning Division, Fresno, CA.
- City of Fresno. 1992b. *Fresno Yosemite International Airport and Environs Specific Plan*. September.
- City of Fresno. 2002. *Draft Master Environmental Impact Report, No. 10130, 2025 Fresno General Plan*. May. Prepared by URS Corporation for the City of Fresno Planning & Development Department.

- City of Fresno. 2008a. *City of Fresno Urban Water Management Plan*. Adopted: August 19, 2008. Available: <<http://www.fresno.gov/Government/DepartmentDirectory/PublicUtilities/Watermanagement/WaterInformation/Default.htm>>. Accessed: June 30, 2010.
- City of Fresno. 2008b. *City of Fresno – Zero Waste Strategic Action Plan*. Approved: February 11, 2008. Available: <<http://www.fresno.gov/NR/rdonlyres/9112A6F3-33A3-428E-9762-6EBC0E0523B7/0/ZeroWasteStrategicActionPlan.pdf>>. Accessed: July 7, 2010.
- City of Fresno. 2009a. *City of Fresno 2025 Fresno General Plan Land Use and Circulation Map*. Updated: January 27, 2009. Available: <<http://www.fresno.gov/NR/rdonlyres/16BFB03A-2306-477A-859A-B1E76224B34C/0/gp2025big.pdf>>. Accessed: June 28, 2010.
- City of Fresno. 2009b. Draft – Air Quality Update of the 2025 Fresno General Plan Resource Conservation Element, 2025 General Plan Objectives, Policies, and Implementation Measures Relating to Air Quality (Pursuant to Assembly Bill 170). Revised May 7, 2009. Prepared for Plan Amendments Application No. A-09-02. Fresno, CA.
- City of Fresno. 2009c. *Sewer System Management Plan*. Prepared by the City of Fresno, Fresno, CA.
- City of Fresno and City of Fresno Redevelopment Agency (City of Fresno). 1999. *Draft and Final Program EIR 98-01, Central City Commercial Revitalization Redevelopment Project Area; Airport Area Revitalization Redevelopment Project Area; Southeast Fresno Redevelopment Project Area; South Fresno Industrial Redevelopment Project Area* (SCH No. 990011008). April (Draft), June (Final).
- Federal Emergency Management Agency. 2009. Flood Insurance Rate Map, Fresno County, California and Incorporated Areas, Map Number 06019C1590H. Map Revised: February 18, 2009.
- National Park Service. 1983. *Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Archeology and Historic Preservation*.
- National Park Service. 1985. *National Register Bulletin 24*.
- Office of Historic Preservation. 1986. *California Historic Resources Survey Workbook*.
- Office of Historic Preservation. 1989. *Archaeological Resource Management Reports: Recommended Contents and Format*.
- Office of Historic Preservation. 1995. *Instructions for Recording Historical Resources and Appendix 6: Types of Survey Activities*.
- San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District. 2009. *Final GHG Guidance*. Appendix J.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife. 2010. National Wetlands Inventory. Available: <<http://www.fws.gov/wetlands/Data/Mapper.html>>. Accessed: June 30, 2010.

Personal Communications

Hattersley-Drayton, Karana. Historic Preservation Project Manager. City of Fresno Historic Preservation Commission. August 4, 2010—telephone conversation.

List of Preparers

Redevelopment Agency of the City of Fresno

David Martin, Project Manager

Jerry Freeman, Project Consultant

ICF International

Lee Lisecki, Project Director

Steven Esselman, Project Manager/Senior Environmental Planner

Jonathan Riker, Esq., LEED AP, Environmental Counsel/Project Manager

Terry Rivasplata, AICP, Technical Director

Namrata Belliappa, GIS Analyst