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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION – SCOPE OF THE PLAN

1.1 Authority and Purpose

Requirements for creation of airport land use commissions were first established under the California State Aeronautics Act (Public Utilities Code Section 21670, et seq.) in 1967. The fundamental purpose of the Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC or Commission) is to promote land use compatibility around airports and is expressed in the statute as:

“… to protect public health, safety, and welfare by ensuring the orderly expansion of airports and the adoption of land use measures that minimize the public’s exposure to excessive noise and safety hazards within areas around public airports to the extent that these areas are not already devoted to incompatible uses.”

The statutes give ALUC’s the following powers and duties, subject to limitations, by which to accommodate the following:

- Assist local agencies in ensuring compatible land uses in the vicinity of airports to the extent that land in the vicinity of the airport is not already devoted to incompatible uses.
- Coordinate planning at the state, regional and local level, so as to provide for the orderly development of air transportation, while at the same time protect public health, safety and welfare;
- Prepare and adopt airport land use compatibility plans.

The State Aeronautics Act (Public Utilities Code, Section 21670 et seq.) requires preparation of an airport land use compatibility plan for nearly all public-use airports in the State of California (Section 21675). Compatibility Plans specifically provide for the orderly growth of each public airport and the area surrounding the airport within the jurisdiction of the commission and safeguard the general welfare of the inhabitants within the vicinity of the airport and the public in general.

1.2 Airport Identification

The airport addressed by this plan is Fresno Yosemite International Airport (FYI). Prior to October 3, 1996, FYI was known as the Fresno Air Terminal. The official Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) identifier has remained FAT.
1.3 Geographic Coverage

The policies of this Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan ("Compatibility Plan") apply to all land within the Airport Influence Area. The Airport Influence Area (AIA) is depicted in Figure 4.5 and consists of all land within the 60 or greater CNEL contours (refer to Figure 4.1) and within Safety Compatibility Zones 1 through 5 (refer to Figure 4.2.1).

1.4 Jurisdictions Affected

The jurisdiction affected by this Compatibility Plan is the City of Fresno.

1.5 Limitations of the Plan

There are important limitations to an ALUC's authority. ALUC’s have no authority over either existing land uses (Section 21670(a)(2)) or the operation of airports (Section 21674(a)). Once a local agency has made its general plan consistent with the ALUC plan, the ALUC's authority to review projects within that jurisdiction is narrowly limited. The only actions for which review remains mandatory are proposed adoption or amendment of general plans, specific plans, rezone applications, text amendments to the zoning ordinance, and building regulations affecting land within an AIA. Submittal of individual projects for ALUC review is voluntary.

CHAPTER 2: AIRPORT INFORMATION

2.1 Planning Status

FYI, in cooperation with the FAA, updated the airport master plan in 2006. Known as the January 2006 FYI Master Plan Update (AMP), the process included a total of six meetings with input from the public and several agencies, including the ALUC. Although not formally adopted, the AMP provides a 20 year planning window for FYI, including an FAA approved 20 year aviation demand forecast, and an FAA approved Airport Layout Plan (ALP). In 2012 FYI, in cooperation the FAA, updated the ALP based on a congressionally mandated Runway Safety Area (RSA) Program.

2.2 Airport Layout Plan

Refer to Figure 4.4, FAA approved ALP.

2.3 Airport Activity

FYI is the largest and busiest commercial service airport in California’s Central Valley and is owned and operated by the City of Fresno. The principal runway (11L-29R) is 9,227 feet long and 150 feet wide. A parallel runway (11R-29L), scheduled to reopen in late 2012 after a complete reconstruction, is 8,006 feet long and 150 feet wide. The
The elevation of the airport is 336 feet above Mean Sea Level (MSL).

FYI is a joint use civilian/military airport. It is used by commercial air carriers, air cargo operators, charter operators, the State of California, general aviation, and the United States military. The California Air National Guard (CANG) occupies a 58 acre area adjacent to McKinley Avenue in the southeast portion of FYI. A helicopter repair and maintenance unit of the Army National Guard, the California Division of Forestry, and a number of corporate aviation businesses occupy facilities north of the runways. About 250 general aviation aircraft are based at FYI and two Fixed Base Operators (FBO's) offer a wide range of aeronautical services.

The AMP and subsequent joint environmental document (2011 EA/EIR) took into consideration the 20 year FAA approved aviation demand forecast, which was a key step in providing a basis for determining the aviation development and activity at the airport. The aviation demand forecast data and detailed distribution of operations can be found in the 2011 EA/EIR. The 2012 updated ALP is based on an FAA approved RSA study of alternatives and recommended plan, and is support by a NEPA EA and a CEQA Initial Study (2012 EA/MND).

**CHAPTER 3: COMPATIBILITY POLICIES & CRITERIA**

3.1 Noise

The purpose of noise compatibility policies is to avoid establishment of new noise-sensitive land uses and exposure of the users to levels of aircraft noise that can disrupt activities involved. The noise contours established for the purpose of evaluating noise compatibility of land use are depicted on Figure 4.1. The state law (Public Utilities Code Section 21675(a)) requires that noise contours reflect the anticipated growth of the airport during at least the next 20 years. The AMP, 2011 EA/EIR and the 2012 EA/MND provided the activity forecast used in the contour calculations.

1. Airport land use noise compatibility shall be evaluated in terms of the Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL), as defined in Title 21, Subchapter 6, of the California Code of Regulations (noise standards). Wherever used in this plan, the term CNEL shall be assumed to be an annual average.

2. The maximum noise exposure which shall be considered normally acceptable for residential areas is 65 db CNEL. The residential area criterion establishes the baseline from which noise compatibility for other land uses shall be evaluated.

3. The relative acceptability or unacceptability of particular land uses with respect to the noise levels to which they would be exposed is indicated in
the "Airport Land Use Noise Compatibility Criteria" matrix, Table 1. These criteria shall be the principal determinants of whether a proposed land use is compatible with the noise impact from FYI. Special circumstances which would affect the specific proposal's noise sensitivity (e.g., the extent or lack of outdoor activity) shall also be taken into account.

(4) A condition for approval of a proposed land use which is shown on Table 1 identified as "Conditional" for a given noise environment shall be that the building intended for habitation or occupation provide a satisfactory degree of noise attenuation. Table 2 sets forth the permitted interior noise levels. If the structure can reduce the noise exposure to the outlined noise levels, the use may be deemed compatible.

(5) New residential development and new schools shall be prohibited within the 65 CNEL contour of FYI unless it is determined that there is no feasible alternative to such development of the subject property and provided that the following conditions are met:

(a) The record property owner grants an avigation easement to the City of Fresno.

(b) The record property owner executes an agreement in favor of the City of Fresno, whereby the property owner shall indemnify, hold harmless and defend the City and every officer and employee thereof from any and all loss, liability, damages, costs, suits or claims arising out of the location of the development within the 65 CNEL contour.

(c) New residential structures shall incorporate noise insulation in compliance with Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations such that interior noise levels are reduced to no more than 45 db CNEL.

(6) An acoustical analysis shall be required prior to the approval of a special permit (site plan or conditional use permit) for any new residential use, transient lodging, school, library, hospital, nursing home, day nursery, church, auditorium or a concert hall located within a 65 or greater CNEL contour. For single family residential proposals, an acoustical analysis shall be required as a condition of subdivision map approval, said analysis to be submitted prior to the issuance of building permits. The acoustical analysis shall be completed in a manner consistent with Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations. A special permit for the uses listed above shall not be approved unless the acoustical analysis demonstrates that interior noise levels attributable to exterior sources does not exceed 45 db CNEL in any habitable room with windows and doors closed. In quantifying aircraft noise exposure of the project site, the acoustical analysis shall include consideration of engine run up noise where
applicable. A single report may suffice for all similar proposals within the same CNEL contour.

(7) Within the 70 CNEL contour, new or redeveloped schools, hospitals, nursing homes, libraries, day nurseries, churches, auditoriums, and amphitheaters shall be prohibited. New residential uses (excluding transient lodging) shall be prohibited, except as provided for in Policy No. (8), below.

(8) Existing residential uses lying within the 70 CNEL contour, that conform to the land use designations of this plan, may be remodeled in such a way that does not increase the floor space of the residence, or rebuilt if destroyed by fire, explosion or other catastrophic means. A use is considered to be destroyed if the cost of reconstruction, repairing or rebuilding would exceed fifty percent of the reasonable replacement value of the building immediately prior to the destruction.

(9) When applying the noise compatibility criteria listed in Table 1 to a given location, the basis for evaluation shall be the maximum CNEL contour shown in the Compatibility Plan.

(10) If a noise analysis, including noise monitoring, indicates that project noise exposure may be higher or lower than indicated by the Airport Land Use Noise Compatibility Criteria, Table 1, due to site-specific conditions or changes in Airport/aircraft operations, the noise exposure used for project evaluation may be adjusted at the discretion of the ALUC.

3.2 Overflight

Noise from individual aircraft can be intrusive and annoying in locations beyond the limits of the mapped noise contours. Sensitivity to aircraft overflights varies from one person to another. The purpose of overflight compatibility policies is to help notify people about the presence of overflights near airports so that they can make informed decisions regarding acquisition or lease of property in the affected areas. Overflight compatibility is particularly important with regard to residential land uses.

(1) The overflight compatibility of proposed land uses within the AIA shall be evaluated in accordance with the policies set forth in this section.

(2) Except when overriding circumstances exist, a condition for approval of any residential development proposal (i.e., zone change, subdivision map, conditional use permit, site plan review) within the AIA, as defined herein, shall be the dedication of an avigation easement to the City of Fresno.

(3) An Avigation Easement and Agreement shall be required for all development proposals (commercial, industrial or residential) within the 65
The avigation easement shall contain the following property rights:

(a) Right-of-flight at any altitude above acquired easement surfaces.

(b) Right to generate noise, vibrations, fumes, dust and fuel particle emissions.

(c) Right-of-entry to remove, mark, or light any structures or growths above easement surfaces.

(d) Right to prohibit creation of electrical interference, unusual light sources, and other hazards to aircraft flight.

(e) Right to prevent erection or growth of all objects above acquired easement surfaces.

The easement surfaces acquired shall be based on Part 77 of the Federal Aviation Regulations except that no easement surface less than 35 feet above ground shall be acquired.

(4) A Covenant shall be required as a further condition for approval of residential development proposals within the AIA and all development proposals within the 65 CNEL contour. The Council of the City of Fresno shall, except where overriding circumstances exist, require the property owner(s) to record a covenant providing the following:

(a) That it is understood by the owners and owners’ successors in interest that the real property in question lies close to the Fresno Yosemite International Airport and that the operation of the airport and the landing and take-off of aircraft may generate high noise levels which will affect the habitability and quiet enjoyment of the property.

(b) That the owners covenant to accept and acknowledge the operation of the Fresno Yosemite International Airport.

(5) The above avigation easement, covenants, conditions and restrictions shall be recorded in the office of the Fresno County Clerk/Recorder and shall run with the land and shall be binding upon the present and subsequent owners of the property.

(6) Effective January 1, 2004, California state statutes (Business and Professional Code Sections 1102.6, 1103.4 and 1353) require that, as part of residential real estate transactions, information be disclosed regarding
whether the property is situated within an AIA. Buyer notification shall be accomplished by the use of real estate disclosure statements for property within the AIA. The disclosure statements shall notify the buyers of property located within the AIA of Fresno Yosemite International Airport and that aircraft overflights may affect the habitability and quiet enjoyment of the property.

3.3 Safety

The intent of land use safety compatibility is to minimize the risks associated with an off-airport aircraft accident or emergency landing. Risks both to people and property on the ground in the vicinity of the airport and to people on board aircraft are considered. The safety compatibility of land use development is outlined in Table 3. The zone boundaries are based upon general aviation aircraft accident location data contained in the California Airport Land Use Planning Handbook (“Caltrans Handbook”) along with data regarding the runway configuration and aircraft operational procedures at FYI.

(1) Land uses or land use characteristics which may affect safe air navigation or because of their nature and proximity to an airport, may be incompatible with the airport and shall be avoided in the vicinity of FYI.

(2) The criteria which shall be used to evaluate whether a land use is acceptable with respect to its airport proximity are set forth in Table 3, entitled Airport Land Use Safety Compatibility Criteria. The indicated Safety Compatibility Zones (SCZs), as defined in the Caltrans Handbook, shall be used.

NOTE: Within SCZs 3 and 4 the following shall apply:

(a) Existing development that conforms to existing zoning regulations in effect prior to February 20, 1987 may be rebuilt in the event it is destroyed by fire or Act of God.

(b) The regulations identified in the Caltrans Handbook are not intended to take development rights such that the economic viable use of land is unduly restricted. Therefore, development of vacant property or redevelopment of property in accordance with the zoning regulations in effect prior to February 20, 1987 shall not be prohibited on the basis of the restrictions set forth in Table 3. This provision shall not apply to schools, hospitals, nursing homes, churches, auditoriums, concert halls, amphitheaters or other uses that would result in a large concentration of people.

(3) Land uses which attract wildlife that pose a hazard to aviation activities are a special concern adjacent to airports. Examples of land use which may attract hazardous wildlife include landfills and bodies of standing water. In reviewing a project for safety compatibility, the most current
version of the FAA Advisory Circular AC No. 150/5200-33 (Hazardous Wildlife Attractants On or Near Airports) shall be considered. The review area identified in this circular is outlined as the boundary within 10,000 feet of the Airport Operations Area.

3.4 Airspace Protection

The objective of airspace protection policies is to ensure that structures and other uses of the land do not cause hazards to aircraft in flight in the airport vicinity. Hazards to flight include physical obstructions to the navigable airspace, wildlife hazards (particularly bird strikes) and land use characteristics that create visual or electronic interference with aircraft navigation or communication. Boundaries of this zone represent the imaginary surfaces defined for the airport in accordance with Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR) Part 77.

(1) No structure, tree, or other object shall be permitted to exceed the height limits established in accordance with Part 77, Subpart C, of the FAR. This criterion applies unless, in the case of a proposed object or growing tree, one or more of the following conditions exist:

(a) The object would be substantially shielded by existing permanent structures or terrain in a manner such that it clearly would not affect the safety of air navigation;

(b) The FAA has conducted an aeronautical study and either determined that the object would not result in a hazard to air navigation or made recommendations for the object's proper marking and lighting as an obstruction, and FAA recommendations, if any, are properly implemented;

(c) The object is otherwise exempted from the requirements of FAR Part 77.

In the case of an existing object, this criterion also applies unless the object exceeded the prescribed height limits prior to February 20, 1987, in which case marking and lighting may still be required.

(2) No object shall be permitted to be erected that, because of height or other factors, would result in an increase in the minimum ceiling or visibility criteria for an existing or proposed instrument approach procedure to any runway.

(3) The FAR Part 77 surfaces depicted on the Airspace Protection Surfaces (Figures 4.3.1 through 4.3.5) shall be used in conjunction with the above airspace policies to determine whether the height of an object is acceptable.
CHAPTER 4: COMPATIBILITY ZONE MAPS

4.1 Noise Contours

The recently updated AMP and the adopted EA/EIR provides the activity forecast used in the contour calculations. Refer to Figure 4.1, Noise Contours.

4.2 Safety Zones

The Caltrans Handbook, (October 2011), provides guidance for Safety Zone Configuration. These zones are delineated based on the type of airport, size of airport, and operational characteristic. Refer to Figure 4.2.1, Safety Compatibility Zones.

4.3 Airspace Protection Surfaces

Part 77 of the FAR, Objects Affecting Navigable Airspace, establishes standards for determining obstructions to navigable airspace and the effects of such obstructions on the safe and efficient use of that airspace. Refer to Figures 4.3.1 through 4.3.5, Airspace Protection Surfaces.

4.4 Airport Layout Plan

The Airport Layout Plan (ALP) is an FAA approved document that depicts planned development at the airport. Refer to Figure 4.4 (2012 FAA approved ALP). For evaluation purposes the most recent ALP on file with FAA shall be used.

CHAPTER 5: PROCEDURAL POLICIES

5.1 Types of Actions Reviewed by the Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC)

The following types of actions must be referred to the ALUC for review when the affected property is located in the Airport Influence Area (AIA – see Figure 4.5):

   a) Adoption or amendment of general plans, community plans and specific plans;
   b) Rezoning applications or text amendments to the zoning ordinance;
   c) Airport Master Plans
   d) Building Regulations

The following types of local actions do NOT require ALUC review:
e) Conditional Use Permits and Site Plan Reviews
f) Variances
g) Subdivision or Parcel Maps

5.2 Types of Actions that Require Consistency with Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan Policies:

The following types of local actions require consistency with the plan policies included in this document when the affected property is located in the AIA:

   a) Rezoning applications,
   b) Conditional use permits, and site plan reviews,
   c) Variances,
   d) Subdivision maps and parcel maps

Interpretation Guidelines:

   a) If a parcel of land is partially within the AIA, the entire parcel is considered to be subject to the land use consistency requirements of this plan.

   b) In the event that it cannot be precisely determined from the AIA Map whether a parcel of land is within the AIA, the determination in this regard shall be made by the Director of the Development and Resource Management Department. The Director’s Determination shall be final.

5.3 Project Information

The Fresno County Airport Land Use Commission Application Review Form is used for submittal of a project to the ALUC for review.

5.4 Timing of Review

Time is a factor with regard to the project review process in two ways:

   a) Timing of Project Submittal. Plans and projects shall be referred to the ALUC at the earliest reasonable point in time so that the commission’s review can be duly considered by the local jurisdiction prior to formalizing its actions. Depending upon the type of plan or project and the normal scheduling of meetings, ALUC review can be done before, after or concurrently with review by the local planning commission and other advisory bodies, but must be accomplished before final action by the decision making bodies.

   b) Response Time Requirement. ALUC must respond within 60 days of referral to local agency requests for a consistency determination on plans or projects for which submittal is mandatory. However, this response period does not begin
until such time as all information necessary for accomplishment of the project review has been submitted to the commission..
5.5 ALUC Action Choices

ALUC choice of action on a land use plan or project submitted for review may either be consistent or inconsistent with the compatibility plan. Although the Aeronautics Act (Sections 21676(a) and 21676.5(a)) mentions only the above two choices of action, the Fresno County ALUC has decided to allow a third option: consistent with conditions. When a finding of consistency with conditions is made, the conditions should be limited in scope and described in a manner which allows compliance to be clearly assessed.

5.6 Overruling an ALUC Decision

Various sections of the airport land use commission statutes provide for local agencies to overrule ALUC decisions on land use matters and airport master plans. The overruling process involves the three following mandatory steps:

a) The holding of a public hearing (and as a courtesy it is recommended to inform the ALUC of such hearing);

b) The making of specific findings that the action proposed is consistent with the purposes of the ALUC statute; and

c) Approval of the proposed action by a two-thirds vote of the agency’s governing body.

CHAPTER 6: INITIAL REVIEW OF GENERAL PLAN CONSISTENCY

The Caltrans Handbook specifically outlines that to be fully consistent with the compatibility plan, a general plan must not have any direct conflicts with the compatibility plan; and must delineate a mechanism or process for ensuring that individual land use development proposals comply with the ALUC criteria.

The City of Fresno FYI Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan is an amendment to an existing specific plan (the FYI Airport and Environments Plan, 1997). It does not change the planned land use designations in the 2025 Fresno General Plan or the applicable community plans, specific plans or redevelopment plans, nor does it change zoning designations within the scope of the plan area. It simply updates noise contours and safety zone configurations, while maintaining the noise and safety-related land use policies that must be applied to property within the AIA. As such, it is a refinement of the 2025 Fresno General Plan and the McLane, Hoover and Roosevelt Community Plans and applicable redevelopment plans within the AIA.

Furthermore, there are no conflicts between the City of Fresno FYI Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan and the County of Fresno ALUC Compatibility Land Use Plan (CLUP) adopted in October 2010 June 2012. As outlined by the Caltrans Handbook, consistency does not require being identical. It means only that the concepts,
standards, physical characteristics, and resulting consequences of proposed action must not conflict with the intent of law or the compatibility plan to which the comparison is made. The two plans are virtually identical, with slight variation in Chapters 5 and 6 related to processing procedures and general plan consistency. Therefore, they meet the criteria of compatibility set forth in state law.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAND USE CATEGORY</th>
<th>Exterior Noise Exposure (CNEL)</th>
<th>60-65</th>
<th>65-70</th>
<th>70-75</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential, Lodging, and Care</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Residential (including single-family, multi-family)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirement homes, residential support facilities, hospitals, nursing homes, large child day care centers, adult day care facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Hotels, motels, other transient lodging</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Mobile Homes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public and Institutional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Schools, libraries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Places of worship, auditoriums, concert halls, theaters, indoor arenas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemeteries, Parking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial and Industrial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offices, service commercial, retail, shopping centers, restaurants</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale, warehousing, research and development, light industrial</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extractive industry, industrial, manufacturing, utilities</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural, and Recreational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cropland</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature preserves, Livestock breeding, Zoos</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional parks, athletic fields, golf courses, outdoor spectator sports, water recreational facilities, horse stables</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amphitheaters</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 1 (cont)
**AIRPORT LAND USE NOISE COMPATIBILITY CRITERIA**

**LEGEND**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Land Use Acceptability</th>
<th>Interpretation/Conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>Compatible</td>
<td>The activities associated with the specific land use may be carried out with essentially no interference from aircraft noise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Conditional</td>
<td>The indicated noise exposure will cause interference with the activities. Building structure must be capable of attenuating noise to the indoor acceptable CNEL, standard construction methods will normally suffice. Indoor Uses: Noise exposure may cause moderate interference with indoor activities, extensive construction features required to make the indoor environment acceptable. Outdoor Uses: CNEL is acceptable for outdoor activities, although some noise interference may occur, caution should be exercised with regards to noise-sensitive uses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_</td>
<td>Incompatible</td>
<td>Unacceptable noise interference upon these activities will occur indoor and outdoor. Adequate structural noise insulation is not practical under most circumstances. Severe noise interference makes outdoor activities unacceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*</td>
<td>Acoustical Analysis Required</td>
<td>An acoustical analysis shall be performed by an individual or firm experienced in Acoustical Engineering</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 2

**INTERIOR NOISE LEVEL REDUCTION (dBA)**  
**CNEL RANGE (Annual Average)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GENERALIZED LAND USE</th>
<th>60-65</th>
<th>65-70</th>
<th>70-75</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>AS</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transient Lodging</td>
<td>AS</td>
<td>25'dBA</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools, Hospitals and Nursing Homes</td>
<td>AS</td>
<td>25'dBA</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>AS</td>
<td>AS</td>
<td>25'dBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>AS</td>
<td>25'dBA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend**

+ Uses normally acceptable.

-- Uses should not be permitted.

1 Acoustical studies may indicate a need for additional insulation in noise sensitive living areas such as sleeping quarters and areas of the facility used at night for relaxing and conversing.

2 Noise level reductions are for those portions of the buildings where the public is received, office areas, and noise sensitive areas where noise levels are low.

AS Acoustical studies shall be performed to determine if insulation should be added to sensitive occupancy areas.
### TABLE 3
AIRPORT LAND USE SAFETY COMPATABILITY CRITERIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAND USE CHARACTERISTIC</th>
<th>SAFETY ZONES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zone 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Uses</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Uses in Structures</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Uses Not in Structures</td>
<td>(D,F)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SPECIAL CHARACTERISTICS (IN OR OUTSIDE OF STRUCTURES)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Zone 1</th>
<th>Zone 2</th>
<th>Zone 3</th>
<th>Zone 4</th>
<th>Zone 5</th>
<th>Zone 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Distracting Lights or Glare</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sources of Smoke or Electrical Interference</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attractor of Birds</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTES**

1. See Figure 4.2.1, Safety Compatibility Zones.
2. Refer to figure 4.2.2 for dimensional layout of the Safety Compatibility Zones.

**INTERPRETATION**

+ Compatible: Use is acceptable with little or no risks.

( ) Conditional: land use proposals that fall within this category must be reviewed on a case-by-case basis by Commission or jurisdiction having authority. The Commission or jurisdiction having authority may determine the use to be acceptable under conditions cited below.

- A Density no greater than 1 dwelling unit per 3 acres.
- B Density no greater than 2 dwelling units per acre.
- C Density no greater than 5 dwelling units per acre.
- D No uses attracting more than 10 persons per acre.
- E No schools, hospitals, nursing homes, or similar uses.
- F Characteristic cannot reasonably be avoided or located outside the indicated safety zone.

-- Incompatible: Use is unacceptable due to associated high risks.
LEGEND
1. Runway Protection Zone
2. Inner Approach/Departure Zone
3. Inner Turning Zone
4. Outer Approach/Departure Zone
5. Sideline Zone
6. Traffic Pattern Zone
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REPORT TO THE CITY COUNCIL

August 30, 2012

FROM: MIKE SANCHEZ, Planning Manager
Development Services Division

BY: SOPHIA PAGOULATOS, Supervising Planner
Development Services Division

SUBJECT: HEARING TO CONSIDER PLAN AMENDMENT APPLICATION NO. A-12-001 AND RELATED ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT NO. A-12-001 TO AMEND THE FRESNO YOSEMITE INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT LAND USE COMPATIBILITY PLAN, PERTAINING TO APPROXIMATELY 6,608 ACRES OF URBANIZED LAND ON AND AROUND THE FRESNO YOSEMITE INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT (PROPERTY LOCATED IN DISTRICTS 4, 5 AND 7) – DEVELOPMENT AND RESOURCE MANAGEMENT DEPARTMENT

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Fresno City Council take the following actions:

1. ADOPT Environmental Assessment EA. No. A-12-001 for a Mitigated Negative Declaration (State Clearinghouse No. 2012041005) dated March 29, 2012.

2. ADOPT RESOLUTION amending the Hoover, McLane, and Roosevelt Community Plans and the 2025 Fresno General Plan (Plan Amendment Application No. A-12-001);

3. ADOPT ORDINANCE BILL amending the Fresno-Yosemite International Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (A Specific Plan), the Hoover, McLane, and Roosevelt Community Plans, and the 2025 Fresno General Plan.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Plan Amendment Application No. A-12-001 was filed by the Airports Department on behalf of the City of Fresno. This application pertains to approximately 6,608 acres of urbanized land including the Fresno Yosemite International Airport property and surrounding land within the 60 CNEL and Safety Compatibility Zones 1 through 5, which together make up the Airport Influence Area (see attached Vicinity Map). The plan amendment application proposes to amend the Fresno Yosemite International Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (FYI ALUCP), the 2025 Fresno General Plan, and the McLane, Hoover and Roosevelt Community Plans by articulating parameters for making Runway Safety Area Improvements to Runway 11L-29R and updating noise and safety boundaries based on new airport projections, consistent with state law. Noise and safety land use compatibility policies remain unchanged. The plan amendment does not include any changes to the planned land uses within the study area. The plan amendment is necessary to maintain consistency between the recently revised County of Fresno Airport Compatibility Land Use Plan ("CLUP"), and the City of Fresno plan.
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PROJECT INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT</th>
<th>Plan Amendment Application No. A-12-001 proposes to amend the Fresno Yosemite International Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, the 2025 Fresno General Plan, the McLane, Hoover and Roosevelt Community Plans, by articulating parameters for making Runway Safety Area Improvements to Runway 11L-29R and updating noise and safety boundaries based on new airport projections, consistent with the state law. Noise and safety land use compatibility policies remain essentially unchanged.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APPLICANT</td>
<td>City of Fresno Airports Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td>6,608 acres of urbanized land including the Fresno Yosemite International Airport property and surrounding land within the 60 CNEL and Safety Compatibility Zones 1 through 5, which together make up the Airport Influence Area (see vicinity map). Council Districts 4, 5 and 7 (Councilmembers Westerlund, Quintero and Olivier, respectively)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SITE SIZE</td>
<td>Approximately 6,608 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAND USE</td>
<td>As existing; no proposed changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZONING</td>
<td>As existing; no proposed changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLAN DESIGNATION AND CONSISTENCY</td>
<td>The proposed plan amendment amends a specific plan, the FYI Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan most recently revised in 2011. The plan amendment would revise the FYI Airport noise and safety boundaries in the 2025 Fresno General Plan, and the McLane, Hoover and Roosevelt Community Plans and is otherwise consistent with those plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENVIRONMENTAL FINDING</td>
<td>Environmental Assessment EA. No. A-12-001 for a Mitigated Negative Declaration (State Clearinghouse No. 2012041005) dated March 29, 2012 was prepared for the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLAN COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION</td>
<td>The Council District Plan Implementation Committees for Districts 4 and 5 reviewed and recommended approval of the proposed project during a series of meetings held in April and May of 2012.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION</td>
<td>The Fresno Planning Commission recommended approval to the City Council of Plan Amendment No. A-12-001 and related Environmental Assessment on August 1, 2012 by a unanimous vote (6-0-0).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAFF RECOMMENDATION</td>
<td>Recommend that the City Council adopt Environmental Assessment No. A-12-001 (SCH No. 2012041005) and approve the proposed plan amendment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ENVIRONMENTAL FINDING

An environmental assessment initial study was prepared for this project in accordance with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines (see Exhibit F – attached CD). This process included the distribution of requests for comment from other responsible or affected agencies and interested organizations.
Preparation of the environmental assessment necessitated a thorough review of the proposed project and relevant environmental issues and considered previously prepared environmental and technical studies pertinent to the Roosevelt Community Plan area, including the Master Environmental Impact Report (MEIR) No. 10130 for the 2025 Fresno General Plan (SCH#2001071097) and Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) No. A-09-02 (SCH#2009051016). These environmental and technical studies have examined projected sewage generation rates of planned urban uses, the capacity of existing sanitary sewer collection and treatment facilities, and optimum alternatives for increasing capacities; groundwater aquifer resource conditions; water supply production and distribution system capacities; traffic carrying capacity of the planned major street system; and, student generation projections and school facility site location identification.

The proposed amendment of the adopted 2025 Fresno General Plan, has been determined to not be fully within the scope of MEIR No. 10130 as provided by the CEQA, as codified in the Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 21157.1(d) and the CEQA Guidelines Section 15177(c). It has been further determined that all applicable mitigation measures of MEIR No. 10130 and MND No. A-09-02 have been applied to the project, together with project specific mitigation measures necessary to assure that the project will not cause significant adverse cumulative impacts, growth inducing impacts and irreversible significant effects beyond those identified by MEIR No. 10130 or MND No. A-09-02 as provided by CEQA Section 15178(a). In addition, pursuant to Public Resources Code, Section 21157.6(b)(1), staff has determined that no substantial changes have occurred with respect to the circumstances under which the MEIR was certified and that no new information, which was not known and could not have been known at the time that the MEIR was certified as complete, has become available. Therefore, it has been determined based upon the evidence in the record that the project will not have a significant impact on the environment and that the filing of a mitigated negative declaration is appropriate in accordance with the provisions of CEQA Section 21157.5(a)(2) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15178(b)(1) and (2).

Based upon the attached environmental assessment and the list of identified mitigation measures, staff has determined that there is no evidence in the record that the project may have a significant effect on the environment and has prepared a mitigated negative declaration for this project. A public notice of the attached mitigated negative declaration finding for Environmental Assessment Application No. A-12-001 was published on March 29, 2012 with comments received from the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District and the Caltrans Division of Aeronautics. Neither comment identified any potentially significant impacts of the project that were not addressed in the environmental assessment.

BACKGROUND

The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) has established design standards to ensure the safety, economic viability, efficiency, and longevity of an airport. These standards include criteria for RSAs (Runway Safety Areas), which are defined as the surface surrounding the runway prepared or suitable for reducing the risk of damage to airplanes in the event of an aircraft landing short, landing long, or departing from the runway. Traditional RSAs consist of clear, graded, and grassed surfaces surrounding the perimeter of a runway.

In the late 1990s and early 2000s, a series of aircraft accidents highlighted the need for airports to improve safety by modifying RSA's to meet the most current standards. These accidents, such as those in Little Rock, Arkansas and Chicago, Illinois, resulted in the loss of human life which stimulated the passage of Public Law (P.L.) 109-115, Transportation, Treasury, Housing and Urban Development, the Judiciary, the District of Columbia, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, 2006 which states: "That not later than December 31, 2015, the owner or operator of an airport certificated under 49 United States Code (U.S.C.) 44706 shall improve the airport’s runway safety areas to comply with the Federal Aviation Administration design standards required by 14 CFR Part 139." As a certificated
airport, FYI is required by 14 CFR Part 139 to comply with RSA standards to the fullest extent practicable.

In 2006, FYI completed an RSA study in response to H.R. 3058 and FAA Order 5200.8, Runway Safety Area Program, which became effective October 1, 1999. The objective of the RSA program is to ensure that all RSAs at federally obligated airports conform to standards contained in FAA Advisory Circular (AC) 150/5300-13, Airport Design, “to the extent practicable.” The RSA study found that Runway 11L-29R does not fully meet FAA RSA design standards for the types of aircraft which utilize the runway on a regular basis. AC 150/5300-13, Airport Design, defines the need to provide an RSA that is 500 feet wide and extends 1,000 feet beyond the runway end for departures and 600 feet prior to the landing threshold for arrivals. Currently, the RSA for Runway 11L is encroached upon by the perimeter access road, a security fence, and a portion of Clovis Avenue. The localizer antenna is also located within the RSA in this area. These RSA encroachments are depicted in Exhibit D-RSA Improvements.

In March 2011, the 2006 study was re-visited to determine what facility changes are needed to fully comply with the recommended RSA dimensions while maintaining the existing operational runway length. This study, Runway Safety Area Re-Evaluation for Runway 11L-29R, recommended a shift of Runway 11L-29R west to preclude the loss of runway, while minimizing construction cost and maintaining the goal of preserving maximum runway length for all operations. To accommodate existing airport users, the airport needs to maintain 9,227 feet of runway length for aircraft arrivals and departures.

Project Description

The proposed RSA improvements at FYI take into account the various development constraints located beyond the existing runway ends and provide the needed RSA while maintaining runway length. Development constraints beyond the existing runway ends include Clovis Avenue to the east and Dakota Avenue and Chestnut Avenue to the north and west. Taking into account these constraints, the proposed RSA improvement project maintains existing runway landing and departure lengths and meets RSA standards through the implementation of declared distances and a 312-foot westerly extension of Runway 11L-29R. Exhibit D depicts the resultant runway lengths available for takeoff and landing in each direction. The declared distances reflect a standard 600-foot RSA prior to landing and 1,000-foot RSA beyond the runway end for departure. Additional information regarding declared distances is also shown in Exhibit D. The proposed runway improvements result in the airport maximizing the remaining runway length while providing an RSA that meets FAA standards.

The extension of the runway 312 feet and implementation of declared distances requires a number of connected actions. The following bullets summarize the projects resulting from the proposed RSA improvements.

- Construction of two stub taxiways to connect with taxiways currently under construction.
- Reconstruct Taxiway C12 to connect with Taxiway C extension.
- Construction of an aircraft holding apron at the west end of Taxiway C.
- Relocation of the Precision Approach Path Indicator (PAPI) lighting system and the Runway End Identifier Lights (REIL)

All items illustrated in Exhibit D are expected to be developed within the next three years (2012-2015). Table 1 outlines the anticipated development schedule.
TABLE 1
Schedule of Proposed Improvements
Fresno Yosemite International Airport

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Anticipated Start Date*</th>
<th>Anticipated End Date*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Runway 11L-29R Extension/RSA Environmental</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>05/31/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runway 11L-29R Extension/RSA Design</td>
<td>In-Progress</td>
<td>10/01/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runway 11L-29R Extension/RSA Construction</td>
<td>04/01/2013</td>
<td>10/01/2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* All dates are preliminary and contingent upon funding, environmental and actions by others.

In summary, the project involves safety improvements to Runway 11L-29R which necessitate the revision of noise and safety maps in the FYI ALUCP, but do not change any of the noise or safety policies in the text of the FYI ALUCP. Minor changes in the text simply update it to include the RSA project and related environmental assessment references. The updated plan is included in Exhibit E. Note that text changes are highlighted. In addition, both existing (2011) and proposed (2012) plan exhibits showing noise contours, safety zones, the Airport Layout Plan, and other items are included in the plan for comparison purposes.

BACKGROUND / ANALYSIS

Legal Basis for Airport Plans

Requirements for creation of airport land use commissions were first established under the California State Aeronautics Act (Public Utilities Code Section 21670, et seq.) in 1967. The fundamental purpose of the Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC or Commission) is to promote land use compatibility around airports and is expressed in the statute as:

"... to protect public health, safety, and welfare by ensuring the orderly expansion of airports and the adoption of land use measures that minimize the public's exposure to excessive noise and safety hazards within areas around public airports to the extent that these areas are not already devoted to incompatible uses."

The State Aeronautics Act (Public Utilities Code, Section 21670 et seq.) requires preparation of an airport land use compatibility plan for nearly all public-use airports in the State of California (Section 21675). Compatibility Plans specifically provide for the orderly growth of each public airport and the area surrounding the airport within the jurisdiction of the commission and safeguard the general welfare of the inhabitants within the vicinity of the airport and the public in general.

Relationship to other plans

The proposed plan amendment is a revision of the recently amended Fresno Yosemite International Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (FYI ALUCP), previously known as the 1997 Airport Environs Plan, a specific plan originally adopted in 1992. According to the city’s Local Planning and Procedures ordinance, specific plans take precedence over community plans and general plans; therefore adoption of this plan amendment revises the McLane, Hoover and Roosevelt community plans and the 2025
Fresno General Plan. Amendment to these plans will consist of updating in the FYI noise contours and safety compatibility zones referenced in the plans.

**Purpose of Plan Update**

The RSA Improvements called for by the FAA necessitated a revision of the Airport Layout Plan (ALP) to depict the new runway configuration. This in turn affected the safety compatibility zone map due to revised runway configuration. In addition, as noted above, changes to the text of the FYI ALUCP plan were made to incorporate the RSA improvements: primarily new runway dimensions and environmental review information (see Exhibit E for updated plan).

Airport Land Use Compatibility Plans also must include an aviation demand forecast over a 20-year horizon. The forecast is then used to generate noise contours that become part of the ALUCP. This plan update incorporates revised noise contours based on a new demand forecast that is further discussed below in the noise section.

In June of 2012, the Fresno County Airport Land Use Commission adopted the plan update currently before City of Fresno. State guidelines require that city and county plans be consistent, and provide 180 days for cities to adopt airport plans consistent with County ALUC plans.

**Noise**

The proposed project has a less than significant impact on the noise generated by airport operations, however the shape of the contours changed due to revised airport projections and a new noise model. A comparison of the existing and updated noise contours is attached in Exhibit E. The Noise section of the Environmental Assessment (pg 46) states that:

*No noticeable changes to the noise environment surrounding the airport will occur as a result of the proposed extension of Runway 11L-29R. The proposed project results in a slight change in noise when compared to the existing condition because implementation of the proposed project results in a northwesterly shift of the landing and takeoff thresholds of Runway 11L-29R. This would extend the noise exposure to the northwest slightly. However, both the proposed project and the existing condition result in the same number (213) of noise-sensitive parcels located within the 65 CNEL contour. Since the number of operations and types of airplanes using the runway will not change as a result of the project, no additional long-term noise will be created. The exposure of persons to, or generation of, noise levels in excess of established standards is unchanged as a result of the proposed project. (Appendix C of the EA contains the methodology and assumptions used to generate this information.)*

*The EA further states that there are areas within the existing 65 CNEL contour for the airport that contain noise-sensitive land uses, including residences and several schools. To mitigate these impacts, the City of Fresno initiated the Sound Mitigation Acoustical Remedy Treatment (SMART) Program. According to the 2011 EA/EIR, there are 2,447 households and 6,584 people near the airport eligible to receive noise-reducing windows and doors. The SMART Program aims to reduce interior noise levels by at least 5 dB and achieve an interior noise level of 45 CNEL or less. Over 1000 residences and 5 schools have been acoustically treated under this ongoing program. (Note: The Addicott Elementary School was not treated under the noise program since it meets the 45 db interior level standard due to newer construction.)*
Appendix C of the EA also contains future airport noise contours for the year 2015 (year of project implementation) and the year 2020. These contours include projected airport growth and other airport projects currently under construction as well as the proposed project under consideration in this Initial Study. Even in the future, with additional forecast airport growth, no City thresholds for noise will be exceeded. If changes to the types of military aircraft using the airport changes in the future, noise impacts may occur. This potential worst-case impact is not a related to the proposed project.

Noise compatibility policies in the plan amendment remain identical to those in the recently amended FYI ALUCP.

Safety

Safety Compatibility Zones, or “SCZs” are established by the 2011 edition of the California Airport Land Use Planning Handbook (“Caltrans Handbook”) and are based on (i) aircraft incident and accident location data, (ii) runway configurations, and (iii) airport utilization (air carrier, general aviation, and military).

The SCZs to the northwest of the airport shift slightly as a result of the RSA Improvements because they are affected by runway configuration, and Runway 11L-29R was extended in a westward direction by 312 feet. Therefore the subject plan amendment includes a new SCZ Map (see Figure 4.2.1 in Exhibit E). As a result of the RSA improvements, SCZ 1, the most restrictive zone, encroaches approximately 900 feet further into the Leaky Acres property to the northwest of the airport. SCZ zone 4 also extends slightly to the northwest. These impacts are considered to be less than significant in the EA.

Airspace Protection

The objective of airspace protection policies is to ensure that structures and other uses of the land do not cause hazards to aircraft in flight in the airport vicinity. Airspace protection policies in the proposed plan have not changed; they continue to be based on the imaginary surfaces defined for the airport in accordance with Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR) Part 77. These surfaces are depicted in updated Exhibits 4.3.1 – 4.3.5 of the new plan.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Two public information workshops were held to provide members of the public, airport users and different airport stakeholders opportunities to comment on the proposed airport improvements and review materials related to the document. The first workshop was held at the Piccadilly Inn on Thursday, November 3, 2011. Notices for this workshop were posted in the Fresno Bee newspaper, email notices were sent to the members of the Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) of Fresno County and post card notices were mailed to residents and businesses in the vicinity of the airport. No written comments were received during the workshop. The second workshop was held at the Piccadilly Inn on Tuesday, July 10, 2012 between the hours of 4:30 p.m. and 6:30 p.m. Notice of the workshop was provided through the Fresno Bee newspaper on Friday, June 8, 2012 and Friday, July 6, 2012. A court reporter was made available during the second workshop to allow interested individuals to provide verbal comments for the record. No written or verbal comments were received during the second workshop.

The proposed RSA Project and related plan amendment was also presented to the Council District Plan Implementation Committees for Council Districts 4 and 5 in April and May of 2012; all recommended
approval of the plan amendment. In addition, a display ad was published in the Fresno Bee newspaper on July 20, 2012 which included the August 1, 2012 Planning Commission hearing date and the City Council date of August 30, 2012. No members of the public spoke in opposition to the project at the August 1, 2012 Planning Commission hearing.

LAND USE PLANS AND POLICIES

2025 Fresno General Plan

The following general plan policies address the airport:

E-10-a Policy: Pursue appropriate funding sources and capital improvement budget enhancements that will provide a modern, safe and efficient municipal terminal facility and improve quality of air service;

E-12-a Policy: Allow for the orderly expansion of the Fresno Yosemite International and Chandler Downtown airports as envisioned by their airport and environs master plans;

I-7-f Policy: Allow for the orderly expansion and improvement of Fresno's publicly-owned airports (Fresno Air Terminal/Fresno-Yosemite International Airport and Fresno Chandler Downtown Airport), while minimizing adverse environmental impacts associated with these facilities.

Plan Amendment A-12-001 would update the 2011 FYI ALUCP to incorporate the RSA Improvements, a revised Airport Layout Plan, and related noise, safety and Part 77 FAR maps, all of which are necessary to meet general plan objectives for a modern, safe and efficient municipal airport facility. This update of the FYI ALUCP consistent with state law ensures the minimization of adverse environmental impacts associated with airport activities by imposing noise, safety, and airspace protection requirements on identified types of development within the Airport Influence Area. Therefore Plan Amendment A-12-001 is consistent with 2025 Fresno General Plan policies.

Community Plans

Both the Hoover and McLane Community Plans discuss noise issues related to the airport and recommend continuation of land use controls to help mitigate noise and safety concerns. The Roosevelt Community Plan is silent with regards to the airport. It should be noted that the noise contours have decreased substantially since the adoption of the Hoover and McLane Community Plans in 1979 and 1980. Advances in airplane engine technology and an ongoing noise compatibility program have resulted in a steady decrease in the size of the noise contours, even as airport activity increases. Application of the city's existing airport land use compatibility policies as outlined in the new FYI ALUCP will continue to reduce noise and safety impacts related to airport activity in the environs of the airport. Therefore, Plan Amendment A-12-001 is consistent with the applicable community plans.
CONCLUSION

The appropriateness of the proposed project has been examined with respect to its consistency with goals and policies of the 2025 Fresno General Plan and the Hoover, McLane and Roosevelt Community Plans; its compatibility with surrounding existing or proposed uses; and its avoidance or mitigation of potentially significant adverse environmental impacts. These factors have been evaluated as described above and by the accompanying environmental assessment. Upon consideration of this evaluation, it can be concluded that Plan Amendment A-12-001 is appropriate for the project site.

Exhibits:
A: Vicinity Map
B: Aerial Photograph
C: Planned Land Use Map
D: RSA Improvement Maps
E: FYI Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan 2012 Draft
F: EA No. A-12-001 dated March 2012: Mitigated Negative Declaration and Initial Study prepared by Coffman Associates, Inc. (see attached CD)
G. Planning Commission Resolution No. 13169
H. City Council Resolution
I. Ordinance Bill
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Declared distances are used by the FAA to define the effective runway length for landing and takeoff when a displaced threshold is involved. The four types of declared distances, as defined in FAA AC 150/5300-13, Airport Design, are as follows:

Takeoff Run Available (TORA) - The runway length declared available and suitable for the ground run of an airplane taking off. This declared distance reflects the length of pavement that can handle the weight of an aircraft. TORA does not take into consideration RSA standards.

Takeoff Distance Available (TODA) - The TORA plus the length of any remaining runway and/or clearway beyond the far end of the TORA at which the airplane can clear a 50-foot obstacle.

Accelerate-Stop Distance Available (ASDA) - The runway declared available for the acceleration and deceleration of an aircraft aborting a takeoff. ASDA takes into consideration RSA standards, thereby improving safety margins for users.

Landing Distance Available (LDA) - The runway length declared available and suitable for landing taking into account the RSA standard.
E. FYI Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan
2012 Draft
Fresno Yosemite International Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan

City of Fresno

Adopted: July 2012 Draft
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**Appendices**

Staff Report, Ordinance Bill and Resolutions
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION – SCOPE OF THE PLAN

1.1 Authority and Purpose

Requirements for creation of airport land use commissions were first established under the California State Aeronautics Act (Public Utilities Code Section 21670, et seq.) in 1967. The fundamental purpose of the Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC or Commission) is to promote land use compatibility around airports and is expressed in the statute as:

"... to protect public health, safety, and welfare by ensuring the orderly expansion of airports and the adoption of land use measures that minimize the public's exposure to excessive noise and safety hazards within areas around public airports to the extent that these areas are not already devoted to incompatible uses."

The statutes give ALUC’s the following powers and duties, subject to limitations, by which to accommodate the following:

- Assist local agencies in ensuring compatible land uses in the vicinity of airports to the extent that land in the vicinity of the airport is not already devoted to incompatible uses.
- Coordinate planning at the state, regional and local level, so as to provide for the orderly development of air transportation, while at the same time protect public health, safety and welfare;
- Prepare and adopt airport land use compatibility plans.

The State Aeronautics Act (Public Utilities Code, Section 21670 et seq.) requires preparation of an airport land use compatibility plan for nearly all public-use airports in the State of California (Section 21675). Compatibility Plans specifically provide for the orderly growth of each public airport and the area surrounding the airport within the jurisdiction of the commission and safeguard the general welfare of the inhabitants within the vicinity of the airport and the public in general.

1.2 Airport Identification

The airport addressed by this plan is Fresno Yosemite International Airport (FYI). Prior to October 3, 1996, FYI was known as the Fresno Air Terminal. The official Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) identifier has remained FAT.
1.3 Geographic Coverage

The policies of this Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan ("Compatibility Plan") apply to all land within the Airport Influence Area. The Airport Influence Area (AlA) is depicted in Figure 4.5 and consists of all land within the 60 or greater CNEL contours (refer to Figure 4.1) and within Safety Compatibility Zones 1 through 5 (refer to Figure 4.2.1).

1.4 Jurisdictions Affected

The jurisdictions affected by this Compatibility Plan are the City of Fresno, the City of Clovis, and the County of Fresno.

1.5 Limitations of the Plan

There are important limitations to an ALUC's authority. ALUC's have no authority over either existing land uses (Section 21670(a)(2)) or the operation of airports (Section 21674 (a)). Once a local agency has made its general plan consistent with the ALUC plan, the ALUC's authority to review projects within that jurisdiction is narrowly limited. The only actions for which review remains mandatory are proposed adoption or amendment of general plans, specific plans, rezone applications, text amendments to the zoning ordinance, and building regulations affecting land within an AlA. Submittal of individual projects for ALUC review is voluntary.

CHAPTER 2: AIRPORT INFORMATION

2.1 Planning Status

FYI, in cooperation with the FAA, updated the airport master plan in 2006. Known as the January 2006 FYI Master Plan Update (AMP), the process included a total of six meetings with input from the public and several agencies, including the ALUC. Although not formally adopted, the AMP provides a 20 year planning window for FYI, including an FAA approved 20 year aviation demand forecast, and an FAA approved Airport Layout Plan (ALP). In 2012 FYI, in cooperation the FAA, updated the ALP based on a congressionally mandated Runway Safety Area (RSA) Program.

2.2 Airport Layout Plan

Refer to Figure 4.4, FAA approved ALP.

2.3 Airport Activity

FYI is the largest and busiest commercial service airport in California's Central Valley and is owned and operated by the City of Fresno. The principal runway (11L-29R) is 9,227 feet long and 150 feet wide. A parallel runway (11R-29L), is 7,206 feet long and
100 feet wide, scheduled to reopen in late 2012 after a complete reconstruction, is 8,006 feet long and 150 feet wide. The elevation of the airport is 336 feet above Mean Sea Level (MSL).

FYI is a joint use civilian/military airport. It is used by commercial air carriers, air cargo operators, charter operators, the State of California, general aviation, and the United States military. The California Air National Guard (CANG) occupies a 58 acre area adjacent to McKinley Avenue in the southeast portion of FYI. A helicopter repair and maintenance unit of the Army National Guard, the California Division of Forestry, and a number of corporate aviation businesses occupy facilities north of the runways. About 250 general aviation aircraft are based at FYI and two Fixed Base Operators (FBO’s) offer a wide range of aeronautical services.

The AMP and subsequent joint environmental document (2011 EA/EIR) took into consideration the 20 year FAA approved aviation demand forecast, which was a key step in providing a basis for determining the aviation development and activity at the airport. The aviation demand forecast data and detailed distribution of operations can be found in the 2011 EA/EIR. The 2012 updated ALP is based on an FAA approved RSA study of alternatives and recommended plan, and is support by a NEPA EA and a CEQA Initial Study (2012 EA/MND).

CHAPTER 3: COMPATIBILITY POLICIES & CRITERIA

3.1 Noise

The purpose of noise compatibility policies is to avoid establishment of new noise-sensitive land uses and exposure of the users to levels of aircraft noise that can disrupt activities involved. The noise contours established for the purpose of evaluating noise compatibility of land use are depicted on Figure 4.1. The state law (Public Utilities Code Section 21675(a)) requires that noise contours reflect the anticipated growth of the airport during at least the next 20 years. The AMP, 2011 EA/EIR and the 2012 EA/MND provided the activity forecast used in the contour calculations.

1. Airport land use noise compatibility shall be evaluated in terms of the Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL), as defined in Title 21, Subchapter 6, of the California Code of Regulations (noise standards). Wherever used in this plan, the term CNEL shall be assumed to be an annual average.

2. The maximum noise exposure which shall be considered normally acceptable for residential areas is 65 db CNEL. The residential area criterion establishes the baseline from which noise compatibility for other land uses shall be evaluated.
The relative acceptability or unacceptability of particular land uses with respect to the noise levels to which they would be exposed is indicated in the "Airport Land Use Noise Compatibility Criteria" matrix, Table 1. These criteria shall be the principal determinants of whether a proposed land use is compatible with the noise impact from FYI. Special circumstances which would affect the specific proposal's noise sensitivity (e.g., the extent or lack of outdoor activity) shall also be taken into account.

A condition for approval of a proposed land use which is shown on Table 1 identified as "Conditional" for a given noise environment shall be that the building intended for habitation or occupation provide a satisfactory degree of noise attenuation. Table 2 sets forth the permitted interior noise levels. If the structure can reduce the noise exposure to the outlined noise levels, the use may be deemed compatible.

New residential development and new schools shall be prohibited within the 65 CNEL contour of FYI unless it is determined that there is no feasible alternative to such development of the subject property and provided that the following conditions are met:

(a) The record property owner grants an avigation easement to the City of Fresno.

(b) The record property owner executes an agreement in favor of the City of Fresno, whereby the property owner shall indemnify, hold harmless and defend the City and every officer and employee thereof from any and all loss, liability, damages, costs, suits or claims arising out of the location of the development within the 65 CNEL contour.

(c) New residential structures shall incorporate noise insulation in compliance with Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations such that interior noise levels are reduced to no more than 45 db CNEL.

An acoustical analysis shall be required prior to the approval of a special permit (site plan or conditional use permit) for any new residential use, transient lodging, school, library, hospital, nursing home, day nursery, church, auditorium or a concert hall located within a 65 or greater CNEL contour. For single family residential proposals, an acoustical analysis shall be required as a condition of subdivision map approval, said analysis to be submitted prior to the issuance of building permits. The acoustical analysis shall be completed in a manner consistent with Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations. A special permit for the uses listed above shall not be approved unless the acoustical analysis demonstrates that interior noise levels attributable to exterior sources does not exceed 45 db CNEL in any habitable room with windows and doors closed. In quantifying aircraft noise exposure of the project site, the acoustical
analysis shall include consideration of engine run up noise where applicable. A single report may suffice for all similar proposals within the same CNEL contour.

(7) Within the 70 CNEL contour, new or redeveloped schools, hospitals, nursing homes, libraries, day nurseries, churches, auditoriums, and amphitheaters shall be prohibited. New residential uses (excluding transient lodging) shall be prohibited, except as provided for in Policy No. (8), below.

(8) Existing residential uses lying within the 70 CNEL contour, that conform to the land use designations of this plan, may be remodeled in such a way that does not increase the floor space of the residence, or rebuilt if destroyed by fire, explosion or other catastrophic means. A use is considered to be destroyed if the cost of reconstruction, repairing or rebuilding would exceed fifty percent of the reasonable replacement value of the building immediately prior to the destruction.

(9) When applying the noise compatibility criteria listed in Table 1 to a given location, the basis for evaluation shall be the maximum CNEL contour shown in the Compatibility Plan.

(10) If a noise analysis, including noise monitoring, indicates that project noise exposure may be higher or lower than indicated by the Airport Land Use Noise Compatibility Criteria, Table 1, due to site-specific conditions or changes in Airport/aircraft operations, the noise exposure used for project evaluation may be adjusted at the discretion of the ALUC.

3.2 Overflight

Noise from individual aircraft can be intrusive and annoying in locations beyond the limits of the mapped noise contours. Sensitivity to aircraft overflights varies from one person to another. The purpose of overflight compatibility policies is to help notify people about the presence of overflights near airports so that they can make informed decisions regarding acquisition or lease of property in the affected areas. Overflight compatibility is particularly important with regard to residential land uses.

(1) The overflight compatibility of proposed land uses within the AIA shall be evaluated in accordance with the policies set forth in this section.

(2) Except when overriding circumstances exist, a condition for approval of any residential development proposal (i.e., zone change, subdivision map, conditional use permit, site plan review) within the AIA, as defined herein, shall be the dedication of an avigation easement to the City of Fresno.
(3) An Avigation Easement and Agreement shall be required for all development proposals (commercial, industrial or residential) within the 65 CNEL contour. The avigation easement shall contain the following property rights:

(a) Right-of-flight at any altitude above acquired easement surfaces.

(b) Right to generate noise, vibrations, fumes, dust and fuel particle emissions.

(c) Right-of-entry to remove, mark, or light any structures or growths above easement surfaces.

(d) Right to prohibit creation of electrical interference, unusual light sources, and other hazards to aircraft flight.

(e) Right to prevent erection or growth of all objects above acquired easement surfaces.

The easement surfaces acquired shall be based on Part 77 of the Federal Aviation Regulations except that no easement surface less than 35 feet above ground shall be acquired.

(4) A Covenant shall be required as a further condition for approval of residential development proposals within the AIA and all development proposals within the 65 CNEL contour. The Council of the City of Fresno shall, except where overriding circumstances exist, require the property owner(s) to record a covenant providing the following:

(a) That it is understood by the owners and owners' successors in interest that the real property in question lies close to the Fresno Yosemite International Airport and that the operation of the airport and the landing and take-off of aircraft may generate high noise levels which will affect the habitability and quiet enjoyment of the property.

(b) That the owners covenant to accept and acknowledge the operation of the Fresno Yosemite International Airport.

(5) The above avigation easement, covenants, conditions and restrictions shall be recorded in the office of the Fresno County Clerk/Recorder and shall run with the land and shall be binding upon the present and subsequent owners of the property.
Effective January 1, 2004, California state statutes (Business and Professional Code Sections 1102.6, 1103.4 and 1353) require that, as part of residential real estate transactions, information be disclosed regarding whether the property is situated within an AIA. Buyer notification shall be accomplished by the use of real estate disclosure statements for property within the AIA. The disclosure statements shall notify the buyers of property located within the AIA of Fresno Yosemite International Airport and that aircraft overflights may affect the habitability and quiet enjoyment of the property.

3.3 Safety

The intent of land use safety compatibility is to minimize the risks associated with an off-airport aircraft accident or emergency landing. Risks both to people and property on the ground in the vicinity of the airport and to people on board aircraft are considered. The safety compatibility of land use development is outlined in Table 3. The zone boundaries are based upon general aviation aircraft accident location data contained in the California Airport Land Use Planning Handbook ("Caltrans Handbook") along with data regarding the runway configuration and aircraft operational procedures at FYI.

(1) Land uses or land use characteristics which may affect safe air navigation or because of their nature and proximity to an airport, may be incompatible with the airport and shall be avoided in the vicinity of FYI.

(2) The criteria which shall be used to evaluate whether a land use is acceptable with respect to its airport proximity are set forth in Table 3, entitled Airport Land Use Safety Compatibility Criteria. The indicated Safety Compatibility Zones (SCZs), as defined in the Caltrans Handbook, shall be used.

NOTE: Within SCZs 3 and 4 the following shall apply:

(a) Existing development that conforms to existing zoning regulations in effect prior to February 20, 1987 may be rebuilt in the event it is destroyed by fire or Act of God.

(b) The regulations identified in the Caltrans Handbook are not intended to take development rights such that the economic viable use of land is unduly restricted. Therefore, development of vacant property or redevelopment of property in accordance with the zoning regulations in effect prior to February 20, 1987 shall not be prohibited on the basis of the restrictions set forth in Table 3. This provision shall not apply to schools, hospitals, nursing homes, churches, auditoriums, concert halls, amphitheaters or other uses that would result in a large concentration of people.
(3) Land uses which attract wildlife that pose a hazard to aviation activities are a special concern adjacent to airports. Examples of land use which may attract hazardous wildlife include landfills and bodies of standing water. In reviewing a project for safety compatibility, the most current version of the FAA Advisory Circular AC No. 150/5200-33 (Hazardous Wildlife Attractants On or Near Airports) shall be considered. The review area identified in this circular is outlined as the boundary within 10,000 feet of the Airport Operations Area.

3.4 Airspace Protection

The objective of airspace protection policies is to ensure that structures and other uses of the land do not cause hazards to aircraft in flight in the airport vicinity. Hazards to flight include physical obstructions to the navigable airspace, wildlife hazards (particularly bird strikes) and land use characteristics that create visual or electronic interference with aircraft navigation or communication. Boundaries of this zone represent the imaginary surfaces defined for the airport in accordance with Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR) Part 77.

(1) No structure, tree, or other object shall be permitted to exceed the height limits established in accordance with Part 77, Subpart C, of the FAR. This criterion applies unless, in the case of a proposed object or growing tree, one or more of the following conditions exist:

(a) The object would be substantially shielded by existing permanent structures or terrain in a manner such that it clearly would not affect the safety of air navigation;

(b) The FAA has conducted an aeronautical study and either determined that the object would not result in a hazard to air navigation or made recommendations for the object's proper marking and lighting as an obstruction, and FAA recommendations, if any, are properly implemented;

(c) The object is otherwise exempted from the requirements of FAR Part 77.

In the case of an existing object, this criterion also applies unless the object exceeded the prescribed height limits prior to February 20, 1987, in which case marking and lighting may still be required.

(2) No object shall be permitted to be erected that, because of height or other factors, would result in an increase in the minimum ceiling or visibility criteria for an existing or proposed instrument approach procedure to any runway.
(3) The FAR Part 77 surfaces depicted on the Airspace Protection Surfaces (Figures 4.3.1 through 4.3.5) shall be used in conjunction with the above airspace policies to determine whether the height of an object is acceptable.

CHAPTER 4: COMPATIBILITY ZONE MAPS

4.1 Noise Contours

The recently updated AMP and the adopted EA/EIR provides the activity forecast used in the contour calculations. Refer to Figure 4.1, Noise Contours.

4.2 Safety Zones

The Caltrans Handbook, January 2002 October 2011, provides guidance for Safety Zone Configuration. These zones are delineated based on the type of airport, size of airport, and operational characteristic. Refer to Figure 4.2.1, Safety Compatibility Zones.

4.3 Airspace Protection Surfaces

Part 77 of the FAR, Objects Affecting Navigable Airspace, establishes standards for determining obstructions to navigable airspace and the effects of such obstructions on the safe and efficient use of that airspace. Refer to Figures 4.3.1 through 4.3.5, Airspace Protection Surfaces.

4.4 Airport Layout Plan

The Airport Layout Plan (ALP) is an FAA approved document that depicts planned development at the airport. Refer to Figure 4.4 (2006 2012 FAA approved ALP). For evaluation purposes the most recent ALP on file with FAA shall be used.

CHAPTER 5: PROCEDURAL POLICIES

5.1 Types of Actions Reviewed by the Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC)

The following types of actions must be referred to the ALUC for review when the affected property is located in the Airport Influence Area (AIA – see Figure 4.5):

a) Adoption or amendment of general plans, community plans and specific plans;
b) Rezoning applications or text amendments to the zoning ordinance;
c) Airport Master Plans
d) Building Regulations

The following types of local actions do NOT require ALUC review:

e) Conditional Use Permits and Site Plan Reviews
f) Variances
g) Subdivision or Parcel Maps

5.2 Types of Actions that Require Consistency with Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan Policies:

The following types of local actions require consistency with the plan policies included in this document when the affected property is located in the AIA:

a) Rezoning applications,
b) Conditional use permits, and site plan reviews,
c) Variances,
d) Subdivision maps and parcel maps

Interpretation Guidelines:

a) If a parcel of land is partially within the AIA, the entire parcel is considered to be subject to the land use consistency requirements of this plan.

b) In the event that it cannot be precisely determined from the AIA Map whether a parcel of land is within the AIA, the determination in this regard shall be made by the Director of the Development and Resource Management Department. The Director's Determination shall be final.

5.3 Project Information

The Fresno County Airport Land Use Commission Application Review Form is used for submittal of a project to the ALUC for review.

5.4 Timing of Review

Time is a factor with regard to the project review process in two ways:

a) Timing of Project Submittal. Plans and projects shall be referred to the ALUC at the earliest reasonable point in time so that the commission's review can be duly considered by the local jurisdiction prior to formalizing its actions. Depending upon the type of plan or project and the normal scheduling of meetings, ALUC review can be done before, after or concurrently with review by the local planning
commission and other advisory bodies, but must be accomplished before final action by the decision making bodies.

b) Response Time Requirement. ALUC must respond within 60 days of referral to local agency requests for a consistency determination on plans or projects for which submittal is mandatory. However, this response period does not begin until such time as all information necessary for accomplishment of the project review has been submitted to the commission..
5.5 ALUC Action Choices

ALUC choice of action on a land use plan or project submitted for review may either be consistent or inconsistent with the compatibility plan. Although the Aeronautics Act (Sections 21676(a) and 21676.5(a)) mentions only the above two choices of action, the Fresno County ALUC has decided to allow a third option: consistent with conditions. When a finding of consistency with conditions is made, the conditions should be limited in scope and described in a manner which allows compliance to be clearly assessed.

5.6 Overruling an ALUC Decision

Various sections of the airport land use commission statutes provide for local agencies to overrule ALUC decisions on land use matters and airport master plans. The overruling process involves the three following mandatory steps:

a) The holding of a public hearing (and as a courtesy it is recommended to inform the ALUC of such hearing);

b) The making of specific findings that the action proposed is consistent with the purposes of the ALUC statute; and

c) Approval of the proposed action by a two-thirds vote of the agency’s governing body.

CHAPTER 6: INITIAL REVIEW OF GENERAL PLAN CONSISTENCY

The Caltrans Handbook specifically outlines that to be fully consistent with the compatibility plan, a general plan must not have any direct conflicts with the compatibility plan; and must delineate a mechanism or process for ensuring that individual land use development proposals comply with the ALUC criteria.

The City of Fresno FYI Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan is an amendment to an existing specific plan (the FYI Airport and Environs Plan, 1997). It does not change the planned land use designations in the 2025 Fresno General Plan or the applicable community plans, specific plans or redevelopment plans, nor does it change zoning designations within the scope of the plan area. It simply updates noise contours and safety zone configurations, while maintaining the noise and safety-related land use policies that must be applied to property within the AIA. As such, it is a refinement of the 2025 Fresno General Plan and the McLane, Hoover and Roosevelt Community Plans and applicable redevelopment plans within the AIA.

Furthermore, there are no conflicts between the City of Fresno FYI Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan and the County of Fresno ALUC Compatibility Land Use Plan (CLUP) adopted in October 2010 June 2012. As outlined by the Caltrans Handbook, consistency does not require being identical. It means only that the concepts,
standards, physical characteristics, and resulting consequences of proposed action must not conflict with the intent of law or the compatibility plan to which the comparison is made. The two plans are virtually identical, with slight variation in Chapters 5 and 6 related to processing procedures and general plan consistency. Therefore, they meet the criteria of compatibility set forth in state law.
TABLE 1
AIRPORT LAND USE NOISE COMPATIBILITY CRITERIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAND USE CATEGORY</th>
<th>Exterior Noise Exposure (CNEL)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60-65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential, Lodging, and Care</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Residential (including single-family, multi-family)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirement homes, residential support facilities,</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hospitals, nursing homes, large child day care centers,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adult day care facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Hotels, motels, other transient lodging</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Mobile Homes</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public and Institutional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Schools, libraries</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Places of worship, auditoriums, concert halls, theaters, indoor arenas</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemeteries, Parking</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial and Industrial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offices, service commercial, retail, shopping centers,</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>restaurants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale, warehousing, research and development, light</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>industrial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extractive industry, industrial, manufacturing, utilities</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural, and Recreational</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cropland</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature preserves, Livestock breeding, Zoos</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional parks, athletic fields, golf courses, outdoor spectator sports, water recreational facilities, horse stables</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amphitheaters</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**TABLE 1 (cont)**

**AIRPORT LAND USE NOISE COMPATIBILITY CRITERIA**

**LEGEND**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Land Use Acceptability</th>
<th>Interpretation/Conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>Compatible</td>
<td>The activities associated with the specific land use may be carried out with essentially no interference from aircraft noise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Conditional</td>
<td>The indicated noise exposure will cause interference with the activities. Building structure must be capable of attenuating noise to the indoor acceptable CNEL, standard construction methods will normally suffice. Indoor Uses: Noise exposure may cause moderate interference with indoor activities, extensive construction features required to make the indoor environment acceptable. Outdoor Uses: CNEL is acceptable for outdoor activities, although some noise interference may occur, caution should be exercised with regards to noise-sensitive uses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_</td>
<td>Incompatible</td>
<td>Unacceptable noise interference upon these activities will occur indoor and outdoor. Adequate structural noise insulation is not practical under most circumstances. Severe noise interference makes outdoor activities unacceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*</td>
<td>Acoustical Analysis Required</td>
<td>An acoustical analysis shall be performed by an individual or firm experienced in Acoustical Engineering</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## TABLE 2

**INTERIOR NOISE LEVEL REDUCTION (dBA)**

**CNEL RANGE (Annual Average)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GENERALIZED LAND USE</th>
<th>60-65</th>
<th>65-70</th>
<th>70-75</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>AS</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transient Lodging</td>
<td>AS</td>
<td>25\textsuperscript{1} dBA</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools, Hospitals and Nursing Homes</td>
<td>AS</td>
<td>25\textsuperscript{1} dBA</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>AS</td>
<td>AS</td>
<td>25 dBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing\textsuperscript{2}</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>AS</td>
<td>25 dBA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend**

+ Uses normally acceptable.

-- Uses should not be permitted.

\textsuperscript{1} Acoustical studies may indicate a need for additional insulation in noise sensitive living areas such as sleeping quarters and areas of the facility used at night for relaxing and conversing.

\textsuperscript{2} Noise level reductions are for those portions of the buildings where the public is received, office areas, and noise sensitive areas where noise levels are low.

AS Acoustical studies shall be performed to determine if insulation should be added to sensitive occupancy areas.
### TABLE 3

**AIRPORT LAND USE SAFETY COMPATABILITY CRITERIA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAND USE CHARACTERISTICS</th>
<th>SAFETY ZONES</th>
<th>SAFETY ZONES</th>
<th>SAFETY ZONES</th>
<th>SAFETY ZONES</th>
<th>SAFETY ZONES</th>
<th>SAFETY ZONES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zone 1</td>
<td>Zone 2</td>
<td>Zone 3</td>
<td>Zone 4</td>
<td>Zone 5</td>
<td>Zone 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Uses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Uses in Structures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Uses Not in Structures</td>
<td>(D,F)</td>
<td>(D)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### SPECIAL CHARACTERISTICS (IN OR OUTSIDE OF STRUCTURES)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Zone 1</th>
<th>Zone 2</th>
<th>Zone 3</th>
<th>Zone 4</th>
<th>Zone 5</th>
<th>Zone 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Distracting Lights or Glare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sources of Smoke or Electrical Interference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attractor of Birds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### NOTES

1. See Figure 4.2.1, Safety Compatibility Zones.
2. Refer to figure 4.2.2 for dimensional layout of the Safety Compatibility Zones.

#### INTERPRETATION

+ Compatible: Use is acceptable with little or no risks.

( ) Conditional: Land use proposals that fall within this category must be reviewed on a case-by-case basis by Commission or jurisdiction having authority. The Commission or jurisdiction having authority may determine the use to be acceptable under conditions cited below.

- A Density no greater than 1 dwelling unit per 3 acres.
- B Density no greater than 2 dwelling units per acre.
- C Density no greater than 5 dwelling units per acre.
- D No uses attracting more than 10 persons per acre.
- E No schools, hospitals, nursing homes, or similar uses.
- F Characteristic cannot reasonably be avoided or located outside the indicated safety zone.

-- Incompatible: Use is unacceptable due to associated high risks.
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INTRODUCTION

This Mitigated Negative Declaration and Initial Study (MND/IS) evaluates the potential environmental effects of proposed runway safety area (RSA) improvements at Fresno Yosemite International (FYI) Airport. This MND/IS is being provided as part of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) documentation for the City of Fresno's consideration. The City of Fresno is undertaking the role of "Lead Agency" for this project in accordance with CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines. Discretionary actions required by the City for project implementation include: certification of the project's compliance with CEQA, and an update to the City's Airport Compatibility Land Use Plan (CLUP)/General Plan Amendment. Discretionary action anticipated by the Fresno County Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) is the adoption of an update to the ALUC FYI Compatibility Land Use Plan.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW PROCESS

The City of Fresno's review and determination regarding the potential environmental impacts of the proposed runway safety improvements at FYI will be based on the information presented in this MND/IS. The 2011 joint Environmental Assessment (EA)/Environmental Impact Report (EIR), prepared for the Airport Master Plan, was utilized to provide background information for the currently proposed project. The Final Environmental Assessment and Environmental Impact Report, Improvements at Fresno Yosemite International Airport (FAT), Fresno, California (FAA and City of Fresno 2011) is incorporated by reference into this MND/IS. (Note: The FAA airport identifier for FYI is FAT.) This document is hereby referred to as the 2011 EA/EIR.
The Initial Study portion of the document contains an “Environmental Checklist” for assessing potential environmental impacts of the proposed project in a modified form suggested by Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines. A brief explanation is provided for all responses contained in the Environmental Checklist, including supportive documentation for those responses identified as “No Impact” or “Less than Significant Impact.” Where appropriate, mitigation measures have been identified to reduce potentially significant impacts to a less-than-significant level.

Based on analysis undertaken to fill out the checklist, the proposed airport improvements are not expected to result in any environmental impacts that could not be mitigated to a less-than-significant level through project design or implementation of existing federal, state, or city regulations or standards. Based on this determination, the City of Fresno is proposing to adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration for the proposed project. This MND/IS document suffices to fulfill the environmental review requirements for approvals by the City of Fresno and other agencies under CEQA, as noted in Item 10 of the Project Description.
1. Project Title:

Proposed Runway Safety Area (RSA) Improvements to Runway 11L-29R

2. Lead Agency Name and Address:

City of Fresno Airports Department
4995 E Clinton Way
Fresno, CA 93727-1525

3. Contact Person and Phone Number:

Kevin Meikle, Architect
Assistant Director of Aviation
City of Fresno Airports Department
(559) 621-4500
4. Project Location:

Fresno Yosemite International (FYI) Airport is located in the San Joaquin Valley of central California approximately five miles northeast of downtown Fresno. It is also adjacent to the City of Clovis. Figure 1 depicts the airport in its regional setting.

The airport is accessed from the south via E. Clinton Way. It is also bordered by N. Chestnut Avenue on the west, E. Dakota Avenue on the north, E. Airways Boulevard on the northeast, and N. Clovis Avenue on the east.

5. Project Sponsor's Name and Address:

City of Fresno Airports Department
5175 E. Clinton Way
Fresno, CA 93727

6. General Plan Designation:

The existing airport, including the proposed project area, is designated primarily as Public Facilities - Airport on the City's 2025 Fresno General Plan Land Use and Circulation map (City of Fresno 2010). However, some areas within the airport boundaries are designated as: Open Space (the Airways Golf Course and several ponding basins); Light Industrial (areas located to the northeast and southwest of the airport runway system); and Commercial (small parcel located on the northeast corner of the intersection of N. Chestnut and E. Shields avenues).

The onsite and adjacent land use designations are shown on Figure 2. The airport is primarily surrounded by lands designated as light industrial. An area immediately northwest of the intersection of E. Dakota and N. Chestnut avenues is designated as Water Recharge Basin. Another area to the southwest of the airport is designated as Regional Park.

7. Zoning:

The airport is generally zoned as follows: M-1, Light Manufacturing; M-1-P, Industrial Park Manufacturing; M-2, General Industrial; and OC, Open Conservation. However, the area of the airport that contains the proposed RSA improvements is zoned as Open Conservation. Additional zoning at the airport includes: AE-5, Exclusive Five Acre Agricultural; RA, Single Family Residential Agricultural; R-1, Single Family Residential; R-P, Residential and Professional Office; and C-6, Heavy Commercial.

Figure 2
CITY OF FRESNO
GENERAL LAND USE DESIGNATIONS

Source: City of Fresno, 2025 General Plan Land Use and Circulation Map
8. Description of Project:

Airport Background

FYI is a joint-use civilian/military airport utilized by commercial air carriers, air cargo operators, charter operators, and the military. The California Air National Guard (CANG) occupies a 58-acre area in the southeast corner of the airport. In addition, the CANG and the United States Army Reserve occupy facilities on the north side of the airport. The entire airport encompasses approximately 1,728 acres of land.

The airport is served by two parallel runways. The primary runway, Runway 11L-29R, is 9,227 feet long and 150 feet wide. Runway 29R is displaced by 312 feet in order to provide adequate approach surface clearances over N. Clovis Avenue.

The secondary runway, Runway 11R-29L, is 7,206 feet long and 100 feet wide and also has a displaced threshold. A project is currently underway to extend Runway 11R-29L by 700 feet to the west and 100 feet to the east, remove the displaced threshold, and widen the runway to 150 feet. Once this project is complete, it will allow the airport to substantially maintain existing operating capacity when the primary runway is closed for maintenance or other purposes. This project was evaluated within the 2011 EA/EIR. The parallel runway system is supported by full-length, 75-foot wide parallel taxiways on both the north and south sides of the runway system.

An airport traffic control tower is located on the south side of the airport and provides 24-hour traffic control services at the airport. The airport terminal building, located south of the runways off E. Clinton Way, houses commercial passenger services and airport administration offices. Passenger facilities include airline ticketing counters, a baggage return area, food and gift shops, a Federal Inspection Station, rental car facilities, and boarding gates.

Two fixed base operators (FBOs), each providing a wide range of aviation-related services, are located at FYI. The current FBOs are Corporate Air and Signature Flight Support. Fuel, aircraft maintenance, aircraft rental, and aircraft parking services are available from these tenants. Additionally, the airport has an airport rescue and firefighting (ARFF) station located on-site to provide fire suppression services in case of an emergency.

Project Background

The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) has established design standards to ensure the safety, economic viability, efficiency, and longevity of an airport. These standards include criteria for RSAs, which are defined as the surface surrounding the runway prepared or suitable for reducing the risk of damage to airplanes in the event of an aircraft landing short, landing long, or departing from the runway. Traditional RSAs consist of clear, graded, and grassed surfaces surrounding the perimeter of a runway.
In the late 1990s and early 2000s, a series of aircraft accidents highlighted the need for airports to comply with RSA standards. These accidents, such as those in Little Rock, Arkansas and Chicago, Illinois, resulted in the loss of human life which stimulated the passage of Public Law (P.L.) 109-115, Transportation, Treasury, Housing and Urban Development, the Judiciary, the District of Columbia, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, 2006 which states: "That not later than December 31, 2015, the owner or operator of an airport certificated under 49 United States Code (U.S.C.) 44706 shall improve the airport's runway safety areas to comply with the Federal Aviation Administration design standards required by 14 CFR Part 139." As a certificated airport, FYI is required by 14 CFR Part 139 to comply with RSA standards to the fullest extent practicable.

In 2006, FYI completed an RSA study in response to H.R. 3058 and FAA Order 5200.8, Runway Safety Area Program, which became effective October 1, 1999. The objective of the RSA program is to ensure that all RSAs at federally obligated airports conform to standards contained in FAA Advisory Circular (AC) 150/5300-13, Airport Design, to the extent practicable. The RSA study found that Runway 11L-29R does not fully meet FAA RSA design standards for the types of aircraft which utilize the runway on a regular basis. AC 150/5300-13, Airport Design, defines the need to provide an RSA that is 500 feet wide and extends 1,000 feet beyond the runway end for departures and 600 feet prior to the landing threshold for arrivals. Currently, the RSA for Runway 11L is encroached upon by the perimeter access road, a security fence, and Clovis Avenue. The localizer antenna is also located within the RSA in this area. These RSA encroachments are depicted on Figure 3.

In March 2011, the 2006 study was re-visited to determine what facility changes are needed to fully comply with the recommended RSA dimensions while maintaining the existing operational runway length. This study, Runway Safety Area Re-Evaluation for Runway 11L-29R, recommended a shift of Runway 11L-29R west to preclude the loss of runway, while minimizing total construction cost and maintaining the goal of preserving maximum runway length for all operations. To accommodate existing airport users, the airport needs to maintain 9,227 feet of runway length for aircraft arrivals and departures.

Proposed Runway Safety Area (RSA) Improvements

The proposed RSA improvements take into account the various development constraints located beyond the existing runway ends and provides the needed RSA while maintaining runway length. Development constraints beyond the existing runway ends include Clovis Avenue to the east and Dakota Avenue and Chestnut Avenue to the north and west. Taking into account these constraints, the proposed RSA improvement project maintains existing runway landing and departure lengths and meets RSA standards through the implementation of declared distances and a 312-foot westerly extension of Runway 11L-29R. Figure 4 depicts the resultant runway lengths available for takeoff and landing in each direction. The declared distances reflect a standard 600-foot RSA prior to landing and 1,000-foot RSA beyond the runway end for departure. Additional information regarding declared distances is also shown on Figure 4. The proposed runway improvements result in the airport maximizing the remaining runway length while providing an RSA that meets FAA RSA standards.
DECLARED DISTANCES

Declared distances are used by the FAA to define the effective runway length for landing and takeoff when a displaced threshold is involved. The four types of declared distances, as defined in FAA AC 150/5300-13, Airport Design, are as follows:

**Takeoff Run Available (TORA)** - The runway length declared available and suitable for the ground run of an airplane taking off. This declared distance reflects the length of pavement that can handle the weight of an aircraft. TORA does not take into consideration FSA standards.

**Takeoff Distance Available (TDCA)** - The TORA plus the length of any remaining runway and/or clearance beyond the far end of the TORA at which the airplane can clear a 50-foot obstacle.

**Accelerate-Stop Distance Available (ASDA)** - The runway declared available for the acceleration and deceleration of an aircraft aborting a takeoff. ASDA takes into consideration FSA standards, thereby improving safety margins for users. ASDA is the most critical for runway length calculations.

**Landing Distance Available (LDA)** - The runway length declared available and suitable for landing taking into account the FSA standard.
The extension of the runway 312 feet and implementation of declared distances requires a number of connected actions. The following bullets summarize the projects resulting from the proposed RSA improvements.

- Construction of two stub taxiways to connect with taxiways currently under construction.
- Reconstruct Taxiway C12 to connect with Taxiway C extension.
- Construction of an aircraft holding apron at the west end of Taxiway C.
- Relocation of the Precision Approach Path Indicator (PAPI) lighting system and the Runway End Identifier Lights (REIL)

All items illustrated on Figure 4 are expected to be developed within the next three years (2012-2015). Table 1 outlines the anticipated development schedule.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Anticipated Start Date*</th>
<th>Anticipated End Date*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Runway 11L-29R Extension/RSA Environmental</td>
<td>In-Progress</td>
<td>05/31/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runway 11L-29R Extension/RSA Design</td>
<td>In-Progress</td>
<td>10/01/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runway 11L-29R Extension/RSA Construction</td>
<td>04/01/2013</td>
<td>10/01/2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* All dates are preliminary and contingent upon funding, environmental and actions by others.

9. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting: Briefly describe the project's surroundings.

Land uses on airport property consist primarily of aviation-related uses. However, the Fresno Airways Golf Course is located on airport property north of the runways and several industrial/commercial land uses are located north of E. Clinton Way and southwest of E. Andersen Avenue. The airport is located within the jurisdictional boundary of the City of Fresno. City of Clovis and County of Fresno jurisdictional areas are also located within the vicinity of the airport.

As depicted on Figure 5, land uses located to the west of the airport are a mixture of residential and commercial. A portion of this residential area is within a County of Fresno "island." Homes in this area were mostly built in the 1950s and '60s. Directly south, southwest, and east of the airport are industrial areas that include businesses that are compatible with or related to the airport. Most of the buildings are considered to be low-rise (i.e., three stories or less). Landscaping consists of various trees, shrubs, and grasses that are adjacent to the commercial, industrial, and residential buildings.
Land uses to the southeast, within County of Fresno jurisdiction, are primarily agricultural with some areas of residential development. Land uses in the City of Clovis, located north and northeast of the airport, are primarily residential with some industrial and commercial uses.

Several percolation ponds are located immediately northwest of the airport. This 210-acre groundwater recharge area is locally known as the “Leaky Acres.” There are also noise-sensitive land uses such as places of worship, medical facilities, and schools within the vicinity of the airport. Addicott Elementary School is located across N. Chestnut Avenue from the airport’s western property line. Scandanavian Middle School is also located within 0.25-mile of the airport’s western boundary.

10. Other Agencies Whose Approval is Required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Approval Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal Aviation Administration (FAA)</td>
<td>Unconditional Approval of proposed changes to the airport layout plan (ALP); Determinations ensuring compliance with applicable federal regulations related to airport safety and funding; Certification of compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresno County Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC)</td>
<td>Update to Fresno County’s Airport Compatibility Land Use Plan (CLUP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Fresno</td>
<td>Update to City of Fresno’s CLUP/General Plan Amendment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB)</td>
<td>Update to the applicable National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Industrial Permit (#CA0083500); Issuance of a NPDES General Construction Permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD)</td>
<td>Issuance of an Authority to Construct permit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. Environmental Factors Potentially Affected:

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

☐ Aesthetics ☐ Agriculture and Forestry Resources ☐ Air Quality
☐ Biological Resources ☐ Cultural Resources ☐ Geology /Soils
☐ Greenhouse Gas Emissions ☐ Hazards & Hazardous Materials ☐ Hydrology / Water Quality
☐ Land Use / Planning ☐ Mineral Resources ☐ Noise
☐ Population / Housing ☐ Public Services ☐ Recreation
☐ Transportation/Traffic ☐ Utilities / Service Systems ☐ Mandatory Findings of Significance
12. Determination:

Staff has reviewed the project proposal described above and consulted with affected agencies. The proposed project has been evaluated with respect to the provisions of the adopted 2025 Fresno General Plan (City Council Resolution No. 2002-379) and the Hoover, McLane and Roosevelt Community Plans and the corresponding potential adverse environmental impacts, adopted environmental impact mitigation measures, and determinations of overriding considerations established by the certification of the related Master Environmental Impact Report (MEIR) No. 10130 (City Council Resolution No. 2002-378) and Air Quality Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND). The proposed project has been determined to not be fully within the scope of MEIR No. 10130 as provided by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), as codified in the Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 21157.1-(d) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15177(c).

Based upon an analysis of the project, as summarized in the following environmental assessment Initial Study, it has been determined that the project may contribute to the creation of certain moderate environmental effects or the project may be adversely impacted by existing conditions as addressed below.

All such potential impacts can be mitigated to a level of insignificance with the adoption of the proposed mitigation measures that have proven to be effective in reducing or limiting said impacts. Further, these potential impacts have been determined to be equivalent to or less than those adverse impacts identified by MEIR No. 10130. It has been further determined that all applicable mitigation measures of MEIR No. 10130 have been applied to the project, together with project-specific mitigation measures necessary to assure that the project will not cause significant adverse cumulative impacts, growth inducing impacts and irreversible significant effects beyond those identified by MEIR No. 10130 as provided by CEQA Guidelines Section 15178(a). In addition, pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21157.6(b)(1), it is further determined that no substantial changes have occurred with respect to the circumstances under which the MEIR was certified and that no new information, which was not known and could not have been known at the time that the MEIR was certified as complete, has become available. Therefore, it has been determined that the filing of a Mitigated Negative Declaration is appropriate in accordance with the provisions of Public Resources Code, Section 21157.5(a) (2) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15178(b) (1) and (2). A Review Summary to the 2025 Fresno General Plan Master Environmental Impact Report (Exhibit A) is attached to this MND/IS as a reference.

MEIR No. 10130 examined the potential adverse environmental impacts of implementation of the 2025 Fresno General Plan, which provides plans and policies to accommodate projected population and employment growth through the year 2025. The City of Fresno has determined that specific economic, legal, social, technological and other considerations related to the implementation of the 2025 Fresno General Plan outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects identified in the Final MEIR, including any effects not mitigated because of the infeasibility of mitigation measures, and that the identified adverse environmental
effects are considered acceptable. It has been determined that the proposed project may be adversely impacted by environmental situations addressed below.

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

☐ I find the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

☐ I find the proposed project MAY have a significant effect(s) on the environment, 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, if the effect is a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated." 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, there WILL NOT be a significant effect in this case because all potentially significant effects: (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR pursuant to applicable standards; and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project.

Signature: [Signature]
Date: 3-26-02
Printed Name: KEVIN R. MEIKLE
For: [For]
FRESNO YOSEMITE
INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

EVALUATION OF
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS
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 where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).

2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.

3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.

4) "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The Lead Agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from "Earlier Analyses," as described in (5) below may be cross-referenced).

5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the 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 they are available for review.

   b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in 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 Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.

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, where 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 less than significant.
## ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues (Supporting Information Sources)</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. AESTHETICS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state-designated scenic highway?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Impact Analysis

1 a) No Impact. There are no scenic vistas in proximity to the proposed project area, which is located in an urban, developed area of the City.

1 b) No Impact. There are no scenic resources or state-designated scenic highways within proximity to the proposed project area.³

1 c) No Impact. The existing visual character in the area of the airport is dominated by urban development consisting of various commercial, industrial, and residential buildings, along with local roadways, and airfield-related facilities. Most of the buildings are considered to be low-rise (i.e., three stories or less). Landscaping consists of various trees, shrubs, and grasses that are adjacent to the commercial, industrial, and residential buildings.

The airport itself is surrounded by a perimeter chain link fence and some landscaping that helps to define its boundaries. The proposed project will extend the runway and retain the remaining open space within the airport boundaries. Existing airport landscaping will not be altered. The proposed project will not change the existing urban development, roads, and landscaping adjacent to the airport that defines the visual quality of the area.

1 d) Less than Significant Impact. The proposed project will extend Runway 11L-29R west 312 feet, which will result in a shift of the Runway End Identifier Lights (REIL) and the Precision

---

Approach Path Indicator (PAPI) system. Runway and taxiway edge lighting will also be relocated to reflect the runway extension.

Changes to the REILs, PAPI, and runway and taxiway edge lights are not expected to result in impacts to neighboring land uses. Airfield lighting is generally low to the ground and considered to be low intensity. The closest residence to the proposed runway/taxiway extensions is a home located on the northwestern corner of N. Chestnut and E. Dayton avenues. This home is more than 0.25 mile west of the closest portion of the taxiway/runway extensions. Other residences are located further away along N. Chestnut Avenue near E. Fountain Way. Trees planted within the median of N. Chestnut Avenue will help to further buffer residents along the roadway from airport lighting. At distances of more than a quarter mile, the additional amount of low intensity lighting in the area as a result of the proposed project would be less than significant.

No additional glare is anticipated to be created as a result of the proposed project. Should lighting glare issues arise with neighboring land uses, these lighting fixtures can be shielded so that they are visible only to aircraft flight crews.
II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES:
In determining whether impacts to 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 Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the 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 Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board.

Would the project:

a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?

b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?

c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?

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

e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

Impact Analysis

II a) No Impact. According to the California Resources Agency’s Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP), mapping for eastern Fresno County indicates that there are no prime, unique, or farmland of statewide importance present at the airport.4

II b) No Impact. There are no Williamson contracts or agricultural-related zoning applied to the airport (FAA and City of Fresno 2011); the airport does not contain prime farmland.

---

II c) No Impact. There is no forest land, timberland, or related zoning applied to the airport.

II d) No Impact. There is no forest land present at the airport.

II e) No Impact. According to the California Resources Agency’s FMMP,\(^5\) mapping for eastern Fresno County indicates that there are two areas of farmland of local importance located on the northeastern side of the airport. Neither of these two areas would be disturbed by the proposed project. The proposed project area is considered urban and built-up land by the FMMP. As stated in Sections II c) and II d) of this Initial Study, there are no forest lands present at the airport.

**MEIR Mitigation Measures**

The proposed project shall implement and incorporate the Agriculture and Forest Resource related mitigation measures as identified in the attached MEIR and Air Quality MND Mitigation Monitoring Checklist (Exhibit A) (dated March 30, 2012).

\(^{5}\) ibid.
III. AIR QUALITY

Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations:

Would the project:

a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?

No

Less Than Significant Impact

Less Than Significant Impact

No Impact

b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?

No

Less Than Significant Impact

Less Than Significant Impact

No Impact

c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the air basin is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?

No

Less Than Significant Impact

Less Than Significant Impact

No Impact

d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

No

Less Than Significant Impact

Less Than Significant Impact

No Impact

e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

No

Less Than Significant Impact

Less Than Significant Impact

No Impact

Impact Analysis

III a-c) Less than Significant Impact. Fresno Yosemite International Airport is located in Fresno County, which along with Kings, Madera, Merced, San Joaquin, Stanislaus, and Tulare counties and the western portion of Kern County, is part of the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD). Currently, the San Joaquin Valley is classified as being in non-attainment for 8-hour ozone and fine particulate matter (PM$_{2.5}$) and maintenance for carbon dioxide (CO) and coarse particulate matter (PM$_{10}$), as defined by the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). The SJVAPCD is in nonattainment for ozone, PM$_{2.5}$, and PM$_{10}$ and is classified as “severe” for 1-hour ozone, as defined by the state standards promulgated by the California Air Resources Board (CARB).

The proposed project is primarily an airport safety project and will not result in an increase in the number or types of flights currently occurring at the airport. Therefore, in the long-term, no additional emissions of criteria pollutants will occur as a result of the proposed project.

The proposed project will generate additional emissions of criteria pollutants during the construction phase of the project. Construction activities would include pavement removal, site preparation, grading, and paving, which would require the use of heavy trucks, excavating and grading equipment, material loaders, dozers, and paving equipment. Equipment exhaust

---

would be generated from construction worker vehicle trips, material truck trips, and the operation of construction equipment. Fugitive dust emissions during construction would be generated during ground-disturbing activities, materials handling, and mobile equipment use on unimproved surfaces. Fugitive reactive organic gases (ROG) emissions would be generated during asphalt paving operations. These pollutants could contribute to existing air quality violations occurring within the SJVAPCD and the cumulative degradation of air quality in the short-term.

A construction emissions inventory was conducted for the proposed project by KB Environmental Sciences, Inc. in December 2011 using approved CARB emission models and other appropriate guidelines (Appendix A). Based on an anticipated six-month construction period from April 2013 to October 2013 and estimates of the types and duration of construction equipment likely to be used on the project, expected construction emissions due to the proposed project are presented in Table 2. Approximately 0.37 tons of ROG, 2.08 tons of carbon monoxide (CO), and 3.27 tons of oxides of nitrogen (NO\textsubscript{x}) are likely to be generated by the project. These emissions are well below applicable SJVAPCD thresholds (i.e., 10 tons of ROG and NO\textsubscript{x}).

### TABLE 2
**Construction Emissions Inventory (tons)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>ROG</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>NO\textsubscript{x}</th>
<th>PM\textsubscript{10}</th>
<th>PM\textsubscript{2.5}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Off-road Equipment</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-road Vehicles</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asphalt Paving</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fugitive Dust</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>2.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>2.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: KB Environmental Sciences, Inc., 2011.

Notes: ROG = reactive organic gases, CO = carbon monoxide; NO\textsubscript{x} = oxides of nitrogen; PM\textsubscript{10} = particulate matter with diameter equal to or less than 10 microns; PM\textsubscript{2.5} = particulate matter with diameter equal to or less than 2.5 microns.

As shown in Table 2, the project is also expected to result in 10.5 tons of PM\textsubscript{10} and 2.28 tons of PM\textsubscript{2.5}, most of which would come from fugitive dust. To address fugitive dust, the SJVAPCD’s air quality guidelines require implementation of a series of rules known collectively as Regulation VIII.\textsuperscript{9} The purpose of Regulation VIII is to reduce the amount of dust entrained into the atmosphere as a result of fugitive dust sources such as construction activities. Compliance with Regulation VIII does not constitute mitigation because it is already required by law. The following control measures are required to be implemented pursuant to Regulation VIII:

- All disturbed areas, including storage piles, which are not being actively utilized for construction purposes, shall be effectively stabilized of dust emissions using water, chemical stabilizer/suppressant, covered with a tarp or other suitable cover or vegetative ground cover.

\textsuperscript{8} SJVAPCD, Guide for Accessing and Mitigating Air Quality Impacts, January 10, 2002.

\textsuperscript{9} Ibid.
• All on-site unpaved roads and off-site unpaved access roads shall be effectively stabilized of dust emissions using water or chemical stabilizer/suppressant.

• All land clearing, grubbing, scraping, excavation, land leveling, grading, cut and fill, and demolition activities shall be effectively controlled of fugitive dust emissions utilizing application of water or by presoaking.

• When materials are transported off-site, all material shall be covered, or effectively wetted to limit visible dust emissions, and at least six inches of freeboard space from the top of the container shall be maintained.

• All operations shall limit or expeditiously remove the accumulation of mud or dirt from adjacent public streets at the end of each workday. (The use of dry rotary brushes is expressly prohibited except where preceded or accompanied by sufficient wetting to limit the visible dust emissions. Use of blower devices is expressly forbidden.)

• Following the addition of materials to, or the removal of materials from, the surface of outdoor storage piles, said piles shall be effectively stabilized of fugitive dust emissions utilizing sufficient water or chemical stabilizer/suppressant.

• Within urban areas, track-out shall be immediately removed when it extends 50 or more feet from the site and at the end of each workday.

• Any site with 150 or more vehicle trips per day shall prevent carryout and track-out.

The above measures typically can reduce fugitive dust emissions to less than 40 percent and have been assumed to be in place for the emissions inventory presented in Table 2. Similar best management practices (BMPs) are also identified in the FAA Advisory Circular (AC) 150/5371-10, Standards for Specifying Construction of Airports, Item P-156, Temporary Air and Water Pollution, Soil Erosion and Siltation Control.

Since emissions related to the proposed project would be short-term in nature and would be below established thresholds, and since Regulation VIII and other BMPs will be required for this project, project-related impacts associated with the implementation of air quality plans, violations of air quality standards, and net increases of criteria pollutants are less than significant.

III d) Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. As discussed above in Section III a-c), the project will generate emissions during the six-month construction phase of the project. There is an elementary school with an outside playground area located to the west of the construction site. Although the project’s emissions would be in compliance with the established SJVAPCD thresholds and rules, there is the potential for a child to be adversely affected by the construction-related emissions, particularly if weather conditions are adverse. This is considered a potentially significant impact of the project that can be mitigated to below a level of significance by the following measure:
Project-Specific Mitigation Measure

**AIR QUALITY MM-1:** As an added precaution, the school administration for Addicott Elementary School shall be notified of the project’s construction schedule in advance. It will then be the school administration’s responsibility to keep sensitive students from going outside if it would endanger the students’ health.

III e) Less than Significant Impact. After the proposed project is implemented, the airport will continue to function as it currently operates. There are no known objectionable odors currently related to the airport. With respect to the SJVAPCD Odor Threshold, a review of odor complaints filed with the SJVAPCD’s Compliance Division revealed that no complaints have been filed with that agency against the airport; in addition, no odor complaints have been filed with the City of Fresno. Based on SJVAPCD’s *Guide for Assessing and Mitigating Air Quality Impacts* (Table 4-2), SJVAPCD has not classified airports (and FYI in particular) as a source known to produce odors (FAA and City of Fresno 2011).

During construction of the project, diesel-powered equipment might be utilized. The more than one-quarter mile between the closest portions of the construction area and residents or schools along N. Chestnut Avenue will provide an adequate buffer for potential diesel odor related to construction. The above mitigation measure (**AIR QUALITY MM-1**) would also help to keep diesel odors from adversely affecting students.

**MEIR Mitigation Measures**

The proposed project shall implement and incorporate the Air Quality related mitigation measures as identified in the attached MEIR and Air Quality MND Mitigation Monitoring Checklist (Exhibit A) (dated March 30, 2012).
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

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

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

c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

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?

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

f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?

Impact Analysis

IV a) Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. The project site is characterized by non-native, annual, grassland habitat that is highly disturbed and heavily managed through routine airport maintenance activities, including the application of herbicides and rodenticides. Appendix B includes photographs of the project site. The airport takes measures to manage several species in accordance with the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) guidelines and has a contract with Wildlife Control Technology to address the potential for burrowing owls (FAA and City of Fresno 2011).

Table 3 identifies federal or state-listed endangered or threatened species as well as federal candidate and state rare species or species of special concern that may occur within the United
States Geological Survey (USGS) Clovis quadrangle of Fresno County. The FYI Airport is located within this USGS quadrangle. This information is part of the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB) maintained by the CDFG. None of the species listed in Table 3 are expected to occur within the project area due to a lack of vegetation or landscape features known to support these species or due to the project site’s disturbed state.

### Table 3: Special-Status Species Present within the Regional Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
<th>Known Habitat</th>
<th>Listing</th>
<th>Location within Project Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American badger</td>
<td><em>Taxidea taxus</em></td>
<td>Wide open plains and deciduous woodlands are the principal habitats, but across its range a wide variety of habitats are utilized. The species can also be found in mountainous areas up as far as the arctic-alpine zone, farmland, marshy areas, prairies, and deserts.</td>
<td>State-designated as species of special concern.</td>
<td>Species not likely present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California jewel-flower</td>
<td><em>Coulантhús californicus</em></td>
<td>Chenopod scrub, valley and foothill grassland, pinyon-juniper woodland.</td>
<td>Federal and state-listed as endangered.</td>
<td>Species not likely present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California tiger salamander</td>
<td><em>Ambystома californiense</em></td>
<td>Needs underground refuges, especially ground squirrel burrows and vernal pools or other seasonal water sources for breeding.</td>
<td>Federal and state-listed as threatened; state-designated as species of special concern.</td>
<td>Species not likely present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greene’s tuctoria</td>
<td><em>Tuctorіа greenei</em></td>
<td>Dry bottoms of vernal pools in open grasslands.</td>
<td>Federal-listed as endangered; state-designated as rare.</td>
<td>Species not likely present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vernal pool fairy shrimp</td>
<td><em>Branchinectа lynchі</em></td>
<td>Inhabit small, clear-water sandstone-depression pools and grassed swale, earth slump, or basalt-flow depression pools.</td>
<td>Federal-listed as threatened.</td>
<td>Species not likely present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western yellow-billed cuckoo</td>
<td><em>Cоссуzіа amеrісаns occіdentаlis</em></td>
<td>Nests in riparian jungles of willow, often mixed with cottonwoods, lower story of blackberry, nettles, or wild grape.</td>
<td>Federal candidate species for listing; State-listed as endangered.</td>
<td>Species not likely present.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The burrowing owl (*Athene cunicularia*) is not a federal- or state-listed threatened or endangered species; however, it is a migratory species that is protected by international law under the *Migratory Bird Treaty Act* (MTBA) of 1918. In addition, the burrowing owl is designated as a state species of concern. Although it is not recorded within the CNDDB for the Clovis quadrangle, this species has been located on the airport in the past (FAA and City of Fresno 2011). Therefore, a historical records search and onsite Phase II survey was conducted by Quad Knopf as part of the proposed project's environmental review (see Appendix B). Based on the findings of the survey, no burrowing owls or evidence of burrowing owl habitation were observed on the project site. In addition, no evidences of habitation by other sensitive species, including federally-listed species, were found.
Because burrowing owls have been present at the airport in the past, there is potential for this species to occur again. Construction activities could result in adverse impacts to occupied nests. This is a potentially significant impact of the proposed project.

Project-Specific Mitigation Measure

The following mitigation measure from the 2011 EA/EIR will be implemented as part of this currently proposed project:

**BIO MM-1: Conduct pre-construction burrowing owl survey.** The airport shall conduct a pre-construction survey of ground disturbance sites during the breeding season (from approximately February 1 through August 31), consistent with CDFG guidelines, in the same calendar year that construction is planned to begin. The survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist to determine if any burrowing owls are nesting on or directly adjacent to any construction site. If phased construction procedures are planned, the results of the above survey shall be valid only for the season when it is conducted. If the pre-construction breeding season survey does not identify any burrowing owls on the construction site, then no further mitigation would be required.

Should any burrowing owls be found, neither the airport nor any construction contractor shall disturb an occupied burrow while there is an active nest and/or juvenile owls are present. Avoidance shall include the establishment of a non-disturbance buffer zone around the nest consistent with CDFG guidelines. The buffer zone shall be delineated by highly visible temporary construction fencing. The occupied nest site shall be monitored by a qualified biologist to determine when the juvenile owl is fledged and independent. Disturbance of an occupied burrow shall only occur outside the breeding season when there is no nest or juvenile owl based on monitoring by a qualified biologist. Based on approval by CDFG, pre-construction and pre-breeding season exclusion measures may be implemented to preclude burrowing owl occupation of a construction site prior to project-related disturbance.

IV b) No Impact. There is no riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the CDFG or the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) present within the project site (FAA and City of Fresno 2011).

IV c) No Impact. The USFWS’s National Wetlands Inventory did not indicate the presence of potential wetland areas on the Fresno Yosemite International Airport property. In addition, a field investigation of airport property conducted in January 2006 and a field verification survey conducted in 2010 did not locate any wetlands at the airport (FAA and City of Fresno 2011).

In general, wetlands exhibit three characteristics: hydrology, hydrophytes (plants able to tolerate various degrees of flooding or frequent saturation), and poorly drained soils. A review of the Natural Resource Conservation Service’s Web Soil Survey\(^\text{10}\) indicates that partially hydric

---

soils are present at the airport; however, there are none located in areas that may potentially be impacted by the RSA improvement projects evaluated within this Initial Study.

**IV d)** No Impact. The area on and surrounding the airport is urbanized and isolated from known wildlife habitats or wildlife corridors (FAA and City of Fresno 2011). The proposed RSA improvements would not interfere with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species, established wildlife corridors, or wildlife nursery sites.

**IV e)** No Impact. The proposed RSA improvement project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources. The project would not be subject to the City of Fresno’s parking lot tree shading ordinance since the proposed project does not involve paved parking lots.11

**IV f)** No Impact. The airport currently complies with all federal, state, and local policies and ordinances protecting common biological resources. There are no approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plans within the area surrounding the airport (FAA and City of Fresno 2011).

**MEIR Mitigation Measures**

The proposed project shall implement and incorporate the Biology related mitigation measures as identified in the attached MEIR and Air Quality MND Mitigation Monitoring Checklist (Exhibit A) (dated March 30, 2012).

---

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in State CEQA 15064.5? □ □ □ ✗

b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to State CEQA 15064.5? □ □ □ ✗

c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? □ □ □ ✗

d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? □ □ ✗ □

Impact Analysis

V a) No Impact. As part of the analysis completed for the 2011 EA/EIR, potentially historic properties within the airport’s area of potential effect (APE) were evaluated in accordance with Section 15064.5(a)(2)-(3) of the CEQA Guidelines, using the criteria of the California Register of Historic Places (CRHP). None of the buildings or features within the APE appear to be significant historic resources under those criteria. The APE evaluated in the 2011 EA/EIR encompassed the entire airport property. In addition, a search of facilities listed on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) confirmed that there are no listed sites in the project area.12

V b-c) No Impact. According to the 2011 EA/EIR, a cultural resources field investigation of airport property conducted in September 2004 identified no archaeological or paleontological resources. This investigation included an intensive pedestrian survey of portions of the APE to the northwest and southeast of the runways/taxiways. It was noted in the 2011 EA/EIR that nearly the entire APE had been substantially graded, with large expanses subsequently paved. As a result, it is unlikely that intact archaeological or paleontological deposits remain within the airfield area.

In addition, based on City’s Policies G-11-d and e of the Resources Conservation Element of the 2025 Fresno General Plan, the following measures would be incorporated into the proposed project:

- It shall be a condition of project permits that work stop immediately in the immediate vicinity of the find if archaeological and/or nonhuman fossil material is encountered on the site.

• An archaeological assessment shall be conducted for the project if prehistoric human relics are found that were not previously assessed. The site shall be formally recorded, and archaeologists' recommendations shall be made to the City on further site investigation or site avoidance/preservation measures.

• If nonhuman fossils are recovered, the Museum of Paleontology at U.C. Berkely shall be contacted to obtain a referral list of recognized paleontologists. If the paleontologist determines the material to be significant, it shall be preserved.

• If the site of a proposed development or public works project is found to contain unique (archaeological or paleontological) resources, and it can be demonstrated that the project will cause damage to these resources, reasonable efforts shall be made to permit any or all of the resource to be scientifically removed, or they shall be preserved in situ (left in an undisturbed state). In situ preservation may include the following options, or equivalent measures:
  a. Amending construction plans to avoid the resources.
  b. Setting aside sites containing these resources by deeding them into permanent conservation easements.
  c. Capping or covering these resources with a protective layer of soil before building on the sites.
  d. Incorporating parks, green space, or other open space into the project to leave these resources undisturbed and to provide a protective cover over them.
  e. Avoiding public disclosure of the location of these resources until or unless the site is adequately protected from vandalism or theft.

V d) Less than Significant Impact. A request for information was sent to the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) during the preparation of the 2011 EA/EIR. A response from the NAHC on October 13, 2004, did not identify the presence of any known cultural resources within the airport vicinity. In the event of accidental discovery or recognition of any human remains during development of the project, such remains would be treated as required by CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 (e), Public Resources Code Section 5097.98, and Policy G-11-d of the Resources Conservation Element of the City's 2025 Fresno General Plan.

MEIR Mitigation Measures

The proposed project shall implement and incorporate the Cultural Resource related mitigation measures as identified in the attached MEIR and Air Quality MND Mitigation Monitoring Checklist (Exhibit A) (dated March 30, 2012).
VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues (Supporting Information Sources)</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

iv) Landslides?

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

c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?

d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?

e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?

Impact Analysis

The following information is taken from the 2011 EA/EIR (FAA and City of Fresno 2011):

VI a(i) Less than Significant Impact. The closest known earthquake fault to the airport is the Clovis fault, which trends north to south through the City of Clovis, approximately five miles to the northeast. No evidence has been found of historic ground movement along this feature. Larger, more active faults are known to exist at a greater distance from the airport; however, the Fresno area is located in Seismic Safety Zone III, one of the most seismically-stable areas in all of California, and is not located within an Alquist-Priolo
Earthquake Fault Zone. The proposed project's potential to expose people or structures to substantial adverse effects involving ground rupture is less than significant.

(ii) Less than Significant Impact. Although the airport area is located within Seismic Safety Zone III, as discussed above, the deep alluvial soils of the Fresno-Clovis area could be subject to potentially severe ground shaking during a major earthquake. However, the proposed project will not involve additional employees or clients at the airport, with the exception of during the construction phase. The proposed project would not expose people or structures to ground shaking unless such an event happened to occur during a period of onsite construction. Even in this case, the potential for substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death, are not expected to be significant.

(iii-iv) Less than Significant Impact. The soils that underlie the airport are stable. The potential for liquefaction during a seismic event is considered to be low and the airport is relatively flat with no risk of landslides or mudslides. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would result in a low risk to life or property from such conditions. No significant impacts are anticipated.

VI b) Less than Significant Impact. Topography at the airport is relatively flat with onsite elevations ranging from approximately 330 feet along the eastern boundary and 325 feet along the western boundary. Onsite soil series within the proposed project area are loamy sands of the Tujunga and Atwater soil series. Land clearing/grading activities would disturb the ground surface and remove the vegetative cover, temporarily increasing the potential for soil erosion. However, significant erosion or top soil loss is not anticipated during the construction of the runway extension due to the lack of topographical variation within the construction area. As discussed in the 2011 EA/EIR, proposed airport projects would use BMPs to ensure compliance with state and local requirements as follows:

- Comply with City of Fresno ordinances for all grading, drainage, and construction improvements.
- Prepare and implement a grading/erosion control plan.

Once the proposed project is constructed, no soil erosion or loss of topsoil is expected since the area will either be paved or vegetated. According to FAA standards, an RSA must have no surface variations.

VI c) Less than Significant Impact. As discussed above in Response to VI a)(iii-iv), the soils that underlie the project site are considered stable. Construction of the runway extension is not expected to cause any of the following conditions: landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse. The proposed project will conform to the California Uniform Building Code as well as other applicable design standards and/or recommendations of a site-specific geotechnical report.
VI d) Less than Significant Impact. The potential for expansion or shrink/swell of onsite soils is considered to be low. The proposed project will conform to the California Uniform Building Code and design standards and/or geotechnical recommendations applicable to the project.

VI e) No Impact. The proposed project will not require the disposal of wastewater.

MEIR Mitigation Measures

The proposed project shall implement and incorporate the Geology related mitigation measures as identified in the attached MEIR and Air Quality MND Mitigation Monitoring Checklist (Exhibit A) (dated March 30, 2012).
VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Would the project:

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

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

Impact Analysis

VII a) Less than Significant Impact. As discussed in Section III of this document, the proposed project’s primary contribution to air emissions is attributable to construction activities. Project construction could result in greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from the following construction related sources: (1) construction equipment emissions; and (2) emissions from construction workers’ personal vehicles traveling to and from the construction site. Construction-related GHG emissions vary depending on the level of activity, length of the construction period, specific construction operations, types of equipment, and number of personnel.

The primary GHG emissions that would result from the proposed project would be carbon dioxide (CO2) from gasoline and diesel combustion, with more limited vehicle tailpipe emissions of nitrous oxide (N2O) and methane (CH4), as well as other GHG emissions related to vehicle cooling systems. Although construction emissions are a one-time event, GHG emissions such as CO2 can persist in the atmosphere for decades. However, neither the SJVAQMD nor the County has yet established a quantitative threshold or standard for determining whether a project’s GHG emissions are significant.

GHGs and criteria pollutants would realize co-beneficial emissions reduction from the implementation of BMPs discussed in Section III, Air Quality. In addition, the 2011 EA/EIR provides a list of measures that the airport is currently doing to reduce their GHG emissions.

VII b) Less than Significant Impact. In September 2006, the State of California passed the Global Warming Solutions Act (Assembly Bill [AB] 32). The Act requires that GHG emissions in California be reduced to 1990 levels by 2020. This is part of a larger plan in which California hopes to reduce its emissions to 80 percent below 1990 levels by 2050. This reduction shall be accomplished through an enforceable statewide cap on GHG emissions that will be phased starting in 2012. The CARB is in charge of setting specific standards for different source emissions as well as monitoring whether they are being met.

On December 6, 2007, the CARB approved a mandatory reporting regulation for certain facilities including: cement plants, petroleum refineries, hydrogen plants, electricity generating facilities, electricity retail providers and electricity marketers, cogeneration facilities, and
facilities with general stationary combustion. If any such facility emits more than 25,000 metric tonnes of CO₂, it is required to collect GHG data and prepare reports which are then verified by an accredited verification body. To date, airports are not subject to these requirements. However, due to the short-term nature of the construction phase of the project, it is unlikely that this project would impede the state’s ability to meet the reduction targets of AB 32.

MEIR Mitigation Measures

The proposed project shall implement and incorporate the Greenhouse Gas Emissions related mitigation measures as identified in the attached MEIR and Air Quality MND Mitigation Monitoring Checklist (Exhibit A) (dated March 30, 2012).
### VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues (Supporting Information Sources)</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Project Setting

Hazardous substances have been identified at the airport, both due to historical land uses associated with the Old Hammer Army Airfield and to current aviation-related land uses. Historically, the Old Hammer airfield was located on the northeast side of the airport property. Former and existing sites of environmental contamination date back to this military land use. A
groundwater plume of chlorinated volatile organic compounds (VOC) originates near N. Clovis Avenue and extends southwest several thousand yards past the current airport boundary. Groundwater plumes of tetrachloroethene (PCE) are also present from this area and from the CANG facility located on the southern side of the airport. Remediation of these sources is ongoing (ERM 2004).

According to the 2011 EA/EIR, the majority of the hazardous substance release sites where the subsurface of the ground has been affected are located along the southern side of the airfield, west of the terminal building. This area of the airport is used for air cargo and general aviation operations, such as fueling, servicing and repair of aircraft, ground service equipment, and motor vehicle activities. Most hazardous sites in this area of the airport are related to the release of petroleum hydrocarbons from leaking underground storage tanks (LUSTs). Where known, such releases are being or have been addressed through soil removal and remediation. Specific sites and their locations are included in the 2011 EA/EIR (Figure 5.7-4).

According to the EPA’s EJView13 online tool, the Fresno Air Terminal and California Air National Guard Fresno are listed as Superfund sites. Neither of these sites is listed on the National Priorities List (NPL), which is part of the Superfund cleanup process and is updated periodically.

Impact Analysis

VIII a) Less than Significant Impact. The proposed project is to extend the runway/taxiway system of Runway 11L-29R 312 feet west of the existing runway/taxiway system and to bring the RSA areas for both ends of the runway into compliance with FAA standards. Although runway operations may involve the transport of hazardous materials (also called “dangerous goods” by the airline industry) and the use of fuel, oil, and other-petroleum based products, these are not results from the proposed project itself. These operations will continue to occur at the airport under established guidelines with or without the proposed project.

During the construction phase of the project, a staging area would be located within the project area that would most likely require the use of aboveground storage tanks and other temporary facilities to store fuel, oil, and other petroleum-based products. These temporary facilities would be in accordance with applicable rules, regulations, and procedures governing their use. Typical construction BMPs include placing catch basins beneath construction equipment during the fueling process. This measure, as well as other industry standard BMPs, will ensure that potential hazards to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials related to the proposed project are less than significant.

In the event of a discovery of a hazardous substance in an amount greater than the reportable quantity as established by the EPA, the contractor shall notify the engineer’s designated person responsible for the administration of the Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasure Plan (SPCC). The airport representative will contact the National Response Center and provide details of the incident and measures taken to reduce the impact of the release.

VIII b) No Impact. Potential hazards to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment are already addressed by the airport’s Public Safety Office and its hazardous materials management and emergency response plans. These plans will continue to be in effect throughout the airport whether the proposed project is constructed or not. The City of Fresno Fire Department operates one fire station located at the airport; another City fire facility, Station #10, is located adjacent to the airport on the northeast side. No new hazards would be created as a result of the project.

VIII c) Less than Significant. The closest school, Addicott Elementary School, is located over one-quarter mile from the closest portion of the proposed project (i.e., the taxiway connection to the currently ongoing runway extension of Runway 11R-29L).

The proposed project is not expected to emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials other than those discussed above in Section VIII a). For example, runway operations may involve the transport of hazardous materials by aircraft and the use of fuel, oil, and other-petroleum based products. These operations will continue to occur at the airport under established guidelines with or without the proposed project.

VIII d) No Impact. Based on Figure S.7-4 of the 2011 EA/EIR, there are no known hazardous sites listed on any environmental review databases within the boundaries of the proposed project. Implementation of the proposed project would not involve the portion of the airport that is on the EPA’s Superfund Site List.

VIII e) No Impact. As discussed in more detail in Section X b), Land Use, the airport has an approved airport CLUP (Fresno County 2010). The proposed project may slightly change the safety compatibility zones identified in the CLUP as a result of shifting the runway approximately 312 feet to the west. However, the safety zones are primarily intended to provide an extra level of review for the development of vacant parcels of land within the safety zones to make sure that proposed land uses are compatible with the airport.

The proposed project will not result in a significant safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area. The project is not increasing the number or types of aircraft using the airport. Instead, the project’s primary purpose is to improve the safety of the airport by providing the FAA-mandated RSAs for all runway approaches and departures.

VIII f) No Impact. There are no private airstrips affected by the proposed project.

VIII g) No Impact. The proposed project would not impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. Instead, it would improve emergency preparedness by providing the FAA-mandated RSAs for all runway approaches and departures.
VIII h) No Impact. As stated in the 2011 EA/EIR, the airport is not located within an area that has a high risk of wildland fires as mapped by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection on its Natural Hazard Disclosure Map for Fresno County.

MEIR Mitigation Measures

The proposed project shall implement and incorporate the Hazards and Hazardous Materials related mitigation measures as identified in the attached MEIR and Air Quality MND Mitigation Monitoring Checklist (Exhibit A) (dated March 30, 2012).
**IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY**

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues (Supporting Information Sources)</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Impact Analysis

IX a) Less than Significant Impact. The airport presently complies with the State of California’s National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Permit (#CAS0000001) for discharges of stormwater associated with industrial activities. In accordance with the NPDES permit, the City of Fresno and the airport have prepared a stormwater management plan that outlines BMPs that would be implemented to prevent the discharge of pollutants in stormwater.

The proposed project would not change the quality of the stormwater (i.e., the type of potential pollutants) that is generated at the airport since the project does not introduce new types of development. The quantity of runoff would increase slightly due to the creation of additional impervious surfaces. The proposed project would incorporate the following BMPs to ensure compliance with NPDES requirements:

- Prepare and implement an updated stormwater pollution prevention plan (SWPPP) to include the additional runway and taxiway surfaces.

In addition, a NPDES General Construction Permit will be required from the Central Valley RWQCB since the proposed project will involve the disturbance of more than one (1) acre. Conditions of the NPDES construction permit may include:

- Implement BMPs such as those included in FAA Advisory Circular (AC) 150/5371-10, Standards for Specifying Construction of Airports, Item P-156, Temporary Air and Water Pollution, Soil Erosion and Siltation Control.

- Comply with City of Fresno ordinances for all grading, drainage, and construction of improvements.

- Prepare and implement a grading/erosion plan.

IX b) Less than Significant. The proposed project is not located within a designated groundwater recharge area although there are areas where localized ponding during storm events does occur on the airport. The City of Fresno has a dedicated recharge basin located northwest of the airport. This 210-acre recharge basin (i.e., the “Leaky Acres”) allows water to pond and then percolate into the aquifer for later use. The proposed project would not have any adverse impact on this nearby groundwater recharge area.

The proposed project will create approximately 8 acres of additional impervious surface at the airport. Based on analysis contained in the 2011 EA/EIR, upon completion of the projects evaluated in that EA/EIR, the airport would contain approximately 540 acres of impervious surfaces. This equates to 31.25 percent of the total airport acreage of 1,728 acres. After the currently proposed improvements, (i.e., a 312-foot extension of Runway 11L-29R and associated taxiway extensions), the percentage of impervious surface at the airport would
increase to approximately 31.71 percent. This small increase in the percent of impervious surface at the airport would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge.

**IX c)** Less than Significant. Elevations on the proposed site range from approximately 331 to 333 feet above sea level (asl). Likewise, there will be very little elevational change after the project is complete per FAA requirements. Drainage improvements associated with the expanded runway and taxiway system would be designed to preserve the existing drainage patterns. Therefore, the proposed project will not significantly alter onsite drainage patterns and substantial siltation or erosion is not anticipated. (See also Section IX a) for conditions that would be incorporated into the proposed project).

**IX d)** Less than Significant. As discussed above in Section IX c), the proposed project would not significantly alter onsite drainage patterns and drainage improvements associated with the expanded runway and taxiway system would be designed to interface properly with the airport’s existing stormwater conveyance system.

The airport does not have any water bodies or rivers which would be altered and subsequently cause flooding downstream. Additional stormwater runoff in the western part of the airport is directed to two new pump stations, conveyed through the FYI storm drainage system, and discharged into Mill Ditch, a Fresno Irrigation District (FID) facility (FAA and City of Fresno 2011). Stormwater runoff due to airside development in the eastern part of FYI is directed to the McKinley/Clovis Pump Station. (See also response to Section IX e) below.)

**IX e)** Less than Significant. FYI has its own flood control system and discharge agreement with FID. The 2011 EA/EIR contains a lengthy discussion of the airport’s stormwater management program for the conveyance of the airport’s stormwater and of the methods and procedures in place to limit water in significant storm events to levels that can be handled by the FID system.

On the eastern part of the airport, the existing Taxiway B2 would be removed and a new connection to the east of its present location would be constructed. This represents a net decrease in impervious surfaces related to the proposed project since a portion of the new taxiway is already being constructed as part of a previously approved project. None of the proposed changes to impervious surfaces related to this project will generate enough additional stormwater to alter the agreements between the airport and FID.

See Section IX a) for a discussion of potential impacts resulting from additional stormwater pollutants.

**IX f)** Less than Significant. See Section IX a) above for a discussion of potential impacts related to water quality standards as a result of the proposed project. The proposed project would incorporate the following to ensure compliance with NPDES requirements:
• Prepare and implement an updated SWPPP to include the additional runway and taxiway surfaces.

• Implement BMPs such as those included in FAA Advisory Circular (AC) 150/5371-10, Standards for Specifying Construction of Airports, Item P-156, Temporary Air and Water Pollution, Soil Erosion and Siltation Control.

• Comply with City of Fresno ordinances for all grading, drainage, and construction of improvements.

• Prepare and implement a grading/erosion plan.

No substantial degradation to water quality is anticipated to occur in either the short-term or the long-term as a result of the proposed project.

IX g) No Impact. The proposed project does not involve the construction of housing.

IX h) No Impact. The airport, and the proposed project area, in particular, is not located within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (Map ID No. 06019C1590H).14

IX i) No Impact. The closest dam to the airport is on the San Joaquin River at Millerton Lake, located approximately 15 miles to the north.

IX j) No Impact. There are no water bodies located in the immediate vicinity of the airport; the airport would not be inundated as a result of seiche, tsunami or mudflow.

MEIR Mitigation Measures

The proposed project shall implement and incorporate the Hydrology related mitigation measures as identified in the attached MEIR and Air Quality MND Mitigation Monitoring Checklist (Exhibit A) (dated March 30, 2012).

X. LAND USE AND PLANNING

Would the project:

a) Physically divide an established community?

b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues (Supporting Information Sources)</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X a) No Impact. The proposed project is a safety project at FYI, an established land use in the City of Fresno. No changes to communities outside the airport will occur.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X b) Less than Significant Impact. The proposed project is consistent with the City's 2025 Fresno General Plan (2002), which designates the proposed project area as Public Facilities - Airport. However, plan amendments would be necessary to reflect the proposed change to the runway on applicable City planning maps (refer to the discussion below.) Objectives and related policies within the 2025 Fresno General Plan's Public Facilities Element (Objectives E-10, 11 and 12) and Safety Element (Objective I-7) are applicable to the airport:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**E-10 Objective (Public Facilities Element):** Operate Fresno's municipal airport facilities to meet present and anticipated demands in a manner that enhances safety to the public, minimizes the adverse effects of aircraft operations on people, and promotes the economic health of the community.

**E-11 Objective (Public Facilities Element):** Improve the quality of air carrier service to and from Fresno Yosemite International Airport (FYI).

**E-12 Objective (Public Facilities Element):** Develop airport properties as outlined in the applicable airport and environs master plans to encourage economic growth.

**I-7 Objective (Safety Element):** Develop and operate Fresno's airport facilities to meet present and anticipated demands and promote the economic health of the community while protecting the safety, health, and welfare of persons and property on the ground and in aircraft by minimizing exposure to airport-related hazards.
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The proposed project is consistent with these objectives and related policies, especially Objectives E-10 and I-7, which call for enhanced safety to the public.

The 2025 Fresno General Plan's Resource Conservation (RC), Noise (N) and Safety (S) elements also contain objectives and policies adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. Those applicable to the proposed project relate to protecting biological resources (RC, Objective G-12), cultural resources (RC, Policies G-11-d and e), and water resources (RC, Policies G-3-c, G-3-I and G-4-b, and S, Policy I-5-e). Potential impacts of the project related to these resources are addressed in Sections IV-Biological Resources, V-Cultural Resources, and IX-Hydrology and Water Resources of this Initial Study. The proposed project would incorporate General Plan policies and BMPs as part of its permit conditions to ensure that the project is consistent with these General Plan objectives and policies.

The State of California also has requirements for the establishment of airport land use commissions (ALUCs), a seven-member commission created under the authority of the California State Aeronautics Act (Public Utility Code, Section 21670). The Fresno County ALUC adopted the Fresno Yosemite International Airport Compatibility Land Use Plan (CLUP) on October 4, 2010. CLUP policies apply to undeveloped lands within an established Airport Influence Area (AIA), which includes land within the jurisdictions of the County of Fresno, the City of Fresno, and the City of Clovis. The AIA, depicted on Figure 6, is defined as land contained within the 60 or greater CNEL (Community Noise Equivalency Level) contour and within Safety Compatibility Zones 1 through 5. According to the CLUP's initial review, there are no conflicts between the recently adopted CLUP and local jurisdiction plans (CLUP, Chapter 6).

Several types of airport development plans are also to be submitted to the ALUC for review. As the Runway 11L end is being extended, the airport sponsor will forward this information to the County's ALUC for consideration as part of any future document revision process. Noise related to the proposed project is addressed in Section XII, including the noise criteria for areas located within the AIA (Fresno County 2010), as well as City's 2025 Fresno General Plan policies. As discussed in that section, the proposed project would not result in noise impacts which exceed the applicable thresholds of significance.

As discussed in Section VIII e), there is no impact related to safety hazards for people residing or working in the project area as a result of changes to the safety compatibility zones of the CLUP. The project is not increasing the number or types of aircraft using the airport. Instead, the project's primary purpose is to improve the safety of the airport by providing the FAA-mandated RSAs for all runway approaches and departures. The CLUP's safety compatibility zones are primarily intended to provide an extra level of review for the development of vacant parcels of land within the safety zones to make sure that proposed land uses are compatible with the airport.

In conclusion, the proposed project is consistent with applicable land use plans, policies, and regulations adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. An
amendment to the CLUP to adjust the AIA to reflect a 312-foot shift in the runway and plan amendments necessary to update City land use, noise contour, and other planning maps would have a less than significant impact on land use compatibility issues related to the airport.

X c) No Impact. There are no approved habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans in effect in the project area.

MEIR Mitigation Measures

The proposed project shall implement and incorporate the Land Use related mitigation measures as identified in the attached MEIR and Air Quality MND Mitigation Monitoring Checklist (Exhibit A) (dated March 30, 2012).
Figure 6
AIRPORT INFLUENCE AREA

Source: City of Fresno Airports Department
Fresno Yosemite International Airport
Compatibility Land Use Plan
Airport Influence Area, June 2019
XI. MINERAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?

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?

Impact Analysis

XI a-b) No Impact. There are no valuable deposits of mineral commodities known to exist within three miles of the airport (FAA and City of Fresno 2011). The airport is not located within the MZR-2 zone (Regionally Significant Mineral Resources Present) of the City’s Aggregate Mineral Resources Zone map. Therefore, no impacts are anticipated.

MEIR Mitigation Measures

The proposed project shall implement and incorporate the Mineral Resource related mitigation measures as identified in the attached MEIR and Air Quality MND Mitigation Monitoring Checklist (Exhibit A) (dated March 30, 2012).

---

XII. NOISE

Would the project result in:

a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?

b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels?

c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

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

f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

---

Impact Analysis

XII a) No Impact. Applicable noise policies as listed in the City’s 2025 Fresno General Plan’s Noise Element are as follows:

_H-1-h Policy (Noise Element):_ For purposes of city analysis of noise impacts, and for determining appropriate noise mitigation, a significant increase in ambient noise levels is assumed if the project causes ambient noise levels to exceed the following:

- The ambient noise level is less than 60 dB Ldn and the project increases noise levels by 5 dB or more.
- The ambient noise level is 60-65 dB Ldn and the project increases the noise levels by 3 dB or more.
- The ambient noise level is greater than 65 dB Ldn and the project increases noise levels by 1.5 dB or more.
**H-1-j Policy (Noise Element):** Noise created by new transportation noise sources, including roadway improvement projects, shall be mitigated so that resulting noise levels do not exceed the adopted standards at noise-sensitive land uses.

Table 4 shows the land use compatibility standards for new developments located within the AIA as set forth by the airport’s CLUP.

**TABLE 4**
Fresno Yosemite International Airport Compatibility Land Use Plan
Land Use Compatibility Chart for Aircraft Noise

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generalized Land Use</th>
<th>CNEL Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60-65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Residential (including single-family, multi-family)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirement homes, residential support facilities, hospitals, nursing homes,</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>large child day care centers, adult day care facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Hotels, motels, other transient lodging</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Mobile homes</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Schools, libraries</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Places of worship, auditoriums, concert halls, theaters, indoor arenas</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemeteries, parking</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offices, service commercial, retail, shopping centers, restaurants</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale, warehousing, research and development, light industrial</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extractive industry, industrial, manufacturing, utilities</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cropland</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature preserves, livestock breeding, zoos</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional parks, athletic fields, golf courses, outdoor spectator sports,</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>water recreational facilities, horse stables</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amphitheaters</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend:**

+ = Compatible: Activities associated with the specific land use may be carried out with essentially no interference from aircraft.

0 = Conditional: The indicated noise exposure will cause interference with the activities. Building structure must be capable of attenuating noise to the indoor acceptable CNEL, standard construction methods will normally suffice.

  - Indoor Uses - Noise exposure may cause moderate interference with indoor activities, extensive construction features required to make the indoor environment acceptable.
  - Outdoor Uses - CNEL is acceptable for outdoor activities, although some noise interference may occur, caution should be exercised with regards to noise-sensitive uses.

- = Incompatible: Unacceptable noise interference upon these activities will occur indoor and outdoor. Adequate structural noise insulation is not practical under most circumstances. Severe noise interference makes outdoor activities unacceptable.

* = Acoustical Analysis Required: An acoustical analysis shall be performed by an individual or firm experienced in Acoustical Engineering.

**Source:** Fresno Yosemite International Airport Compatibility Land Use Plan, adopted October 2010.

No noticeable changes to the noise environment surrounding the airport will occur as a result of the proposed extension of Runway 11L-29R. The proposed project results in a slight change
in noise when compared to the existing condition because implementation of the proposed project results in a northwesterly shift of the landing and takeoff thresholds of Runway 11L-29R. This would extend the noise exposure to the northwest slightly. However, both the proposed project and the existing condition result in the same number (213) of noise-sensitive parcels located within the 65 CNEl contour. Since the number of operations and types of airplanes using the runway will not change as a result of the project, no additional long-term noise will be created. The exposure of persons to, or generation of, noise levels in excess of established standards is unchanged as a result of the proposed project. (Appendix C contains the methodology and assumptions used to generate this information.)

There are areas within the existing 65 CNEl contour for the airport that contain noise-sensitive land uses, including residences and several schools. To mitigate these impacts, the City of Fresno initiated the Sound Mitigation Acoustical Remedy Treatment (SMART) Program. According to the 2011 EA/EIR, there are 2,447 households and 6,584 people near the airport eligible to receive noise-reducing windows and doors. The SMART Program aims to reduce interior noise levels by at least 5 dB and achieve an interior noise level of 45 CNEl or less. Over 1000 residences and 5 schools have been acoustically treated under this ongoing program. (Note: The Addicott Elementary School was not treated under the noise program since it meets the 45 db interior level standard due to newer construction.)

Appendix C also contains future airport noise contours for the year 2015 (year of project implementation) and the year 2020. These contours include projected airport growth and other airport projects currently under construction as well as the proposed project under consideration in this Initial Study. Even in the future, with additional forecast airport growth, no City thresholds for noise will be exceeded. If the types of military aircraft using the airport changes in the future, noise impacts may occur. This potential worst-case impact is not related to the proposed project.

XII b) Less than Significant Impact. Vibration is sound-radiated through the ground and can be caused by a source such as machinery equipment. The peak particle velocity (PPV) or the root mean square (RMS) velocity is usually used to describe vibration levels. PPV is defined as the maximum instantaneous peak of the vibration level, while RMS is defined as the square root of the average of the squared amplitude of the level. PPV is typically used for evaluating potential building damage, while RMS velocity in decibels (VdB) is typically more suitable for evaluating human response. The vibration velocity level threshold of perception for humans is approximately 65 VdB (Table 5).
The proposed construction has the potential to produce vibration levels that may be annoying or disturbing to humans (i.e., over 75 VdB) due to activities such as soil compacting and the use of bulldozers or other heavy tracked construction equipment. However, because the proposed project would be located over 0.25 mile from the nearest residences or schools, ground-borne vibration should be within the range of vibration tolerable to most people. Any adverse impacts would be short-term in length, and would occur only within the hours of construction allowed by the City’s noise ordinance (Fresno Municipal Code, Section 10-109a) (i.e., 7:00 am to 10:00 pm, Monday – Saturday). Ground-borne vibrations in connection to this project are not anticipated to be excessive and potential impacts would be less than significant.

XII c) No Impact. See the discussion in Section XII a) above. The proposed project will not result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in areas surrounding the airport.

XII d) Less than Significant Impact. Project-related construction would temporarily increase ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project site. Table 6 shows typical noise from construction equipment. Short-term construction noise levels would range from 65 to 90 dBA at 50 feet from construction activities, but these noise levels would be intermittent throughout the day. Average noise levels over the course of construction would be substantially lower. (Because sounds in the environment usually vary with time, they cannot simply be described with a single number. Two methods are used to describe variable sounds. These are exceedance levels and equivalent levels, both of which are derived from a large number of moment-to-moment A-weighted noise level measurements. Exceedance levels are values from the cumulative amplitude distribution of all the noise levels observed during a measurement period. Exceedance levels are designated $L_n$, where $n$ represents a value from 0 to 100 percent. $L_{max}$ is the maximum noise level anticipated to occur during the measurement period.)

The nearest sensitive receptors of project-related construction noise would be at residences and schools located more than 0.25 mile from the proposed project improvements. No significant noise impacts would result from construction of the project, which would be in conformance with the City noise ordinance, Fresno Municipal Code, Section 10-109(a).17

---

**TABLE 5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vibration Velocity Level</th>
<th>Human Reaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>65 VdB</td>
<td>Approximate threshold of perception for many people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 VdB</td>
<td>Approximate dividing line between barely perceptible and distinctly perceptible. Many people find that transportation-related vibration at this level is unacceptable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85 VdB</td>
<td>Vibration is acceptable only if there are an infrequent number of events per day.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


---


17 Ibid.
TABLE 6  
Construction Operations, Equipment Types and Their Noise Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equipment Type</th>
<th>$L_{max} @ 50'$ (dBA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scrapers</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dozers</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vibratory Compactors</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haul Trucks</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excavator</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Crane</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drill Rigs</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loaders</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete Batch Plant</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


XII e) Less than Significant Impact. See the discussion in Sections XII a) and d) above. The proposed project will not result in a perceptible change in ambient noise levels in areas surrounding the airport. As discussed in Section X b), Fresno County adopted a CLUP for FYI in 2010. The plan outlines the area of review, the compatibility review process, and the compatibility criteria applicable to development within the airport environs. The CLUP addresses airport noise and safety issues in relation to land use planning. As the Runway 11L end is being extended, the airport sponsor will forward this information to the ALUC for consideration as part of any future document revision process.

XII f) No Impact. The project does not involve a private airstrip.

MEIR Mitigation Measures

The proposed project shall implement and incorporate the Noise related mitigation measures as identified in the attached MEIR and Air Quality MND Mitigation Monitoring Checklist (*Exhibit A*) (dated March 30, 2012).
XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING

Would the project:

a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

Impact Analysis

XIII a) No Impact. The proposed runway extension is a safety-related project, not a capacity-driven project; the proposed improvements will not increase the capacity of the airport. No population growth will occur as a result of the project.

XIII b) No Impact. The proposed project does not necessitate the removal of existing housing.

XIII c) No Impact. The proposed project does not necessitate the displacement of people living or working in the area. All proposed improvements to the airport will occur within the airport property.

MEIR Mitigation Measures

The proposed project shall implement and incorporate the Population and Housing related mitigation measures as identified in the attached MEIR and Air Quality MND Mitigation Monitoring Checklist (Exhibit A) (dated March 30, 2012).
XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues (Supporting Information Sources)</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Fire protection?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Police protection?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Schools?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Parks?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Other public facilities?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Impact Analysis

XIV a-e) No Impact. The proposed project would not increase demand for any of the above public services or facilities. The project proposes to extend an existing runway and associated taxiways to provide RSAs at the airport that will meet the FAA’s safety standards. There is no residential or business-related growth associated with the proposed project. Service ratios and response times for fire protection and police service to the airport will remain the same regardless of whether or not the proposed project is implemented. The airport does not generate a demand for schools, parks, or other public facilities such as libraries or community centers.

MEIR Mitigation Measures

The proposed project shall implement and incorporate the Public Service related mitigation measures as identified in the attached MEIR and Air Quality MND Mitigation Monitoring Checklist (Exhibit A) (dated March 30, 2012).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues (Supporting Information Sources)</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XV. RECREATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Impact Analysis

**XV a) No Impact.** The proposed project does not include a residential component. Since the project is a safety project, not a capacity-increasing project at the airport, no change in local or regional population would occur due to the project. Therefore, the proposed project will not increase the use of neighborhood or regional parks or recreational facilities.

**XV b) No Impact.** The proposed project does not include the construction or expansion of recreational facilities.

**MEIR Mitigation Measures**

The proposed project shall implement and incorporate the Recreation related mitigation measures as identified in the attached MEIR and Air Quality MND Mitigation Monitoring Checklist (Exhibit A) (dated March 30, 2012).
XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

Would the project:

a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to, intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?

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?

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?

d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

e) Result in inadequate emergency access?

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?

Impact Analysis

XVI a) Less than Significant Impact. The City's 2025 Fresno General Plan establishes the following standard for the performance of the circulation system:

*E-1-f Policy (Public Facilities Element): Allow a Level of Service “D” (LOS “D”) as the acceptable level of traffic congestion on major streets. LOS “D” according to the Caltrans and COFCG [Council of Fresno County Governments] accepted LOS criteria, as developed by the Florida Department of Transportation, means moderate traffic congestion at peak traffic periods; approaching unstable flow with reduced speeds, limited maneuverability, and loss of convenience; average speeds range from 9 to 17 miles per hour on arterials with stopped delays of 40 seconds or less.*
According to the 2011 EA/EIR, there are several roadway segments in the general service area (GSA) surrounding the airport that are projected to operate at LOS E or worse by 2025. Most of the segments are located on the state highway system (i.e., State Routes [SR] 99, 41 and 180). Of the local roadways that were analyzed by the 2011 EA/EIR, a small portion of N. Peach Avenue and several segments of N. Clovis Avenue are expected to experience LOS E or worse by 2025.

The COFCG also includes traffic data in its 2011 Regional Transportation Plan. Based on its projections for the year 2030, sections of N. Chestnut, E. McKinley, N. Clovis, and E. Ashlan avenues in the vicinity of the airport will operate at LOS E or F during the P.M. peak hour (COFCG 2011).

The proposed project will not generate additional long-term traffic that would contribute to substandard performance of the surrounding circulation system. The proposed runway and taxiway extension is needed for safety purposes only and will not increase the capacity of the airport.

Construction-related traffic will occur in the near-term for approximately six months (April 2013 - October 2013). The surrounding street system currently operates at LOS D or better during the P.M. peak hour with the exception of segments of N. Clovis Avenue, just north of E. McKinley and north of SR 180. This information is based on 2007 data presented in the COFCG's 2011 Regional Transportation Plan; however, since little land development has occurred in the GSA of the airport over the past five years, traffic demand has not changed significantly and it is anticipated that the 2007 data is still representative of current traffic conditions.

Based on construction assumptions provided by the project engineers, construction of the proposed project is expected to involve approximately 20 employees (Appendix A). Assuming these workers arrive and leave the construction site at normal business hours, approximately 20 P.M. peak trips would occur on the immediately adjacent street network. Vehicle trips would also occur in the course of the day as construction vehicles, such as haul and water trucks, enter and leave the construction site. These trips are assumed to occur primarily during non-peak hours.

Access to the project will occur via Gate 14 off of E. Shields Ave. From there, construction trucks and worker vehicles would make their way on the local street network to arterials such as N. Chestnut, E. McKinley, or N. Clovis avenues before potentially travelling on the state highway system. No significant change to the projected LOS for these roadways or state highways is expected as a result of the low number of peak trips created by the project and the short-term nature of the construction phase. Therefore, potential conflicts with applicable transportation-related plans and policies are less than significant.

XVI b) Less than Significant Impact. Similar to the City of Fresno, the COFCG has adopted strategies as part of its Congestion Management Process (CMP) of the 2011 Regional
Transportation Plan, Appendix F.\textsuperscript{18} These strategies include intelligent transportation system, public transit, travel demand management, bicycle and pedestrian, and land use strategies (COFCG 2011). The proposed project will not interfere with the implementation of these strategies since all aspects of the project will occur on existing airport property. (See also Section XVI f). In addition, the proposed project will not generate long-term traffic that would contribute to congestion of the surrounding circulation system.

As discussed above in Section XVI a), the project will contribute some peak hour trips to streets and intersections currently operating at unacceptable service levels during construction of the runway and taxiway extensions. This is not considered to be a significant impact due to the low number of peak trips created by the project and the short-term nature of the construction phase. The COFCG has adopted the City of Fresno’s standard of LOS D for the Fresno/Clovis metropolitan area.

XVI c) No Impact. The proposed project involves creating the FAA-mandated RSAs for the airport. No changes to air traffic patterns will occur.

XVI d) No Impact. The purpose of the project is to reduce the hazards associated with the airport by providing appropriate RSAs at each end of the runways.

XVI e) No Impact. The proposed project will not change emergency access to the airport or to neighboring land uses.

XVI f) No Impact. The City’s 2025 Fresno General Plan contains several objectives and implementing policies related to transit systems (Objectives E-7, E-8, and E-9), bikeways (Objectives E-13 and E-14), and trails (Objectives E-15, E-16, and E-17). The proposed project will not conflict with any of these objectives and policies. All construction and operation of the runway and taxiway extensions and RSAs will occur on existing airport property. There will be no impact to the development and implementation of transit service, or bikeways and trails on the surrounding streets and neighborhoods.

MEIR Mitigation Measures

The proposed project shall implement and incorporate the Transportation and Traffic related mitigation measures as identified in the attached MEIR and AQ MND Mitigation Monitoring Checklist (Exhibit A) (dated March 30, 2012).

XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Would the project:

a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?

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?

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?

d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?

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

f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs?

g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

Impact Analysis

XVII a, b, e) No Impact. The proposed project will not result in the long-term generation of wastewater. Any wastewater generated during the construction phase of the project will be incorporated into the existing airport wastewater system, as appropriate. Alternatively, a portable wastewater disposal system may be used for easier access by construction workers.

XVII b, d) No Impact. The proposed project will not create a need for additional long-term water supplies. Any water needed during the construction phase of the project will be provided by the existing airport water system or by the contractor, where appropriate.

XVII c) No Impact. As discussed in Section IX, the proposed project would not significantly alter onsite drainage patterns, and drainage improvements associated with the extended runway
and taxiway system would be designed to interface properly with the airport’s existing stormwater conveyance system. Stormwater runoff in the western part of the airport is directed to two new pump stations, conveyed through the FYI storm drainage system and discharged into Mill Ditch, an FID facility. The 2011 EA/EIR contains a lengthy discussion of the airport’s agreement with the FID for the conveyance of the airport’s stormwater and of the methods and procedures in place to limit water in significant storm events to levels that can be handled by the FID facilities.

In the eastern part of the airport, the existing Taxiway B2 would be removed and a new connection east of its present location would be constructed. This represents a net decrease in impervious surfaces related to the proposed project since a portion of the new taxiway is already being constructed as part of a previously approved project. None of the proposed changes to impervious surfaces related to this project will generate enough additional stormwater to alter the agreements between the airport and FID.

**XVII f-g) No Impact.** As described in the 2011 EA/EIR, solid waste disposal at the airport is handled by the City of Fresno’s Solid Waste Management Division and includes paper, plastic, food products, landscaping and construction debris. Non-hazardous waste material is collected in designated areas of the airport and taken to the Cedar Avenue Recycling and Transfer Facility. Non-recyclable solid waste is ultimately transported to the American Avenue landfill in Kerman, California. This landfill has sufficient capacity to handle the airport’s solid waste through the year 2031.\(^1\)

The proposed project would not typically generate any solid waste in the long-term. In the short-term, construction-related solid waste would be disposed of as described above. No impacts to capacity at the transfer station or the landfill or to applicable federal, state, and local solid waste statutes and regulations are anticipated.

**MEIR Mitigation Measures**

The proposed project shall implement and incorporate the Utilities related mitigation measures as identified in the attached MEIR and Air Quality MND Mitigation Monitoring Checklist (*Exhibit A*) (dated March 30, 2012).

XVIII. MANDATORY FINDING OF SIGNIFICANCE

a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?

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

Impact Analysis

XVIII a) Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. The proposed project could result in the following project-related environmental impacts, which would, however, be less than significant with mitigation incorporated:

IMPACT: Because burrowing owls have been present at the airport in the past, there is potential for this species to occur again. Construction activities could result in adverse impacts to occupied nests. The following mitigation measure from the 2011 EA/EIR will be implemented as part of this currently proposed project.

**BIO MM-1: Conduct pre-construction burrowing owl survey.** The airport shall conduct a pre-construction survey of ground disturbance sites during the breeding season (from approximately February 1 through August 31), consistent with CDFG guidelines, in the same calendar year that construction is planned to begin. The survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist to determine if any burrowing owls are nesting on or directly adjacent to any construction site. If phased construction procedures are planned, the results of the above survey shall be valid only for the season when it is conducted. If the pre-construction breeding season survey does not identify any burrowing owls on the construction site, then no further mitigation would be required.
Should any burrowing owls be found, neither the airport nor any construction contractor shall disturb an occupied burrow while there is an active nest and/or juvenile owls are present. Avoidance shall include the establishment of a non-disturbance buffer zone around the nest consistent with CDFG guidelines. The buffer zone shall be delineated by highly visible temporary construction fencing. The occupied nest site shall be monitored by a qualified biologist to determine when the juvenile owl is fledged and independent. Disturbance of an occupied burrow shall only occur outside the breeding season when there is no nest or juvenile owl based on monitoring by a qualified biologist. Based on approval by CDFG, pre-construction and pre-breeding season exclusion measures may be implemented to preclude burrowing owl occupation of a construction site prior to project-related disturbance.

Based on cultural resources surveys at the airport, there are no known sensitive cultural resources that would be adversely affected by the proposed project. Existing General Plan policies and other mandated procedures will be followed to ensure that no impacts will occur in the event that unknown resources are encountered during development.

XVIII b) Less than Significant. The proposed project could result in cumulative impacts related to air and water quality. These impacts are considered to be less than significant due to the implementation of SJVAPCD’s Regulation VIII, FAA-required BMPs, and other conditions of project approval. For example, the project would be required to:

- Implement the SJVAPCD’s air quality guidelines for controlling fugitive dust (i.e., Regulation VIII). The purpose of Regulation VIII is to reduce the amount of dust entrained into the atmosphere as a result of emissions generated from fugitive dust sources such as construction activities.

- Implement BMPs such as those included in FAA’s AC 150/5371-10, Standards for Specifying Construction of Airports, Item P-156, Temporary Air and Water Pollution, Soil Erosion and Siltation Control.

- Prepare and implement an updated SWPPP to include the additional runway and taxiway surfaces (per NPDES Industrial Permit requirements).

- Comply with City of Fresno ordinances for all grading, drainage, and construction of improvements.

- Prepare and implement a grading/erosion plan (per NPDES Construction Permit requirements).

XVIII c) Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. Project-related environmental effects on humans would be less than significant with the following mitigation:

IMPACT: The project will generate emissions during the six-month construction phase of the project. There is an elementary school with an outside playground area located to the west of
the construction site. Although the project’s emissions would be in compliance with the established SJVAPCD thresholds and rules, there is the potential for a child to be adversely affected by the construction-related emissions, particularly if weather conditions are adverse. This is considered a potential impact of the project that will be mitigated to below a level of significance by the following measure.

**AIR QUALITY MM-1:** As an added precaution, the school administration for Addicott Elementary School shall be notified of the project’s construction schedule in advance. It will then be the school administration’s responsibility to keep sensitive students from going outside if it would endanger the students’ health.

Other potential adverse effects of the proposed project are less than significant as discussed below:

- **Aesthetics - Lighting:** Changes to the REILs, PAPI, and runway and taxiway edge lights are not expected to result in impacts to neighboring land uses. Airfield lighting is generally low to the ground and considered to be low intensity. The closest residence to the proposed runway/taxiway extensions is a home located on the northwestern corner of N. Chestnut and E. Dayton avenues. This home is more than 0.25 mile west of the closest portion of the taxiway/runway extensions. At a distance of more than a quarter mile, the additional amount of low intensity lighting in the area as a result of the proposed project would be less than significant. No mitigation is necessary.

- **Hazards and Hazardous Materials:** During the construction phase of the project, a staging area would be located within the project area that would most likely require the use of aboveground storage tanks and other temporary facilities to store fuel, oil, and other petroleum-based products. These temporary facilities would be in accordance with applicable rules, regulations, and procedures governing their use. Typical construction BMPs include placing catch basins beneath construction equipment during the fueling process. This measure, as well as other industry standard BMPs, will ensure that potential hazards to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials related to the proposed project are less than significant. No mitigation is necessary.

The closest school, Addicott Elementary School, is located over one-quarter mile from the closest portion of the proposed project (i.e., the taxiway connection to the currently ongoing runway extension of Runway 11R-29L). The proposed runway operations may involve the transport of hazardous materials by aircraft and the use of fuel, oil, and other-petroleum based products. These operations will continue to occur at the airport under established guidelines with or without the proposed project. No mitigation is necessary.

- **Noise:** The proposed project will not result in a perceptible change in impact to noise-sensitive land uses located within the 65-70 CNEL noise contour of the airport. During
construction of the project, additional noise and ground-borne vibration will be created. However, the nearest sensitive receptors to the project site are at residences and schools located more than 0.25 mile from the potential sources of construction noise and vibration. At this distance, no significant impacts are anticipated. No mitigation is necessary.

- **Construction traffic:** The project may contribute up to 20 peak hour trips on two street segments on N. Clovis Avenue currently operating at unacceptable service levels during the six-month construction period. This is not considered to be a significant impact due to the low number of peak trips created by the project and the short-term nature of the construction phase. No mitigation is necessary.

**LIST OF PREPARERS:**

**Environmental Consultants**  
Coffman Associates  
4835 E. Cactus Road, Suite 235  
Scottsdale, AZ  85254

**Air Quality Subconsultants**  
KB Environmental Sciences  
9500 Koger Boulevard, Ste. 211  
St. Petersburg, FL  33702

**Biological Subconsultants**  
Quad Knopf  
5110 West Cypress Avenue  
P.O. Box 3699  
Visalia, CA  93278
REFERENCES:


Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) and City of Fresno, 2006. *Runway 11L Runway Safety Area Study* (Safety Area Study), November 2.

FAA and City of Fresno, 2011. *Final Environmental Assessment and Environmental Impact Report, Improvements at Fresno Yosemite International Airport (FAT)*, Fresno, California, October.

EXHIBIT A

MASTER ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT (MEIR)
(NO. 10130/SCH No. 2001071097/ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT NO. A-09-02)
FINDING OF MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION
FOR THE 2025 FRESNO GENERAL PLAN

Project/EA No. A-12-001

Mitigation Monitoring Checklist

Following is the mitigation monitoring checklist from MEIR No. 10130 as applied to the above-noted project's environmental assessment, required by City Council Resolution No. 2002-378 and Exhibit E thereof (adopted on November 19, 2002) to certify the MEIR for the 2025 Fresno General Plan Update. On June 25, 2009, through its Resolution No. 2009-146, the City Council adopted Environmental Assessment No. A-09-02 confirming the finding of a Mitigated Negative Declaration prepared for General Plan Amendment Application No. A-09-02 which updated the Air Quality Section of the Resource Conservation Element of the 2025 Fresno General Plan and incorporated additional and revised mitigation measures as necessary within the following monitoring checklist.

NOTE: Letters B-Q in mitigation measures refer to the respective sections of Chapter V of MEIR No. 10130

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MITIGATION MEASURE</th>
<th>WHEN IMPLEMENTED</th>
<th>COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Incorporate into Project</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Mitigated</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Mitigation in Progress</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Responsible Agency Contacted</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Part of City-wide Program</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Not Applicable</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B-1. Development projects that are consistent with plans and policies but that could affect conditions on major street segments predicted by the General Plan MEIR traffic analysis to perform at an Average Daily Traffic (ADT) level of service (LOS) D or better in 2025, with planned street improvements, shall not cause conditions on those segments to be worse than LOS E before 2025 without completing a traffic and transportation evaluation. This evaluation will be used to determine appropriate project-specific design measures or street/transportation improvements that will contribute to achieving and maintaining LOS D.

PUBLIC WORKS
Prior to approval of land use entitlement
Public Works
Dept./Traffic Planning;
Development and
Resource Management
Dept.

X

B-2. Development projects that are consistent with plans and policies but that could affect conditions on major street segments predicted by the General Plan MEIR traffic analysis to perform at an ADT LOS E in 2025, with planned street improvements, shall not cause conditions on those segments to be worse than LOS E before 2025 without completing a traffic and transportation evaluation. This evaluation will be used to determine appropriate project-specific design measures or street/transportation improvements that will contribute to achieving and maintaining LOS E.

PUBLIC WORKS
Prior to approval of land use entitlement
Public Works
Dept./Traffic Planning;
Development and
Resource Management
Dept.

X

Date: March 30, 2012
### MASTER ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT (MEIR) (NO. 10130/SCH No. 2001071097)
FOR THE 2025 FRESNO GENERAL PLAN
Project/EA No. A-12-001

**MEIR Mitigation Monitoring Checklist**

**DATE:** March 30, 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MITIGATION MEASURE</th>
<th>WHEN IMPLEMENTED</th>
<th>COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>B-3.</strong> Development projects that are consistent with plans and policies but that could affect conditions on major street segments predicted by the General Plan MEIR traffic analysis to perform at an ADT LOS F shall not cause further substantial degradation of conditions on those segments before 2025 without completing a traffic and transportation evaluation. This evaluation will be used to determine appropriate project-specific design measures or street/transportation improvements that will contribute to achieving and maintaining a LOS equivalent to that anticipated by the General Plan. Further substantial degradation is defined as an increase in the peak hour vehicle/capacity (v/c) ratio of 0.15 or greater for roadway segments whose v/c ratio is estimated to be 1.00 or higher in 2025 by the General Plan MEIR traffic analysis.</td>
<td>Prior to approval of land use entitlement</td>
<td>Public Works Dept./Traffic Planning; Development and Resource Management Dept.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B-4.</strong> For development projects that are consistent with plans and policies, a site access evaluation shall be required to the satisfaction of the Public Works Director. This evaluation shall, at a minimum, focus on the following factors:</td>
<td>Prior to approval of land use entitlement</td>
<td>Public Works Dept./Traffic Planning; Development and Resource Management Dept.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Disruption of vehicular traffic flow along adjacent major streets, appropriate design measures for on-site vehicular circulation and access to major streets (number, location and design of driveway approaches), and linkages to bicycle/pedestrian circulation systems and transit services.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. In addition, for development projects that the City determines may generate a projected 100 or more peak hour vehicle trips (either in the morning or evening), the evaluation shall determine the project's contribution to increased peak hour vehicle delay at major street intersections adjacent or proximate to the project site. The evaluation shall identify project responsibilities for intersection improvements to reduce vehicle delay consistent with the LOS anticipated by the 2025 Fresno General Plan. For projects which affect State Highways, the Public Works Director may direct the site access evaluation to reference the criteria presented in Caltrans Guide for the Preparation of Traffic Impact Studies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Project/EA No. A-12-001**

**Date:** March 30, 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MITIGATION MEASURE</th>
<th>WHEN IMPLEMENTED</th>
<th>COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>B-5.</strong> Circulation and site design measures shall be considered for development projects so that local trips may be completed as much as possible without use of, or with reduced use of, major streets and major street intersections. Appropriate consideration must also be given to compliance with plan policies and mitigation measures intended to promote compatibility between land uses with different traffic generation characteristics.</td>
<td>Prior to approval of land use entitlement</td>
<td>Public Works Dept./Traffic Planning; Development and Resource Management Dept.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B-6.</strong> New development projects and major street construction projects shall be designed with consideration and implementation of appropriate features (considering safety, convenience and cost-effectiveness) to encourage walking, bicycling, and public transportation as alternative modes to the automobile.</td>
<td>Prior to approval or prior to funding of major street project.</td>
<td>Public Works Dept./Traffic Planning; Development and Resource Management Dept.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B-7.</strong> Bicycle and pedestrian travel and use of public transportation shall be facilitated as alternative modes of transportation including, but not limited to, provision of bicycle, pedestrian and public transportation facilities and improvements to connect residential areas with public facilities, shopping and employment. Adequate rights-of-way for bikeways, preferably as bicycle lanes, shall be provided on all new major streets and shall be considered when designing improvements for existing major streets.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Public Works Dept./Traffic Planning; Development and Resource Management Dept.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MITIGATION MEASURE</td>
<td>WHEN IMPLEMENTED</td>
<td>COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-1. In cooperation with other jurisdictions and agencies in the San Joaquin Valley Air Basin, the City shall take the following necessary actions to achieve and maintain compliance with state and federal air quality standards and programs.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Development and Resource Management Dept.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Develop and incorporate air quality maintenance considerations into the preparation and review of land use plans and development proposals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Maintain internal consistency within the General Plan between policies and programs for air quality resource conservation and the policies and programs of other General Plan elements.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. City departments preparing environmental review documents shall use computer models (software approved by local and state air quality and congestion management agencies) to estimate air pollution impacts of development entitlements, land use plans and amendments to land use regulations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Adopted state and SJVAPCD protocols, standards, and thresholds of significance for greenhouse gas emissions shall be utilized in assessing and approving proposed development projects.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Continue to route information regarding land use plans, development projects, and amendments to development regulations to the SJVAPCD for that agency's review and comment on potential air quality impacts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend:

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

**Date:** March 30, 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MITIGATION MEASURE</th>
<th>WHEN IMPLEMENTED</th>
<th>COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>C-2.</strong> For development projects potentially meeting SJVAPCD thresholds of significance and/or thresholds of applicability for the Indirect Source Review Rule (Rule 9510) in their unmitigated condition, project applicants shall complete the SJVAPCD Indirect Source Review Application prior to approval of the development project. Mitigation measures incorporated into the ISR analysis shall be incorporated into the project as conditions of approval and/or mitigation measures, as may be appropriate.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Development and Resource Management Dept.; SJVAPCD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C-3.</strong> The City shall implement all of the Reasonably Available Control Measures (RACM) identified in Exhibit A of Resolution No. 2002-119, adopted by the Fresno City Council on April 9, 2002. These measures are presented in full detail in Table VC-3 of the MEIR.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Various city departments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C-4.</strong> The City shall continue efforts to improve technical performance, emissions levels and system operations of the Fresno Area Express transit system, through such measures as:</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Fresno Area Express</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Selecting and maintaining bus engines, transmissions, fuels and air conditioning equipment for efficiency and low air pollution emissions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Siting new transit centers and other multi-modal transportation transfer facilities to maximize utilization of mass transit.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Continuing efforts to improve transit on-time performance, increase frequency of service, extend hours of operation, add express bus service and align routes to capture as much new ridership as possible.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Initiating a program to allow employers and institutions (e.g., educational facilities) to purchase blocks of bus passes at a reduced rate to facilitate their incentive programs for reducing single-passenger vehicle use.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A - Incorporated into Project  
B - Mitigated  
C - Mitigation in Process  
D - Responsible Agency Contacted  
E - Part of City-Wide Program  
F - Not Applicable
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MITIGATION MEASURE</th>
<th>WHEN IMPLEMENTED</th>
<th>COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D-1. The City shall monitor impacts of land use changes and development project proposals on water supply facilities and the groundwater aquifer.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Dept. of Public Utilities; Development and Resource Management Dept.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-2. The City shall ensure the funding and construction of facilities to mitigate the direct impacts of land use changes and development within the 2025 General Plan boundaries. Groundwater wells, pump stations, intentional recharge facilities, potable and recycled water treatment and distribution systems shall be expanded incrementally to mitigate increased water demands. Site specific environmental evaluations shall precede the construction of these facilities. Results of this evaluation shall be incorporated into each project to reduce the identified environmental impacts.</td>
<td>Ongoing (City-wide); and prior to approval of land use entitlement as applicable</td>
<td>Dept. of Public Utilities; Development and Resource Management Dept.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-3. The City shall implement the future water supply plan described in the City of Fresno Metropolitan Water Resources Management Plan Update and shall continue to update this Plan as necessary to ensure the cost-effective use of water resources and continued availability of good-quality groundwater and surface water supplies.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Dept. of Public Utilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-4. The City shall work with the Fresno Metropolitan Flood Control District to prevent and reduce the existence of urban stormwater pollutants to the maximum extent practical and ensure that surface and groundwater quality, public health, and the environment shall not be adversely affected by urban runoff, and shall comply with NPDES standards.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Development and Resource Management Dept.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MITIGATION MEASURE</th>
<th>WHEN IMPLEMENTED</th>
<th>COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>D-5.</strong> The City shall preserve undeveloped areas within the 100-year floodway within the city and its general plan area, particularly the San Joaquin Riverbottom, for uses that will not involve permanent improvements which would be adversely affected by periodic floods. The City shall expand this protected area in the Riverbottom pursuant to expanded floodplain and/or floodway maps, regulations, and policies adopted by the Central Valley Flood Protection Board and the National Flood Insurance Protection Program.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Development and Resource Management Dept.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D-6.</strong> The City shall establish special building standards for private structures, public structures and infrastructure elements in the San Joaquin Riverbottom that will protect:</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Development and Resource Management Dept.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Allowable construction in this area from being damaged by the intensity of flooding in the riverbottom;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Water quality in the San Joaquin River watershed from flood damage-related nuisances and hazards (e.g., the release of raw sewage); and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Public health, safety and general welfare from the effects of flood events.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D-7.</strong> The City shall advocate that the San Joaquin River not be channelized and that levees shall not be used in the river corridor for flood control, except those alterations in river flow that are approved for surface mining and subsequent reclamation activities for mined sites (e.g., temporary berms and small side-channel diversions to control water flow through ponds).</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Development and Resource Management Dept.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend:**

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

**Project/EA No. A-12-001**

**Date:** March 30, 2012

## MITIGATION MEASURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MITIGATION MEASURE</th>
<th>WHEN IMPLEMENTED</th>
<th>COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D-8. The City shall maintain a comprehensive, long-range water resource management plan that provides for appropriate management and use of all sources of water available to the planning area, and shall periodically update this plan to ensure that sufficient and sustainable water supplies of good quality will be economically available to accommodate existing and planned urban development. Project-specific and city-wide water conservation measures shall be directed toward assisting in reaching the goal of balancing City groundwater operations by 2025.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Dept. of Public Utilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-9. The City shall continue its current water conservation programs and implement additional water conservation measures to reduce overall per capita water use within the City with a goal of reducing the overall per capita water use in the City to its adopted target consumption rate. The target per capita consumption rate adopted in 2008 is a citywide average of 243 gallons per person per day, intended to be reached by 2020 (which includes anticipated water conservation resulting from the on-going residential water metering program and additional water conservation by all customers: 5% by 2010, and an additional 5% by 2020.)</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Dept. of Public Utilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-10. All development projects shall be required to comply with City Department of Public Utilities conditions intended for the City to reach its overall per capita water consumption rate target. Project conditions shall include, but are not limited to, water use efficiency for landscaping, use of artificial turf and native plant materials, reducing turf areas, and discouraging the development of artificial lakes, fountains and ponds unless only untreated surface water or recycled water supplies are used for these decorative and recreational water features, as appropriate and sanitary.</td>
<td>Prior to approval of land use entitlement</td>
<td>Dept. of Public Utilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend:**

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MITIGATION MEASURE</th>
<th>WHEN IMPLEMENTED</th>
<th>COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D-11. When and if the City adopts a formal management plan for recycled and/or reclaimed water, all development shall comply with its standards and requirements. Absent a formal management plan for recycled and/or reclaimed water, new development projects shall install reasonably necessary infrastructure, facilities and equipment to utilize reclaimed and recycled water for landscape irrigation, decorative fountains and ponds, and other water-consuming features, provided that use of reclaimed or recycled water is determined by the Department of Public Utilities to be feasible, sanitary, and energy-efficient.</td>
<td>Prior to approval of development project</td>
<td>Dept. of Public Utilities</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-12. All applicants for development projects shall provide data (meeting City Department of Public Utilities criteria for such data) on the anticipated annual water demand and daily peak water demand for proposed projects. If a development project would increase water demand at a project location (or for a type of development) beyond the levels allocated in the version of the City’s Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) in effect at the time the project’s environmental assessment is conducted, the additional water demand will be required to be offset or mitigated in a manner acceptable to the City Department of Public Utilities. Allocated water demand rates are set forth in Table 6-4 of the 2008 UWMP as follows:</td>
<td>Prior to approval of development project</td>
<td>Dept. of Public Utilities</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 6-4 of the 2008 UWMP as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOR GROSS DEVELOPED PROJECT ACREAGE OF THE FOLLOWING DEVELOPMENT CATEGORIES</th>
<th>PER-UNIT FACTORS, in acre-ft/acre/yr, for projects projected to be completed during these intervals:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Analysis shall include acreage to all street centerlines.)</td>
<td>01/01/2005 THROUGH 12/31/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single family residential</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-family residential</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A - Incorporated into Project  
B - Mitigated  
C - Mitigation in Process  
D - Responsible Agency Contacted  
E - Part of City-Wide Program  
F - Not Applicable
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MITIGATION MEASURE</th>
<th>WHEN IMPLEMENTED</th>
<th>COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commercial and institutional</td>
<td>2 1.9 1.9</td>
<td>A B C D E F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>2 1.9 1.9</td>
<td>A B C D E F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscaped open space</td>
<td>3 2.9 2.9</td>
<td>A B C D E F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East Growth Area</td>
<td>3.4 3.2 3.2</td>
<td>A B C D E F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: The above land use classifications and demand allocation factors may be amended in future updates of the Urban Water Management Plan.

D-13. The City will conform to the requirements of Waste Discharge Requirements Order 5-01-254, including groundwater monitoring and subsequent Best Practical Treatment and Control (BPTC) assessment and findings.

E-1. The City shall continue to implement and pursue strengthening of urban growth management service delivery requirements and annexation policy agreements, including urging that the county continue to implement similar measures within the boundaries of the 2025 Fresno General Plan, to promote contiguous urban development and discourage premature conversion of agricultural land.

E-2. To minimize the inefficient conversion of agricultural land, the City shall pursue the appropriate measures to ensure that development within the planned urban boundary occurs consistent with the General Plan and that urban development occurs within the city's incorporated boundaries.
### MITIGATION MEASURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MITIGATION MEASURE</th>
<th>WHEN IMPLEMENTED</th>
<th>COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E-3. The City shall pursue appropriate measures, including recordation of right to farm covenants, to ensure that agricultural uses of land may continue within those areas of transition where planned urban areas interface with planned agricultural areas.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Development and Resource Management Dept.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| E-4. Development of agricultural land, or fallow land adjacent to land designated for agricultural uses, shall incorporate measures to reduce the potential for conflicts with the agricultural use. Implementation of the following measures shall be considered:  
  a. Including a buffer zone of sufficient width between proposed residences and the agricultural use.  
  b. Restricting the intensity of residential uses adjacent to agricultural lands.  
  c. Informing residents about possible exposure to agricultural chemicals.  
  d. Where feasible and permitted by law, exploring opportunities for agricultural operators to cease aerial spraying of chemicals and use of heavy equipment near proposed residences.  
  e. Recordation of right to farm covenants to ensure that agricultural uses of land can continue. | Ongoing | Development and Resource Management Dept. |
| F-1. The City shall ensure the provision for adequate trunk sewer and collector main capacities to serve existing and planned urban and economic development, including existing developed uses not presently connected to the public sewer system, consistent with the Wastewater Master Plan. Where appropriate, the City will coordinate with the City of Clovis and other agencies to ensure that planning and construction of facilities address regional needs in a comprehensive manner. | Ongoing | Dept. of Public Utilities; Development and Resource Management Dept. |

**Legend:**  
A - Incorporated into Project  
B - Mitigated  
C - Mitigation in Process  
D - Responsible Agency Contacted  
E - Part of City-Wide Program  
F - Not Applicable
### MASTER ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT (MEIR) (NO. 10130/SCH No. 2001071097)

**FOR THE 2025 FRESNO GENERAL PLAN**

**Project/EA No. A-12-001**

**MEIR Mitigation Monitoring Checklist**

**Date:** March 30, 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MITIGATION MEASURE</th>
<th>WHEN IMPLEMENTED</th>
<th>COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>F-2.</strong> The City shall continue the development and use of citywide sewer flow monitoring and computerized flow modeling to ensure the availability of sewer collection system capacity to serve planned urban development.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Dept. of Public Utilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F-2-a.</strong> The City shall provide for containment and management of leathers and sludge adequate to prevent groundwater degradation.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Dept. of Public Utilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F-3.</strong> The City shall ensure the provision of adequate sewage treatment and disposal by using the Fresno-Clovis Regional Wastewater Reclamation Facility as the primary facility when economically feasible for all existing and new development within the General Plan area. Smaller, subregional wastewater treatment facilities may also be constructed as part of the regional wastewater treatment system, when appropriate. This shall include provision of tertiary treatment facilities to produce recycled water for landscape irrigation and other non-potable uses. Site specific environmental evaluation and development of Waste Discharge Requirements by the Regional Water Quality Control Board shall precede the construction of these facilities. Mitigation measures identified in these evaluations shall be incorporated into each project to reduce the identified environmental impacts.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Dept. of Public Utilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F-4.</strong> The City shall ensure that adequate trunk sewer capacity exists or can be provided to serve proposed development prior to the approval of rezoning, special permits, tract maps and parcel maps, so that the capacities of existing facilities are not exceeded.</td>
<td>Ongoing/prior to approval of land use entitlement</td>
<td>Dept. of Public Utilities; Development and Resource Management Dept.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Key to Compliance Verification:**

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

**Date:** March 30, 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MITIGATION MEASURE</th>
<th>WHEN IMPLEMENTED</th>
<th>COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F-5. The City shall provide adequate solid waste facilities and services for the</td>
<td>Ongoing/prior to</td>
<td>Dept. of Public Utilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>collection, transfer, recycling, and disposal of refuse for existing and planned</td>
<td>construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>development within the City's jurisdiction. Site specific environmental evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shall precede the construction of these facilities. Results of this evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shall be incorporated into each project to reduce the identified environmental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>impacts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-1. Site specific environmental evaluation shall precede the construction of</td>
<td>Ongoing/prior to</td>
<td>Fire Dept./Police Dept.; Development and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>new police and fire protection facilities. Results of this evaluation shall be</td>
<td>construction</td>
<td>Resource Management Dept.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>incorporated into each project to reduce the identified environmental impacts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-1. Site specific environmental evaluation shall precede the construction of</td>
<td>Ongoing/prior to</td>
<td>Parks and Recreation Dept.; Development and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>new public parks. Results of this evaluation shall be incorporated into the park</td>
<td>construction</td>
<td>Resource Management Dept.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>design to reduce the environmental impacts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend:**

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MITIGATION MEASURE</th>
<th>WHEN IMPLEMENTED</th>
<th>COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-1. Projects that could adversely affect rare, threatened or endangered wildlife and vegetative species (or may have impacts on wildlife, fish and vegetation restoration programs) may be approved only with the consent of the California Department of Fish and Game (and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, as appropriate) that adequate mitigation measures are incorporated into the project's approval.</td>
<td>Ongoing/prior to approval of land use entitlement</td>
<td>Development and Resource Management Dept.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-2. Where feasible, development shall avoid disturbance in wetland areas, including vernal pools and riparian communities along rivers and streams. Avoidance of these areas shall including siting structures at least 100 feet from the outermost edge of the wetland. If complete avoidance is not possible, the disturbance to the wetland shall be minimized to the maximum extent possible, with restoration of the disturbed area provided. New vegetation shall consist of native species similar to those removed.</td>
<td>Ongoing/prior to approval of land use entitlement</td>
<td>Development and Resource Management Dept.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-3. Where wetlands or other sensitive habitats cannot be avoided, replacement habitat at a nearby off-site location shall be provided. The replacement habitat shall be substantially equivalent in nature to the habitat lost and shall be provided at a ratio suitable to assure that, at a minimum, there is no net less of habitat acreage or value. Typically, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and California Department of Fish and Game require a ratio of three replacement acres for every one acre of high quality riparian or wetland habitat lost.</td>
<td>Ongoing/prior to approval of land use entitlement and during construction</td>
<td>Development and Resource Management Dept.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-4. Existing and mature riparian vegetation shall be preserved to the extent feasible, except when trees are diseased or otherwise constitute a hazard to persons or property. During construction, all activities and storage of equipment shall occur outside of the drip lines of any trees to be preserved.</td>
<td>Ongoing/prior to approval of land use entitlement and during construction</td>
<td>Development and Resource Management Dept.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MITIGATION MEASURE</td>
<td>WHEN IMPLEMENTED</td>
<td>COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I-5.</strong> Within the identified riparian corridors, environmentally sensitive habitat areas shall be protected against any significant disruption of habitat values and only uses consistent with these values shall be allowed (e.g., nature education and research, fishing and habitat enhancement and protection).</td>
<td>Ongoing/prior to approval of land use entitlement and during construction</td>
<td>Development and Resource Management Dept.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I-6.</strong> All areas within identified riparian corridors shall be maintained in a natural state or limited to recreation and open space uses. Recreation shall be limited to passive forms of recreation, with any facilities that are constructed required to be non-intrusive to wildlife or sensitive species.</td>
<td>Ongoing/prior to approval of land use entitlement and during construction</td>
<td>Development and Resource Management Dept.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>J-1.</strong> If the site of a proposed development or public works project is found to contain unique archaeological or paleontological resources, and it can be demonstrated that the project will cause damage to these resources, reasonable efforts shall be made to permit any or all of the resource to be scientifically removed, or it shall be preserved in situ (left in an undisturbed state). In situ preservation may include the following options, or equivalent measures:</td>
<td>Ongoing/prior to approval of land use entitlement</td>
<td>Development and Resource Management Dept.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Amending construction plans to avoid the resources.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Setting aside sites containing these resources by deeding them into permanent conservation easements.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Capping or covering these resources with a protective layer of soil before building on the sites.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Incorporating parks, green space or other open space into the project to leave these resources undisturbed and to provide a protective cover over them.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Avoiding public disclosure of the location of these resources until or unless the site is adequately protected from vandalism or theft.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend:**

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

**Date:** March 30, 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MITIGATION MEASURE</th>
<th>WHEN IMPLEMENTED</th>
<th>COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J-2. An archaeological assessment shall be conducted for the project if prehistoric human relics are found that were not previously assessed during the environmental assessment for the project. The site shall be formally recorded, and archaeologist recommendations shall be made to the City on further site investigation or site avoidance/preservation measures.</td>
<td>Ongoing/prior to submittal of land use entitlement application</td>
<td>Development and Resource Management Dept.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J-3. If there are suspected human remains, the Fresno County Coroner shall be contacted immediately. If the remains or other archaeological materials are possibly of Native American origin, the Native American Heritage Commission shall be contacted immediately, and the California Archaeological Inventory's Southern San Joaquin Valley Information Center shall be contacted to obtain a referral list of recognized archaeologists.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Development and Resource Management Dept./ Historic Preservation Commission staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J-4. Where maintenance, repair stabilization, rehabilitation, restoration, preservation, conservation or reconstruction of the historical resource will be conducted consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring and Reconstructing Historic Buildings (Weeks and Grimmer, 1995), the project's impact on the historical resource shall generally be considered mitigated below a level of significance and thus not significant.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Development and Resource Management Dept.; Historic Preservation Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-1. The City shall adopt the land use noise compatibility standards presented in Figure VK-2 for general planning purposes.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Development and Resource Management Dept.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend:**

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

**Project/EA No. A-12-001**

**Date:** March 30, 2012

**Dates:**
- March 30, 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MITIGATION MEASURE</th>
<th>WHEN IMPLEMENTED</th>
<th>COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>K-2.</strong> Any required acoustical analysis shall be performed as required by Policy H-1-d of the 2025 Fresno General Plan for development projects proposing residential or other noise sensitive uses as defined by Policy H-1-a, to provide compliance with the performance standards identified by Policies H-1-a and H-1-k. (Note: all are policies of the 2025 Fresno General Plan.) The following measures can be used to mitigate noise impacts; however, impacts may not be fully mitigated within the 70 dBA noise contour areas depicted on Figure VK-4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Planning. See Chapter V for more details.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barriers. See Chapter V for more details.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Designs. See Chapter V for more details.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing/upon submittal of land use entitlement application</td>
<td>Development and Resource Management Dept.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>K-3.</strong> The City shall continue to enforce the California Administrative Code, Title 24, Noise Insulation Standards. Title 24 requires that an acoustical analysis be performed for all new multi-family construction in areas where the exterior sound issuance levels exceed 60 CNEL. The analysis shall ensure that the building design limits the interior noise environment to 45 CNEL or below.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing/prior to building permit issuance</td>
<td>Development and Resource Management Dept.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>L-1.</strong> Any construction that occurs as a result of a project shall conform to current Uniform Building Code regulations which address seismic safety of new structures and slope requirements. As appropriate, the City shall require a preliminary soils report prior to subdivision map review to ascertain site specific subsurface information necessary to estimate foundation conditions. This report shall reference and make use of the most recent regional geologic maps available from the California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Development and Resource Management Dept.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend:**
- A - Incorporated into Project
- B - Mitigated
- C - Mitigation in Process
- D - Responsible Agency Contacted
- E - Part of City-Wide Program
- F - Not Applicable
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MITIGATION MEASURE</th>
<th>WHEN IMPLEMENTED</th>
<th>COMPLIANCE VERIFIED BY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N-1. The City shall cooperate with appropriate energy providers to ensure the provision of adequate energy generated and distribution facilities, including environmental review as required.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Development and Resource Management Dept.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q-1. The City shall establish and implement design guidelines applicable to all commercial and manufacturing zone districts. These design guidelines will require consideration of the appearance of non-residential buildings that are visible to pedestrians and vehicle drivers using major streets or are visible from proximate properties zoned or planned for residential use.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Development and Resource Management Dept.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This monitoring checklist for the above noted environmental assessment is being prepared in accordance with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), as required under Assembly Bill 3180, and is intended to establish a project-specific reporting/monitoring program for Environmental Assessment No. A-12-001. Verification of implementation of these mitigation measures, in addition to the applicable measures specified for this project per the Mitigation Monitoring Checklist prepared for this project pursuant to Master Environmental Impact Report No. 10130 - 2025 Fresno General Plan, will be required upon the application for subdivision of the project site, special permits, or grading on the project site. The captions below refer to corresponding sections of the Initial Study checklist for this project, using the Appendix G format from the CEQA Guidelines.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MITIGATION MEASURE</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTED BY</th>
<th>WHEN IMPLEMENTED</th>
<th>VERIFIED BY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AIR QUALITY MM-1:</td>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Prior to construction.</td>
<td>City of Fresno Development &amp; Resource Management Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As an added precaution, the school administration for Addicott Elementary School shall be notified of the project's construction schedule in advance. It will then be the school administration's responsibility to keep sensitive students from going outside if it would endanger the students' health.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIO MM-1: Conduct pre-construction burrowing owl survey. The airport shall conduct a pre-construction survey of ground disturbance sites during the breeding season (from approximately February 1 through August 31), consistent with CDFG guidelines, in the same calendar year that construction is planned to begin. The survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist to determine if any burrowing owls are nesting on or directly adjacent to any construction site. If phased construction procedures are planned, the results of the above survey shall be valid only for the season when it is conducted. If the pre-construction breeding season survey does not identify any burrowing owls on the construction site, then no</td>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Prior to construction.</td>
<td>City of Fresno Development &amp; Resource Management Department</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
further mitigation would be required.

Should any burrowing owls be found, neither the airport nor any construction contractor shall disturb an occupied burrow while there is an active nest and/or juvenile owls are present. Avoidance shall include the establishment of a non-disturbance buffer zone around the nest consistent with CDFG guidelines. The buffer zone shall be delineated by highly visible temporary construction fencing. The occupied nest site shall be monitored by a qualified biologist to determine when the juvenile owl is fledged and independent. Disturbance of an occupied burrow shall only occur outside the breeding season when there is no nest or juvenile owl based on monitoring by a qualified biologist. Based on approval by CDFG, pre-construction and pre-breeding season exclusion measures may be implemented to preclude burrowing owl occupation of a construction site prior to project-related disturbance.
Appendix A

AIR QUALITY INPUT ASSUMPTIONS
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Appendix A
AIR QUALITY INPUT ASSUMPTIONS

This appendix includes information about the air quality modeling assumptions.

CONSTRUCTION EMISSIONS INVENTORY METHODOLOGY

Pollutants included in this assessment comprise carbon monoxide (CO), reactive organic gases (ROG), nitrogen oxides (NOx), particulate matter measuring 10 micrometers or less in diameter (PM10), and particulate matter measuring 2.5 micrometers or less in diameter (PM2.5). Methodological details pertaining to the estimation of emissions from on-road construction vehicles (haul trucks and employee vehicles), off-road construction equipment, fugitive dust generation, and asphalt paving are discussed.

ON-ROAD CONSTRUCTION VEHICLES

Activity levels and assignments for on-road construction vehicles have been developed based on a schedule of planned construction activities for the project including the number of vehicle trips, the number of vehicles, and the average trip distance. Emissions due to construction employee commutes to and from the work site were calculated, assuming an average commute distance of 12.5 miles (25 miles round trip) and an average of 1.25 employees per piece of construction equipment (per URBEMIS 9.2.4). This results in an average of approximately 20 employees.
Criteria pollutant emissions associated with on-road construction vehicles have been calculated by combining the activity information with emissions factors, in grams per mile, derived using the CARB EMFAC2011 emissions model\textsuperscript{1} assuming a 35-mile-per-hour (mph) travelling speed. Haul truck trip determinations were made based on an assumed operation of eight hours per day and an average speed of 35 miles per hour. Emissions calculations were based on Equation 1. The EMFAC emissions factors are summarized on Table A1, per vehicle type.

\textbf{Equation 1}

\[ \text{Emission Rate (tons/year)} = \text{Emission Factor (gram/mile)} \times \text{trips per day} \times \text{miles per trip} \times \text{days/year} \times (453.59/2000 \text{ tons/gram}) \]

\textbf{Table A1: On-road Vehicle Emissions Factors (g/mile)}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VEHICLE TYPE</th>
<th>POLLUTANT</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employee Vehicle</td>
<td>ROG</td>
<td>0.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>1.791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO\textsubscript{2}</td>
<td>0.153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM\textsubscript{10}</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM\textsubscript{2.5}</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VOC</td>
<td>0.294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>1.281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haul Truck - Diesel</td>
<td>NO\textsubscript{2}</td>
<td>8.629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM\textsubscript{10}</td>
<td>0.207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM\textsubscript{2.5}</td>
<td>0.190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VOC</td>
<td>0.392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>7.354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Truck - Gasoline</td>
<td>NO\textsubscript{2}</td>
<td>1.613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM\textsubscript{10}</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM\textsubscript{2.5}</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: ROG = reactive organic gases, CO = carbon monoxide; NO\textsubscript{2} = oxides of nitrogen; PM\textsubscript{10} = particulate matter with diameter equal to or less than 10 microns; PM\textsubscript{2.5} = particulate matter with diameter equal to or less than 2.5 microns.

\textbf{OFF-ROAD CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT}

Emission parameters for off-road construction equipment including equipment and fuel type, estimated horsepower and estimated annual hours of operation, were also used. Annual hours of off-road equipment operation were based on materials quantities and production rates required to complete each construction subtask, generally as a result of an eight-hour by five day work week. This information was applied to criteria pollutant emissions factors, in grams per horsepower-hour, primarily derived using the CARB OFFROAD2007 emissions model.

\textsuperscript{1} \text{CARB EMFAC2011 Emissions Model, http://www.arb.ca.gov/msei/msei.htm}
Because CARB is revising some information contained within the OFFROAD model, and has issued a data update for select diesel equipment (i.e., the Offroad Emissions Inventory [OEI] Database), the OFFROAD emissions information was appended with the OEI Database information, where necessary and applicable. Equation 2 outlines how off-road construction equipment emissions were computed, and the emissions factors used in this assessment are summarized, by equipment type and construction year, on Table A2.

**Equation 2**

\[
\text{Emission Rate (tons/year)} = \text{Emission Factor (gram/hp-hour)} \times \text{size (hp)} \times \text{hours of operation} \times \text{Load Factor} \times \frac{453.59}{2000} \text{tons/gram}
\]

### Table A2: Off-road Equipment Emission Parameters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equipment</th>
<th>Fuel</th>
<th>HP</th>
<th>LF</th>
<th>2013 Emission Factor (g/HP-hr)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ROG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadtec RX-700 milling machine</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat 450E Backhoe/Loader</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>0.3685</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat 928Hz Wheel Loader</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>0.3685</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat C556 Vibratory Soil Compactor</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>0.3015</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wacker WP-1550 Vibratory Soil Compactor</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>8.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wacker WP-1550 Vibratory Asphalt</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>8.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volvo Motor Grader 970</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>0.4087</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat D6 Dozer</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>0.3618</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat 450E Backhoe/Loader</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>0.3685</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingersol Rand Blaw-Knox Paver PF4410</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>0.4154</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenworth T440 with bottom dump trailer</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>0.4355</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypac C885D Roller</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>0.3752</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat PS-150C Roller</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.3752</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volvo MC110C Skid Street Loader</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>0.3685</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: ROG = reactive organic gases, CO = carbon monoxide; NO\textsubscript{X} = oxides of nitrogen; PM\textsubscript{10} = particulate matter with diameter equal to or less than 10 microns; PM\textsubscript{2.5} = particulate matter with diameter equal to or less than 2.5 microns; D= Diesel; G = Gasoline; HP = Horsepower; HR = Hour; and LF = Load Factor.

**FUGITIVE DUST**

Fugitive dust emissions that may occur due to construction were also estimated. The URBEMIS model provides a worst-case, uncontrolled PM\textsubscript{10} emissions rate of 38.2 pounds per acre-day for
fugitive dust emissions occurring due to travel on unpaved roads, site preparation, grading activities, wind erosion, and other land disturbance activities. The model also indicates that a maximum of 25 percent of the project acreage would likely be disturbed on any given construction day, and that 20 percent of the PM$_{10}$ emissions occur as PM$_{2.5}$. The project acreage is 16 acres but twice the project acreage was assumed subject to disturbance. Lastly, URBEMIS includes 61 percent emissions control efficiency for fugitive dust estimates, which reflect San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District Regulation VIII measures.

ASPHALT PAVING

From the URBEMIS model, an emission factor of 2.62 pounds of ROG per acre of asphalt material was used to estimate emissions from asphalt placement and curing. The project acreage of 16 acres was used to estimate ROG emissions from asphalt paving.
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Appendix B

PHASE II BURROWING OWL SURVEY REPORT

On September 29, 2011, Quad Knopf biologists performed a protocol-level burrowing owl survey. The Phase II Burrowing Owl Survey report is included within this appendix. According to this report, the project site does not contain burrowing owls or evidence of burrowing owl habitation.
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September 29, 2011

Ms. Molly Waller
Coffman Associates
237 NW Blue Parkway, Ste. 100
Lee’s Summit, MO 64063

Subject: Phase II Burrowing Owl Survey for RSA Improvement Sites at Fresno Yosemite International Airport

Dear Ms. Waller:

Fresno Yosemite International Airport is proposing improvements to meet Runway Safety Area (RSA) standards established by the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA). The proposed project will include a 330-foot extension of Runway 11L-29R to the northwest and the development of two stub taxiways that will connect with taxiways currently under construction. The development footprints and staging areas cumulatively encompass approximately 33 acres (project site). An evaluation of the potential for the proposed improvements to impact the burrowing owl (Athene cunicularia) has been requested to comply with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

Although the burrowing owl is not federally or state listed as a threatened or endangered species, and thus not protected by either the federal Endangered Species Act (FESA) or the state Endangered Species Act (CESA), it is a migratory species protected by international law under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) of 1918. The MBTA makes it unlawful to take, possess, buy, sell, purchase, or barter any migratory bird listed in 50 CFR, Part 10, except as allowed by implementing regulations. Sections 3505, 3503.5, and 3800 of the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) Code also prohibit the take, possession, or destruction of birds and their nests. “Take” is further defined by the CDFG as harassing, harming, pursuing, hunting, shooting, wounding, killing, trapping, capturing, or collecting. The burrowing owl is additionally designated as a California State Species of Special Concern. Accordingly, it must be addressed during CEQA review with the intent of assuring the maintenance of viable population levels, thereby avoiding listing pursuant to CESA or FESA.

As with most sensitive species, the primary threat to the burrowing owl is loss of habitat. Typical habitat required by this species is open grassland, deserts, and arid scrublands characterized by low-growing vegetation. Coincidentally, these habitat types are conducive to urban development, which is resulting in the rapid elimination and fragmentation of suitable burrowing owl habitat. The burrowing owl can tolerate trees and shrubs, but generally only if the canopy cover is less than approximately 30 percent of the ground cover. One of the primary aspects influencing western burrowing owl habitation is the presence of subterranean burrows. Burrows, which may be either natural or artificial, are used for breeding, shelter, and protection.
Burrowing owls usually opportunistically occupy burrows that have been previously created by fossorial mammals such as the California ground squirrel (*Spermophilus beecheyi*). Artificial burrows that have proven to be suitable include culverts and debris piles of cement, asphalt, and wood. In addition to the presence of adequate burrows, a sufficient prey base is essential to the successful propagation of this species. Prey items consumed by the burrowing owl primarily include small rodents and insects.

Quad Knopf assessed the project site for the presence of burrowing owls by completing both a database search and a Phase II burrow survey. The California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB) was queried for historical records of the burrowing owl in the vicinity of the project site. No historical occurrences are listed on the project site. The nearest record (EOID 42847) is located approximately 11.2 miles north of the project site. One adult was observed on April 4, 2000, at an active burrow located approximately 0.25 mile east of State Hwy 41 and approximately 1.4 miles north of Avenue 12. The habitat consisted of grazed annual grassland interspersed with vernal pools.

Quad Knopf subsequently conducted a Phase II burrow survey on the project site in accordance with protocols outlined in the “Burrowing Owl Survey Protocol and Mitigation Guidelines” (California Burrowing Owl Consortium 1993). Biologists Andy Glass and Becky Garro completed the Phase II burrow survey on September 29, 2011. The weather conditions during the survey were sunny and approximately 95°F. There were no circumstances encountered that would compromise the results of the survey. Upon arrival at the Fresno Yosemite International Airport, the biologists met with Operations Manager Ron Ames, who coordinated access to the project site.

The biologists completed the survey by conducting pedestrian transects throughout the project site and within 500 feet of its perimeter. The 500-foot buffer was included to account for adjacent burrows and foraging habitat outside the project site and impacts from factors such as noise and vibration due to heavy equipment. To allow for 100 percent visibility of the ground surface, the transect widths were adjusted to account for differences in terrain and vegetation density. Transect widths were never greater than 100 feet. Efforts were focused on identifying burrowing owls, their cast pellets, prey remains, or eggshell fragments near the entrances of burrows. Raptor species observed during the transect surveys were identified with high quality optics, habitat conditions were documented with a digital camera, and burrowing owls and potentially active burrows were mapped with a GPS unit. Ground squirrel burrow complexes, as well as larger burrows with no sign, were also mapped because burrowing owls will readily modify existing burrows for use.

The project site was characterized by non-native annual grassland habitat that was highly disturbed and heavily managed through routine airport maintenance activities (see Photographs 1-4). No burrowing owls were observed on the project site, or within 500 feet of its perimeter, during conduction of the Phase II survey. Additionally, no active burrows or potentially historic burrows were observed on the project site. Fossorial wildlife activity, in general, was absent. Only three remnant small mammal burrow complexes were identified. These complexes predominantly consisted of collapsed burrows. The absence of fossorial wildlife on the project site was apparently due to the success of rodent control measures that have been implemented at
the airport in recent years. During the survey, the only wildlife species observed was the side-blotched lizard (*Uta stansburiana*). Thus, no evidences of habitation by other sensitive species, including federally listed species, were found.

In conclusion, no burrowing owls, or evidences of burrowing owl habitation, were observed on the project site during the Phase II survey that was conducted. Consequently, completion of a Phase III breeding season survey and census is not deemed necessary. It should be noted, though, that a preconstruction survey may still be required by project-specific mitigations no more than 30 days prior to ground disturbing activity.

We appreciate the opportunity to be of service to you on this project. If there are any new developments, or if you have questions regarding the contents of this Phase II burrowing owl survey summary, please do not hesitate to contact me at 559-733-0440.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Andy Glass  
Senior Associate Biologist  
Quad Knopf, Inc.
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October 29, 2011

Photograph 1. South view of project site

Photograph 2. Northwest view of project site
Photograph 3. South view of project site

Photograph 4. North view of project site
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Appendix C
NOISE MODELING INPUT ASSUMPTIONS

This appendix includes information about the noise modeling assumptions for Fresno Yosemite International Airport (FYI). The analysis of the future noise condition for this Initial Study includes a unique dynamic due to the anticipated transition of military aircraft at FYI. Currently, the California Air National Guard (CANG) 144th Fighter Wing bases and operates F-16 aircraft; however, an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is currently being prepared to evaluate a transition from F-16 aircraft to F-15 aircraft. Until the EIS process is complete, there is no certainty regarding the introduction of the F-15 to the FYI fleet mix. That said, it is certain the F-16 will transition away from FYI. If, based on the EIS findings, the F-15 are not introduced at FYI, it is expected that a different military aircraft will operate at the airport.

The noise analysis below reflects the inputs and modeling undertaken for the Environmental Assessment (EA) that is being prepared concurrently with this Initial Study. The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) is the lead federal agency for the EA that is being prepared in accordance with the requirements of the National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA). For the EA analysis, the FAA determined that a continuation of the existing military operational condition (F-16 aircraft) should be carried forward for the future noise condition analysis. This determination was based on the fact that a final Record of Decision will not be adopted regarding the military transition until the EIS is complete. The FAA did recognize that a military aircraft presence will remain at FYI and determined that the F-16 aircraft is a suitable aircraft to model for the existing condition.
Within this Initial Study, the City of Fresno chose to expand the EA noise analysis to include the anticipated noise contours should the F-15 transition occur as currently planned. The resulting analysis is described in detail at the end of this appendix. These assumptions were also used in updating the Airport’s Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP), which encompasses a 20-year planning horizon.

AIRCRAFT NOISE ANALYSIS METHODOLOGY

The standard methodology for analyzing noise conditions at airports involves the use of a computer simulation model. The FAA has approved the Integrated Noise Model (INM) for use in environmental documentation.

INM describes aircraft noise in either the Yearly Day-Night Average Sound Level (DNL) or the Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL). DNL is also commonly referred to as Ldn. DNL accounts for the increased sensitivity to noise at night (10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m.) and is the metric preferred by the FAA, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), and Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), among others, as an appropriate measure of cumulative noise exposure. In California, however, these agencies accept the use of CNEL which, in addition to nighttime sensitivities, also accounts for increased sensitivities during the evening hours (7:00 p.m. to 10:00 p.m.). The FAA has accepted the State of California 65 CNEL metric as the threshold of significance for the noise analysis. Further noise analysis is required if the results of the noise analysis indicate a 1.5 CNEL increase in noise over any noise-sensitive area located within the 65 CNEL noise contour.

CNEL is defined as the average A-weighted sound level as measured in decibels during a 24-hour period. A 10 decibel weighting is applied to noise events occurring at night, and a 4.8 decibel weighting is applied to those occurring during the evening hours. CNEL is a summation metric which allows for objective analysis and can describe noise exposure comprehensively over a large area. In addition to being widely accepted, the primary benefit of using the CNEL metric is that it accounts for the average community response to noise as determined by the actual number and types of noise events and the time of day they occur.

The INM works by defining a network of grid points at ground level around the airport. It then selects the shortest distance from each grid point to each flight track and computes the noise exposure for each aircraft operation by aircraft type and engine thrust level, along each flight track. Corrections are applied for air-to-ground acoustical attenuation, acoustical shielding of the aircraft engines by the aircraft itself, and aircraft speed variations. The noise exposure levels for each aircraft are summed at each grid location. The CNEL at all grid points is used to develop noise exposure contours for selected values (e.g., 65, 70, and 75 CNEL). Noise contours are then plotted on a base map of the airport environs using the CNEL metric.

In addition to the mathematical procedures defined in the model, the INM has another very important element. This is a database containing tables correlating noise, thrust settings, and flight profiles for most of the civilian aircraft and many common military aircraft operating in
the United States. This database, often referred to as the noise curve data, has been developed under FAA guidance based on rigorous noise monitoring in controlled settings. In fact, the INM database was developed through more than a decade of research, including extensive field measurements of more than 10,000 aircraft operations. The database also includes performance data for each aircraft to allow for the computation of airport-specific flight profiles (rates of climb and descent). The most recent version of the INM, Version 7.0b, was used for modeling the noise condition for the purposes of this Initial Study.

**INM Input**

A variety of user-supplied input data is required to use the INM. This includes the airport elevation, average annual temperature, airport area terrain, a mathematical definition of the airport runways, the mathematical description of ground tracks above which aircraft fly, and the assignment of specific take-off weights to individual flight tracks. In addition, aircraft not included in the model’s database may be defined for modeling, subject to FAA approval.

- **Activity Data**

Airport activity is defined as the take-offs and landings by aircraft operating at the facility; this is also referred to as aircraft operations. Activity is further described as either *local*, indicating aircraft practicing take-offs and landings (i.e., performing touch-and-go’s), or *itinerant*, referring to the initial departure from or final arrival at the airport.

*Table C1* provides a summary of operations for the existing condition (2011) and two forecast years (2015 and 2020).

Existing airport activity (i.e., take-offs and landings, or operations by aircraft) for 2011 represents total operations for a 12-month period beginning July 1, 2010 and ending June 30, 2011 based on tower records. Forecasted operations were projected to remain within the reasonable range of the FAA’s *Terminal Area Forecast*.

- **Fleet Mix**

The selection of individual aircraft types is important to the modeling process because different aircraft types generate different noise levels. The aircraft fleet mix was derived from an inventory of existing operations at the airport. *Table C1* summarizes the generalized fleet mix data input into the noise analysis.

---

1 The FAA considers projections within 10 percent of the TAF for the 5-year analytical period and within 15 percent for the 10-year analytical period. Projected 2015 and 2020 FYI operations generated for this Initial Study are within 3.1 percent and 1.2 percent of the TAF, respectively.
TABLE C1  
Operational Fleet Mix  
Fresno Yosemite International Airport Aircraft Fleet Mix and Operations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aircraft Type</th>
<th>INM Designator</th>
<th>2011* (Existing)</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commercial</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A320</td>
<td>A320-211</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A319</td>
<td>A319-131</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A318</td>
<td>A320-211</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B737-700</td>
<td>737700</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD82/87</td>
<td>MD82</td>
<td>1,528</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD83/88</td>
<td>MD83</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRJ900</td>
<td>CRJ9-ER</td>
<td>2,822</td>
<td>2,800</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRJ700</td>
<td>CRJ701</td>
<td>2,348</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRJ200</td>
<td>CL601</td>
<td>6,070</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERJ145</td>
<td>EMB145</td>
<td>3,462</td>
<td>3,600</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q400</td>
<td>DHC830</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q200</td>
<td>DHC8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMB120</td>
<td>EMB120</td>
<td>9,044</td>
<td>9,400</td>
<td>9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Charter</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC10</td>
<td>DC1030</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B757</td>
<td>757RR</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B737-400</td>
<td>737400</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B737-800</td>
<td>737800</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A320</td>
<td>A320-232</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cargo</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B747-400/8</td>
<td>747400</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD10</td>
<td>MD11GE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A300</td>
<td>A300-622R</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A310</td>
<td>A310-304</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B757</td>
<td>757PW</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B727-200</td>
<td>727EM2</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME Turbo</td>
<td>DHC6</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEP</td>
<td>BEC58P</td>
<td>1,722</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Government/Rescue</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanker (P/3, P/2V, S/2T)</td>
<td>P3A</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME Turbo (King Air, AC500, OV/10)</td>
<td>DHC6</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE Turbo (SEAT)</td>
<td>CNA208</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Miscellaneous</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME Turbo</td>
<td>DHC6</td>
<td>4,873</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Itinerant</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cessna Citation 550</td>
<td>CNA55B</td>
<td>1,606</td>
<td>1,606</td>
<td>1,606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cessna Citation Mustang</td>
<td>CNA510</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawker 400</td>
<td>BEC400</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learjet 45</td>
<td>LEAR35</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aircraft</td>
<td>INM Designator</td>
<td>2011* (Existing)</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military E9A (combined)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gulfstream IV</td>
<td>GIV</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilatus PC-12</td>
<td>CNA208</td>
<td>1,497</td>
<td>1,497</td>
<td>1,497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beech King Air 90</td>
<td>CNA441</td>
<td>1,435</td>
<td>1,435</td>
<td>1,435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beech Super King Air 200</td>
<td>BEC200</td>
<td>1,326</td>
<td>1,326</td>
<td>1,326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beech Super King Air 350</td>
<td>BEC300</td>
<td>1,140</td>
<td>1,140</td>
<td>1,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cessna 208 Caravan</td>
<td>CNA208</td>
<td>752</td>
<td>752</td>
<td>752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME Piston</td>
<td>BEC58P</td>
<td>6,149</td>
<td>6,149</td>
<td>6,149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE Piston</td>
<td>GASEPF</td>
<td>23,784</td>
<td>23,784</td>
<td>23,784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helicopter</td>
<td>SA350D</td>
<td>8,540</td>
<td>8,540</td>
<td>8,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Itinerary F-16</td>
<td>F16PW0</td>
<td>4,398</td>
<td>4,398</td>
<td>4,398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-18</td>
<td>F-18</td>
<td>852</td>
<td>852</td>
<td>852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helicopter</td>
<td>SA350D</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local GAS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME Piston</td>
<td>BEC58P</td>
<td>9,627</td>
<td>9,627</td>
<td>9,627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE Piston</td>
<td>GASEPF</td>
<td>19,545</td>
<td>19,545</td>
<td>19,545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Local</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-16</td>
<td>F16PW0</td>
<td>3,734</td>
<td>3,734</td>
<td>3,734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-18</td>
<td>F-18</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Operations</td>
<td>122,319</td>
<td>125,500</td>
<td>128,600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Coffman Associates analysis

*July 1, 2010-June 30, 2011

1,819 F-16 and F-18 Overhead and SFO approaches are also counted as one local arrival operation and one local departure for a total of 3,638 local. F-16s also conduct 281 closed pattern operations for a total of 3,919.

- **Database Selection**

In order to select the proper aircraft from the INM database, a review of the current fleet mix for FYI was conducted. Different aircraft types generate different noise levels; therefore, selection of individual aircraft plays an important role in the noise modeling process. The following paragraphs outline the database selections used for input into the INM.

**Table C1** lists the annual operations by aircraft type. The included aircraft were selected to provide a realistic representation of airport operations. Flight plans, airline flight schedules, airfield observations, based aircraft lists, and operational data provided by the California Air National Guard (CANG) were used to determine the types of aircraft which frequently use the airport. To accurately represent the noise conditions at the airport, the INM provides aircraft noise data for many of the aircraft operating in the national fleet. For those aircraft not specifically identified in the INM, the FAA provides a list of appropriate substitute aircraft.
As indicated in the table, several different air carrier aircraft operate at the airport, including the Boeing 737, Airbus 319, 320, McDonnell Douglas 10, 82/87, 83 and 88, Embraer 120 and 145, Canadair Regional Jet 200, 700, 900, the DeHavilland Dash 8, and Beech 1900. Each of these aircraft is modeled with their corresponding INM identifier. The FAA substitute for the Airbus 318 is the A320-211.

Freight versions of several of the air carrier aircraft are also operated at Fresno Yosemite International Airport. Among these are the Boeing 757, 747, 727, Airbus 300 and 310, and McDonnell Douglas 10. Smaller turboprop aircraft also provide cargo services at the airport. This includes the PA 31 Navajo and the DeHavilland Twin Otter. All of the cargo aircraft were modeled with their respective INM profiles.

Designators for the following business jets are available within the INM: Gulfstream IV, Lear 45, Cessna Mustang and 550, and the Hawker 400. Each of these was modeled with the corresponding identifier. In cases where an aircraft is not included, the INM includes an aircraft substitution list that identifies aircraft with comparable noise characteristics.

A variety of general aviation single-engine fixed-propeller aircraft are modeled with the GASEPF aircraft. Included among these are the Cessna 150, Piper Archer, and Piper Tomahawk. The FAA's substitution list included with the INM documentation identifies the BECS8P, the Beech Baron, as a substitute for light twin-engine aircraft such as Beech 50, Beech 55, Piper PA-23, PA-30, PA-34, Cessna 304, Cessna 310, and Cessna 401 among others. The FAA approved substitute for the Pilatus PC 12 is the CNA208.

The F-16 fighter jet is currently the primary aircraft utilized by the CANG 144th Fighter Wing based at FYI. The F16PWO was used to represent the F-16 aircraft. F-18 fighter jet and helicopter operations are also conducted at FYI. The F-18 and SA350D were used to represent the F-18 and helicopter aircraft. Future military operations may involve the use of F-15 fighter jets at the airport. This alternative scenario is addressed at the end of this appendix. However, the use of F-15 fighter jets is a worst-case scenario that may or may not be implemented in the future.

All the above choices conform to the Pre-Approved Substitution List published by the FAA Office of Environment and Energy (AEE) branch in Washington, D.C.

- **Time-of-Day**

The time-of-day which aircraft operations occur is important as input to the INM due to the 10 decibel nighttime (10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m.) and 4.8 decibel evening (7:00 p.m. to 10:00 p.m.) weighting of flights. In calculating airport noise exposure, one operation at night has the same noise emission value as 10 operations during the day by the same aircraft.

Time-of-day information was determined utilizing consolidated flight schedules for airline activities, interviews with tower personnel and airport staff. Currently, the majority of operations occur during the daytime hours, with only approximately 5.5 percent occurring during evening hours and approximately 7.7 percent occurring during nighttime hours. The noise models for
2015 and 2020 assumed the percentage of nighttime operations would remain static at the current level.

- Runway Use

Runway usage data is also an essential component for developing noise exposure contours in the INM. Local wind data can be used as a general guideline for determining runway use percentages. However, local wind data provides only the directional availability of a runway and does not consider pilot selection, primary runway operations, or local operating conventions. Runway use has been established based on input from the FYI airport traffic control tower personnel and the CANG. Table C2 summarizes the runway use percentages for the existing and future conditions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aircraft Type</th>
<th>Runway</th>
<th>Departures</th>
<th></th>
<th>Arrivals</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Day</td>
<td>Evening</td>
<td>Night</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Commercial &amp; Cargo</td>
<td>11L</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cargo Aircraft</td>
<td>29R</td>
<td>92.5%</td>
<td>92.5%</td>
<td>92.5%</td>
<td>92.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11R</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29L</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military</td>
<td>11L</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29R</td>
<td>92.5%</td>
<td>92.5%</td>
<td>92.5%</td>
<td>92.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11R</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29L</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turboprop &amp; Business Jet</td>
<td>11L</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29R</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
<td>83.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11R</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29L</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Aviation</td>
<td>11L</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29R</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11R</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29L</td>
<td>92.5%</td>
<td>92.5%</td>
<td>92.5%</td>
<td>92.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Future Runway Use

| Large Commercial & Cargo      | 11L    | 6.75%      | 6.75%    | 6.75%    | 7.5%     | 7.5%     | 7.5%     | 7.5%     |
| Cargo Aircraft                | 29R    | 83.25%     | 83.25%   | 83.25%   | 92.5%    | 92.5%    | 92.5%    | 92.5%    |
|                               | 11R    | 0.75%      | 0.75%    | 0.75%    | 0.0%     | 0.0%     | 0.0%     | 0.0%     |
|                               | 29L    | 0.25%      | 0.25%    | 0.25%    | 0.0%     | 0.0%     | 0.0%     | 0.0%     |
| Large Commercial & Cargo      | 11L    | 7.5%       | 7.5%     | 7.5%     | 7.5%     | 7.5%     | 7.5%     | 7.5%     |
| Cargo Aircraft                | 29R    | 92.5%      | 92.5%    | 92.5%    | 92.5%    | 92.5%    | 92.5%    | 92.5%    |
|                               | 11R    | 0.0%       | 0.0%     | 0.0%     | 0.0%     | 0.0%     | 0.0%     | 0.0%     |
|                               | 29L    | 0.0%       | 0.0%     | 0.0%     | 0.0%     | 0.0%     | 0.0%     | 0.0%     |
| Turboprop & Business Jet      | 11L    | 3.8%       | 3.8%     | 3.8%     | 6.7%     | 6.7%     | 6.7%     | 6.7%     |
|                               | 29R    | 46.3%      | 46.3%    | 46.3%    | 83.2%    | 83.2%    | 83.2%    | 83.2%    |
|                               | 11R    | 3.7%       | 3.7%     | 3.7%     | 0.8%     | 0.8%     | 0.8%     | 0.8%     |
|                               | 29L    | 46.2%      | 46.2%    | 46.2%    | 9.3%     | 9.3%     | 9.3%     | 9.3%     |
| General Aviation              | 11L    | 0.0%       | 0.0%     | 0.0%     | 0.0%     | 0.0%     | 0.0%     | 0.0%     |
|                               | 29R    | 0.0%       | 0.0%     | 0.0%     | 0.0%     | 0.0%     | 0.0%     | 0.0%     |
|                               | 11R    | 7.5%       | 7.5%     | 7.5%     | 7.5%     | 7.5%     | 7.5%     | 7.5%     |
|                               | 29L    | 92.5%      | 92.5%    | 92.5%    | 92.5%    | 92.5%    | 92.5%    | 92.5%    |

Source: Coffman Associates and Airport Traffic Control Tower

C-7
Runway 11R-29L will be extended 800 feet in the short term to a length of 8,005 feet. This additional runway length and closer proximity to the passenger terminal is anticipated to increase runway use by larger air carrier aircraft on Runway 11R-29L by one percent.

- **Flight Tracks**

A review of local and regional air traffic control procedures and radar flight tracks was used to develop consolidated flight tracks for use in the INM. A sampling of radar flight tracks for a four-day period beginning August 7 through August 10, 2011 is depicted on Figure C1. A series of consolidated flight tracks describing the typical flight corridors used for aircraft arriving and departing FYI resulted from an analysis of radar flight tracks from a two-week period beginning August 1 through August 14, 2011.

As illustrated on Figure C2, arrivals occur primarily on Runways 29L and 29R based on radar flight tracks previously discussed. A majority of the departure tracks lead to the northeast or southeast. Figure C3 depicts the consolidated departure flight tracks, based on the radar flight track information.

Touch-and-go and helicopter operations are depicted on Figure C4. Touch-and-go operations occur primarily on Runway 11R-29L with occasional touch-and-go operations on Runway 11L-29R. The series of concentric oval-shaped tracks represent the radar flight tracks and the observed variances of the training pattern at Fresno Yosemite International Airport.

Helicopter arrival and departure flight tracks are also illustrated on Figure C3. Helicopters arrive and depart as guided by airport traffic control and typically do not fly a standardized traffic pattern.

- **Flight Profiles**

The standard arrival profile used in the INM program is a three-degree approach. No indication was given by airport staff that there was any variation on this standard procedure for civilian aircraft. Therefore, the standard approach was included in the model as representative of local operating conditions.

It should be noted that INM Version 7.0b computes the take-off profiles based on the user-supplied airport elevation and average annual temperature entries in the input batch. At FYI, the elevation is 336 feet mean sea level (MSL) and the average annual temperature is 63.2 degrees Fahrenheit (F), based on information from the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. If other than standard conditions (temperature of 59 degrees F and elevations of zero feet MSL) are specified by the user, the profile generator automatically computes the take-off profiles using the airplane performance coefficients in the database and equations in the Society of Aeronautical Engineers, *Aerospace Information Report 1845* (SAE/AIR 1845).
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Source: Coffman Associates Analysis

CONSOLIDATED HELICOPTER & TOUCH AND GO TRACKS
Coordination was undertaken with the CANG regarding their operations of the F-16 aircraft. CANG provides approach, departure, and closed pattern profile procedures specific to the 144th Fighter Wing’s mission training. Five overhead approach, two straight-in approaches, one departure, and one closed pattern procedure were developed for the F16PW0 INM designator. These include:

**F-16 Arrivals:**

The F-16 training requirements and noise abatement procedures approved by the FYI tower through the 2008 Letter of Agreement (LOA) dictate special flight operation (SFO) profiles that the F-16 aircraft use arriving into FYI.

**OVERHEAD ARRIVAL (11L):** These are visual approaches with noise abatement procedures for altitude and airspeed (power settings) for Runway 11L.

**STRAIGHT-IN ARRIVAL (11L):** This arrival represents the published approach for Runway 11L.

**SINGLE ENGINE FLAMEOUT OVERHEAD SFO (BASE KEY SFO):** This is the basic SFO with airspeeds and altitudes dictated by F-16 training requirements.

**SINGLE ENGINE FLAMEOUT OVERHEAD SFO (HIGH KEY SFO):** This is the higher altitude SFO arrival with airspeeds and altitudes dictated by F-16 training requirements based on arrival at higher altitudes.

**SINGLE ENGINE FLAMEOUT OVERHEAD SFO (LOW KEY SFO):** This is the lower altitude SFO arrival with airspeeds and altitudes dictated by F-16 training requirements based on arrival at lower altitudes.

**OVERHEAD ARRIVAL (29R):** These are visual approaches with noise abatement procedures for altitude and airspeed (power settings) for Runway 29R.

**STRAIGHT-IN ARRIVAL (29R):** This arrival represents the published approach for Runway 29R.

**F-16 Departures:**

All departures are flown in accordance with FYI LOA for noise abatement. Afterburner is used until crossing the departure end of the runway or 1,300 feet AGL whichever is first. F-16 flight manuals dictate airspeed and power settings for climb-out with consideration for the noise abatement procedures agreed to with FYI tower personnel in the LOA.

**DEPARTURE:** Afterburner is used until reaching 1,300 feet AGL.
F-16 Closed Patterns:

CLOSED PATTERN: Racetrack visual approach parallel to runway.

The INM computes separate departure profiles (altitude at a specified distance from the airport with associated velocity and thrust settings) for each of the various commercial and general aviation aircraft using the airport.

INM Output/Conclusion

Output data selected for calculation by the INM are annual average noise contours in CNEL. The CNEL is a measure of the 24-hour noise level of a community to allow for comparison between existing and future noise conditions.

Computer files developed from data described in the previous section provided input to the INM, which generated output files for years being evaluated. In accordance with FAA Orders 1050.1E and 5050.4B, the 65, 70, and 75 CNEL noise contours were produced. Contours were prepared for the following: existing condition (2011), year of project implementation (2015), and five years beyond (2020). Figures C5 and C6 depict the noise exposure contours for the existing condition and the years 2015 and 2020, respectively.

According to the applicable noise threshold per the City's 2025 Fresno General Plan Noise Element (Policy H-1-h), a significant increase in ambient noise is assumed if “... the ambient noise level is greater than 65 dB Ldn and the project increases noise levels by 1.5 dB or more” OR “... the ambient noise level is 60 – 65 dB Ldn and the project increases noise levels by 3 dB or more” OR “... the ambient noise level is less than 60 dB Ldn and the project increases noise levels by 5 db or more.”

As previously mentioned, a grid point analysis was undertaken to determine what amount of increase in noise would be experienced when the existing condition and future buildout scenarios are compared. Eight grid points were selected at points where the existing condition and future 65 CNEL contours differed the most. Figures C5 and C6 show the locations of the eight grid points analyzed.

As noted in the grid point analysis table in Tables C3 and C4, the anticipated CNEL values in 2015 and 2020 at each grid point are no greater than 1.0 dB CNEL louder when future conditions are compared to existing conditions, with the exception of a school located to the south of the airport that would have an increase of 2.3 dB CNEL over existing conditions. This school is located outside the existing 65 CNEL contour and will remain outside the contour even in the year 2020. According to the City's 2025 Fresno General Plan Noise Element policy (Policy H-1-h), if the ambient noise level is 60-65 Ldn, then noise level increases less than 3 dB are not considered significant.
In conclusion, based on the above methodology, the airport is not forecast to create significant noise impacts in either 2015 or 2020 over existing conditions. The year 2015 noise forecast, which is the implementation year for the proposed project, and the year 2020 noise forecast include projected airport growth and other airport projects currently under construction, as well as the proposed project under consideration in this Initial Study.

**ANALYSIS OF THE F-15 NOISE SCENARIO**

As previously discussed, a noise analysis has also been completed assuming that the CANG 144th Fighter Wing replaces their F-16 aircraft with F-15 aircraft. Conversation with military staff indicated that the F-15 aircraft will operate in a manner very similar to the F-16 aircraft; therefore, minimal changes to the model were undertaken. Within the INM, the F-16 aircraft was replaced by the F-15 aircraft. From an operational perspective, there will be the same number of F-15 flights as are currently experienced with the F-16 aircraft.
Tables C5 and C6 depict the resulting grid point analysis based on the aircraft change, and Figures C7 and C8 depict the resulting 2015 and 2020 noise contours. As is shown in the tables and figures, if the F-16 military aircraft at the airport are replaced with F-15s, then several of the analyzed existing noise-sensitive land uses located between the existing 60 and 65 CNEL contours would experience a greater than 3.0 dB increase in noise in the future.

### TABLE C5

**Worst-Case Grid Point Analysis, Existing Condition and 2015 Noise Contours**

Assuming F-15 Aircraft Utilizing the Fresno Yosemite International Airport

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grid Point</th>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Existing CNEL</th>
<th>2015 CNEL</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>67.4</td>
<td>+5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>67.3</td>
<td>+5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>67.1</td>
<td>+5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>62.3</td>
<td>64.8</td>
<td>+2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>67.2</td>
<td>+4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td>65.2</td>
<td>+3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td>66.5</td>
<td>+2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>67.1</td>
<td>+3.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Coffman Associates analysis, 2012

### TABLE C6

**Worst-Case Grid Point Analysis, Existing Condition and 2020 Noise Contours**

Assuming F-15 Aircraft Utilizing the Fresno Yosemite International Airport

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grid Point</th>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Existing CNEL</th>
<th>2020 CNEL</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>+5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>+5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>67.2</td>
<td>+5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>62.3</td>
<td>64.9</td>
<td>+2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>67.4</td>
<td>+4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td>65.2</td>
<td>+3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td>+2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>67.2</td>
<td>+3.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Coffman Associates analysis, 2012

**YEAR 2032 CLUP PLANNING HORIZON**

Figure C9 shows Year 2032 noise contours, which were developed for planning purposes to show a 20-year planning horizon for the Airport’s CLUP. These contours were based on FAA Terminal Area Forecasts and assume the presence of F-15 aircraft at the airport. The area shown on Figure C9 as having “marginal effect” indicates those areas that are between the 60 and 65 CNEL.
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G. Planning Commission Resolution No. 13169
The Fresno City Planning Commission at its regular meeting on August 1, 2012, adopted the following resolution relating to Plan Amendment Application No. A-12-001;

Requested: 1. Recommend to the City Council Certification of EA No. A-12-001 (SCH No. 2012041005) dated March 29, 2012; and

2. Recommend approval to the City Council of Plan Amendment Application No. A-12-001 to amend the Fresno Yosemite International Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, the 2025 Fresno General Plan, and the McLane, Hoover and Roosevelt Community Plans by updating the text and exhibits of the FYI ALUCP plan to incorporate noise and safety boundaries based on Runway Safety Area Improvements and updated airport projections.

Property Located: Airport Influence Area, which includes the Fresno Yosemite International Airport and vicinity (See Exhibit A).

WHEREAS, Plan Amendment Application No. A-12-001 has been filed with the City of Fresno by the City of Fresno Airports Department proposing to amend the 2011 Fresno Yosemite International Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, the Hoover, McLane and Roosevelt Community Plans and the 2025 Fresno General Plan by the adoption of an updated FYI Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan; and

WHEREAS, the District 4 and 5 Plan Implementation Committees, in April and May of 2012, reviewed and recommended approval of the plan amendment application; and

WHEREAS, on August 1, 2012 the Fresno City Planning Commission conducted a public hearing to review the proposed plan amendment, received public testimony and considered the Development and Resource Management Department’s report recommending approval of the proposed plan amendment; and,

WHEREAS, the Fresno City Planning Commission has reviewed the environmental assessment prepared for this plan amendment, Environmental Assessment No. A-12-001 (EA No. 10136, SCH No. 2012041005) for a mitigated negative declaration dated March 29, 2012 and is satisfied that in accordance with its own independent judgment there is no substantial evidence in the record that, with the project specific mitigation imposed, the plan amendment may have a significant effect on the environment.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Fresno City Planning Commission finds there is no substantial evidence in the record that the proposed plan amendment may have a significant effect on the environment and hereby recommends that the City Council adopt EA No. A-12-001 (SCH. 2012041005); and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Fresno City Planning Commission hereby recommends to the City Council that Plan Amendment Application No. A-12-001 be approved.

The foregoing Resolution was adopted by the Fresno City Planning Commission upon a motion by Commissioner Hansen-Smith, seconded by Commissioner Medina.
Planning Commission Resolution No. 13169
Plan Amendment Application No. A-12-001
Page 2
August 1, 2012

VOTING:
Ayes - Hansen-Smith, Medina, Dawar Torossian, Vazquez, Holt
Noes - None
Not Voting - None
Absent - None

DATED: August 1, 2012

KEITH BERGTHOLD, Secretary
Fresno City Planning Commission

Resolution No. 13169
Plan Amendment Application No. A-12-001
Filed by City of Fresno Airports Department
Action: Recommend Approval
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COUNCIL RESOLUTION NO.


WHEREAS, on November 19, 2002, by Resolution No. 2002-379, the City Council adopted the 2025 Fresno General Plan which correspondingly updated the 1980 Hoover Community Plan, the 1979 McLane Community Plan, and the 1992 Roosevelt Community Plan, and by Resolution No. 2002-378 certified Master Environmental Impact Report No. 10130 which evaluated the potentially significant adverse environmental impacts of urban development within the City of Fresno’s designated urban boundary line and extended sphere of influence; and,

WHEREAS, Plan Amendment No. A-12-001 has been filed with the City of Fresno by the City of Fresno Department of Airports, to amend the Fresno Yosemite International Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (separately amended by ordinance bill on August 30, 2012), the 2025 Fresno General Plan as well as the Hoover, McLane and Roosevelt Community Plans relating to the approximately 6,608 acres of property by updating noise contours and safety zones based on the Runway Safety Area Improvement Project and revised airport projections in conformance with state law and as described below:

WHEREAS, the City, as Lead Agency, has prepared Environmental Assessment No. A-12-001 for a Mitigated Negative Declaration (State Clearinghouse No. 2012041005) dated March 29, 2012 which evaluated the environmental impacts associated with Plan Amendment A-12-001, commonly referred to as the Runway Safety Area Improvement Project, and,

WHEREAS, the District 4 and 5 Plan and Implementation Committees, in April and May of 2012, respectively, reviewed the requested plan amendment and recommended approval to the Planning Commission and the City Council; and,

WHEREAS, on August 1, 2012, the Fresno City Planning Commission held a duly
noticed public meeting at which the Commission considered and discussed the adequacy of
the proposed Environmental Assessment, and found that it adequately discusses the potential
environmental impacts of Plan Amendment A-12-001 and the related Runway Safety Area
Improvement Project; and,

WHEREAS, on August 1, 2012, the Fresno City Planning Commission also considered
the subject plan amendment and considered the proposed project in accordance with the
policies of the 2025 Fresno General Plan, and the Hoover, McLane and Roosevelt Community
Plans; and,

WHEREAS, during the above-noted public hearing, the Planning Commission
considered the staff report and related information and received no public testimony either in
support or in opposition with respect to the proposed Environmental Assessment and the
proposed plan amendment, and recommended the following to the City Council:

A. ADOPTION of Environmental Assessment No. A-12-001 for a Mitigated Negative
   Declaration (State Clearinghouse No. 2012041005) dated March 29, 2012.

B. Approval of the proposed plan amendment; and,

WHEREAS, the Airport Land Use Commission, at a regular meeting held on August 6,
2012, considered the proposed Plan Amendment and made a finding of consistency with the
County of Fresno FYI Airport Compatibility Land Use Plan; and

WHEREAS, on August 30, 2012, the Fresno City Council held a public hearing to
consider Plan Amendment Application No. A-12-001 and received both oral testimony and
written information regarding the proposed plan amendment application and related
Environmental Assessment.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, by the Council of the City of Fresno, based
upon the testimony and information presented at the hearing and upon review and
consideration of the environmental documentation provides as follows:


2. The Council finds the adoption of the proposed plan amendment as recommended by the Fresno City Planning Commission is in the best interest of the City of Fresno.

3. The Council hereby amends the 2025 Fresno General Plan, and the Hoover, McLane and Roosevelt Area Community Plans to be consistent with Plan Amendment A-12-001, FYI Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan Runway Safety Area Improvements (amended separately by ordinance) for the subject site as described below:

   b. The noise contours and safety zones depicted on Exhibit 5-B of the 2025 Fresno General Plan shall be replaced with those depicted on Exhibit A;

   d. The noise contours and safety zones depicted on Figure 21 of the Hoover Community Plan shall be replaced with those depicted on Exhibit A;

   f. The noise contours and safety zones depicted on Figure 22 of the McLane Community Plan shall be replaced with those depicted on Exhibit A;

   h. The Fresno Air Terminal Environ Envelope Area Plan boundary depicted on Figure 2 of the Roosevelt Community Plan shall be replaced with the Airport Influence Area boundary for the FYI Airport Land Use and Compatibility Plan depicted on Exhibit B.
CLERK'S CERTIFICATION

STATE OF CALIFORNIA  )
COUNTY OF FRESNO    )
CITY OF FRESNO      )

I, YVONNE SPENCE, City Clerk of the City of Fresno, certify that the foregoing Resolution was adopted by the City Council of the City of Fresno at a regular meeting held on the ________ day of __________________________, 2012, by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ABSTAIN:

YVONNE SPENCE
City Clerk

By __________________________

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

JAMES C. SANCHEZ
CITY ATTORNEY

By __________________________
Talia Kolluri-Barbick, Deputy City Attorney

Plan Amendment Application No. A-12-001
City of Fresno Airports Department
FY Airport Influence Area (see Exhibit B)
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I: Ordinance Bill
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ORDINANCE OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF FRESNO
PROPOSED AND INITIATED BY ______________________
MOVED BY ____________________ SECONDED BY ______________________

BILL NO. ___________
ORDINANCE NO. ______________

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF FRESNO, CALIFORNIA, AMENDING
THE FRESNO YOSEMITE INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT LAND USE
COMPATIBILITY PLAN (A SPECIFIC PLAN), THE HOOVER, McLANE
AND ROOSEVELT COMMUNITY PLANS AND THE 2025 FRESNO
GENERAL PLAN

WHEREAS, on September 29, 1992 by Ordinance No. 92-77, the City Council of the City of Fresno
adopted the Fresno Air Terminal Airport and Environs Plan; and

WHEREAS, on June 24, 1997 by Ordinance No. 97-30 the City Council of the City of Fresno
renamed and amended the specific plan known as the Airport and Environs Plan Fresno Yosemite
International (FYI) Airport; and

WHEREAS, on March 31, 2011, by Ordinance No. 2011-12, the City Council of the City of Fresno
amended the specific plan known as the Fresno Yosemite International Airport and Environs Plan by
updating the airport noise and safety boundaries, modifying the organization and terminology in the plan in
conformance with state law and LPPO and guidelines, and renaming the plan the Fresno Yosemite
International Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (FYI ALUCP); and
WHEREAS, by Congressional mandate all Part 139 airports are to have compliant Runway Safety Areas (RSA) by December 31, 2015, including Fresno Yosemite International Airport (FYI); and

WHEREAS, compliance with this mandate requires extension of Runway 11L-29R by 312 feet and other minor runway modifications; and

WHEREAS new noise contours and safety zones have been delineated based on the modified runway configuration and updated FYI aviation forecasts; and

WHEREAS Plan Amendment A-12-001 is an amendment to the Fresno Yosemite International Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan which updates the text and exhibits of the FYI ALUCP to include Runway Safety Area parameters and noise and safety boundaries based on updated airport projections and;

WHEREAS Plan Amendment A-12-001 updates the texts of the Fresno 2025 General Plan and the Hoover, McLane, and Roosevelt Community Plans accordingly; and

WHEREAS, the District 4 and 5 Plan Implementation Committees considered this application at their regularly scheduled meetings of April and May, 2012, respectively, and recommended approval; and,

WHEREAS, the City, as Lead Agency, has prepared Environmental Assessment EA. No. A-12-001 for a Mitigated Negative Declaration (State Clearinghouse No. 2012041005) dated March 29, 2012, which evaluated the environmental impacts associated with the improvements at Fresno Yosemite International Airport, including Plan Amendment A-12-001, commonly referred to as the "RSA Improvement Project" proposed by the City of Fresno Airports Department; and,

WHEREAS, pursuant to the provisions of Article 4, Chapter 12, of the Fresno Municipal Code, the Planning Commission of the City of Fresno held a duly noticed public hearing on the 1st day of August 2012, to consider recommendations to the City Council related to Plan Amendment A-12-001 during which hearing the Commission considered and discussed the adequacy of the proposed Environmental Assessment; and,

WHEREAS, pursuant to the provisions of Chapter 12, Article 6 of the Fresno Municipal Code, the Fresno City Planning Commission, at its regular meeting of August 1, 2012, adopted Resolution No. 13169
recommending adoption of Plan Amendment A-12-001 and adoption of Environmental Assessment No. A-12-001 for a Mitigated Negative Declaration (State Clearinghouse No. 2012041005) dated March 29, 2012.; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to the requirements of Public Utilities Code Section 21676, the Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) held a public hearing on the 6th day of August, 2012 to consider Plan Amendment Application No. A-12-001 for the proposed amendment to the FYI ALUCP; and

WHEREAS the Airport Land Use Commission determined Plan Amendment Application No. A-12-001 to be consistent with the ALUC’s recently adopted County of Fresno Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan for FYI and adopted a Finding of Consistency with stated plan; and

WHEREAS, the Council of the City of Fresno, on August 30, 2012, held a duly noticed public hearing to consider Plan Amendment No. A-12-001 and Environmental Assessment No. A-12-001 for a Mitigated Negative Declaration (State Clearinghouse No. 2012041005) dated March 29, 2012; and

NOW, THEREFORE, THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF FRESNO DOES ORDAIN AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION 1. Based upon the testimony and information presented at the hearing and upon review and consideration of the environmental documentation provided, the adoption of the proposed plan amendment is in the best interest of the City of Fresno and adoption of the Fresno Yosemite International Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (Plan Amendment A-12-001) and corresponding amendment to the Hoover, McLane and Roosevelt Community Plans and the 2025 Fresno General Plan is necessary to insure full implementation of the city’s goals related to land use planning in the vicinity of airports as noted above.

SECTION 5. The Council of the City of Fresno hereby adopts Plan Amendment Application No. A-12-001 amending the FYI Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, the Hoover, McLane and Roosevelt Community Plans, and the 2025 Fresno General Plan which applies to the area as described hereinbelow, located in the City of Fresno:

The land referred to herein is situated in the State of California, County of Fresno, City of Fresno, and is described as follows:
Approximately 6,608 acres of land in the vicinity of the Fresno Yosemite International Airport described in the Fresno Yosemite International Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan as the Airport Influence Area (see Exhibit A).

SECTION 6. Any provision in Chapter 12 of the Fresno Municipal Code, or in the other sections of the Hoover, McLane or Roosevelt Community Plans which would render implementation of this ordinance infeasible shall yield to the provisions of this ordinance.

SECTION 7. This ordinance shall become effective and in full force and effect at 12:01 a.m. on the thirty-first day after its passage.
CLERK'S CERTIFICATION

STATE OF CALIFORNIA    )
COUNTY OF FRESNO     )
CITY OF FRESNO       )

I, YVONNE SPENCE, City Clerk of the City of Fresno, certify that the foregoing Ordinance was adopted by the Council of the City of Fresno, California, at a regular meeting held on the 30th day of August 2012, by the following vote:

AYES:
NOES:
ABSENT:
ABSTAIN:

YVONNE SPENCE
City Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

JAMES C. SANCHEZ
City Attorney

By

By
Talia Kolluri-Barbick
Deputy City Attorney

Date: 8/17/12

Plan Amendment Application No. A-12-001
Filed by City of Fresno Airports Department
BEFORE THE FRESNO COUNTY AIRPORT LAND USE COMMISSION
FRESNO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA
RESOLUTION NO. 2012-01

IN THE MATTER OF: )
THE STATE AERONAUTICS ACT )
PUBLIC UTILITIES CODE, SECTION 21670 )
 )
RESOLUTION TO REVISE )
THE FRESNO YOSEMITE )
INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT )
COMPATIBILITY )
LAND USE PLAN, 2012-01 )

WHEREAS, The State Aeronautics Act (Public Utilities Code, Section 21670 et seq.) requires preparation of an airport land use compatibility plan for nearly all public-use airports in the State of California (Section 21675), and

WHEREAS, Compatibility Plans specifically provide for the orderly growth of each public airport and the area surrounding the airport within the jurisdiction of the commission and safeguard the general welfare of the inhabitants within the vicinity of the airport and the public in general; and

WHEREAS, The policies of this Compatibility Land Use Plan (CLUP or Plan) apply to all land within the Airport Influence Area, being previously adopted as Fresno Air Terminal Land Use Policy Plan on June 23, 1986, revised May 21, 1990, adopted as Fresno Yosemite International Airport Compatibility Land Use Plan October 4, 2010 and

WHEREAS, The airport addressed by this plan amendment is now known as Fresno Yosemite International Airport (FYI), prior to October 3, 1996, FYI was known as the Fresno Air Terminal, and

WHEREAS, This 2012 amendment before the Commission this day was submitted to a thorough pre-review and 30 day review, coinciding with the mandated public review and commentary period, to reflect changes affecting the plan, resulting from the planned Runway Safety Area Improvements and planned conversion of F-16 fighters to F-15 fighters at the Air National Guard Station location at the shared FYI site.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT, THE FRESNO YOSEMITE INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT COMPATIBILITY LAND USE PLAN as presented by staff be approved, to become effective immediately.

Adopted at a regular meeting of the Airport Land Use Commission of the County of Fresno, held on the 4th day of June, 2012, by the following vote, IN WITNESS THEREOF:

COMMISSIONERS: Ayes: Magsig, Feasel, Card, Mason, Rapada, Anderson
Noes: Absent:

PROXIES: Ayes: Kilner
Noes: Absent:

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true copy of a resolution of the Fresno County Airport Land Use Commission duly adopted at a regular meeting thereof held on the 4th day of June, 2012

Nathan Magsig Chair
ORDINANCE OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF FRESNO
PROPOSED AND INITIATED BY _______________________
MOVED BY ________________ SECONDED BY __________

BILL NO. B-18

ORDINANCE NO. 2012-18

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF FRESNO, CALIFORNIA, AMENDING
THE FRESNO YOSEMITE INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT LAND USE
COMPATIBILITY PLAN (A SPECIFIC PLAN), THE HOOVER, MCLANE
AND ROOSEVELT COMMUNITY PLANS AND THE 2025 FRESNO
GENERAL PLAN

WHEREAS, on September 29, 1992 by Ordinance No. 92-77, the City Council of the City of Fresno
adopted the Fresno Air Terminal Airport and Environ Plan; and

WHEREAS, on June 24, 1997 by Ordinance No. 97-30 the City Council of the City of Fresno
renamed and amended the specific plan known as the Airport and Environ Plan Fresno Yosemite
International (FYI) Airport; and

WHEREAS, on March 31, 2011, by Ordinance No. 2011-12, the City Council of the City of Fresno
amended the specific plan known as the Fresno Yosemite International Airport and Environ Plan by
updating the airport noise and safety boundaries, modifying the organization and terminology in the plan in
conformance with state law and LPPO and guidelines, and renaming the plan the Fresno Yosemite
International Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (FYI ALUCP); and

Adopted 8-30-12
Approved 8-30-12
Effective 9-20-12

2012-18
WHEREAS, by Congressional mandate all Part 139 airports are to have compliant Runway Safety Areas (RSA) by December 31, 2015, including Fresno Yosemite International Airport (FYI); and

WHEREAS, compliance with this mandate requires extension of Runway 11L-29R by 312 feet and other minor runway modifications; and

WHEREAS new noise contours and safety zones have been delineated based on the modified runway configuration and updated FYI aviation forecasts; and

WHEREAS Plan Amendment A-12-001 is an amendment to the Fresno Yosemite International Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan which updates the text and exhibits of the FYI ALUCP to include Runway Safety Area parameters and noise and safety boundaries based on updated airport projections and;

WHEREAS Plan Amendment A-12-001 updates the texts of the Fresno 2025 General Plan and the Hoover, McLane, and Roosevelt Community Plans accordingly; and

WHEREAS, the District 4 and 5 Plan Implementation Committees considered this application at their regularly scheduled meetings of April and May, 2012, respectively, and recommended approval; and,

WHEREAS, the City, as Lead Agency, has prepared Environmental Assessment EA. No. A-12-001 for a Mitigated Negative Declaration (State Clearinghouse No. 2012041005) dated March 29, 2012, which evaluated the environmental impacts associated with the improvements at Fresno Yosemite International Airport, including Plan Amendment A-12-001, commonly referred to as the “RSA Improvement Project” proposed by the City of Fresno Airports Department; and,

WHEREAS, pursuant to the provisions of Article 4, Chapter 12, of the Fresno Municipal Code, the Planning Commission of the City of Fresno held a duly noticed public hearing on the 1st day of August 2012, to consider recommendations to the City Council related to Plan Amendment A-12-001 during which hearing the Commission considered and discussed the adequacy of the proposed Environmental Assessment; and,

WHEREAS, pursuant to the provisions of Chapter 12, Article 6 of the Fresno Municipal Code, the Fresno City Planning Commission, at its regular meeting of August 1, 2012, adopted Resolution No. 13169
recommending adoption of Plan Amendment A-12-001 and adoption of Environmental Assessment No. A-12-001 for a Mitigated Negative Declaration (State Clearinghouse No. 2012041005) dated March 29, 2012.; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to the requirements of Public Utilities Code Section 21676, the Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) held a public hearing on the 6th day of August, 2012 to consider Plan Amendment Application No. A-12-001 for the proposed amendment to the FYI ALUCP; and

WHEREAS the Airport Land Use Commission determined Plan Amendment Application No. A-12-001 to be consistent with the ALUC’s recently adopted County of Fresno Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan for FYI and adopted a Finding of Consistency with stated plan; and

WHEREAS, the Council of the City of Fresno, on August 30, 2012, held a duly noticed public hearing to consider Plan Amendment No. A-12-001 and Environmental Assessment No. A-12-001 for a Mitigated Negative Declaration (State Clearinghouse No. 2012041005) dated March 29, 2012; and

NOW, THEREFORE, THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF FRESNO DOES ORDAIN AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION 1. Based upon the testimony and information presented at the hearing and upon review and consideration of the environmental documentation provided, the adoption of the proposed plan amendment is in the best interest of the City of Fresno and adoption of the Fresno Yosemite International Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (Plan Amendment A-12-001) and corresponding amendment to the Hoover, McLane and Roosevelt Community Plans and the 2025 Fresno General Plan is necessary to insure full implementation of the city’s goals related to land use planning in the vicinity of airports as noted above.

SECTION 5. The Council of the City of Fresno hereby adopts Plan Amendment Application No. A-12-001 amending the FYI Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, the Hoover, McLane and Roosevelt Community Plans, and the 2025 Fresno General Plan which applies to the area as described hereinbelow, located in the City of Fresno:

The land referred to herein is situated in the State of California, County of Fresno, City of Fresno, and is described as follows:
Approximately 6,608 acres of land in the vicinity of the Fresno Yosemite International Airport described in the Fresno Yosemite International Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan as the Airport Influence Area (see Exhibit A).

SECTION 6. Any provision in Chapter 12 of the Fresno Municipal Code, or in the other sections of the Hoover, McLane or Roosevelt Community Plans which would render implementation of this ordinance infeasible shall yield to the provisions of this ordinance.

SECTION 7. This ordinance shall become effective and in full force and effect at 12:01 a.m. on the thirty-first day after its passage.
CLERK'S CERTIFICATION

STATE OF CALIFORNIA  )
COUNTY OF FRESNO     )
CITY OF FRESNO       )

I, YVONNE SPENCE, City Clerk of the City of Fresno, certify that the foregoing Ordinance was adopted by the Council of the City of Fresno, California, at a regular meeting held on the 30th day of August 2012, by the following vote:

AYES: Baines, Borgeas, Brand, Quintero, Westerlund, Xiong, Olivier
NOES: None
ABSENT: None
ABSTAIN: None

YVONNE SPENCE
City Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

JAMES C. SANCHEZ
City Attorney

By

Talia Kolluri-Barbick
Deputy City Attorney

Date: 8/17/12

Plan Amendment Application No. A-12-001
Filed by City of Fresno Airports Department