**APPENDIX G/INITIAL STUDY FOR A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION**

**Environmental Checklist Form for:**

**Development Permit Application No. P20-XXXXX**

**Note to preparer:**

**Mitigation measures from the GP PEIR that are applied to an individual project are considered project specific mitigation measures and will result in a Mitigated Negative Declaration**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1. | **Project title:**  Development Permit Application No. P20-XXXXX |
| 2. | **Lead agency name and address:**  City of Fresno  Planning and Development Department  2600 Fresno Street  Fresno, CA 93721 |
| 3. | **Contact person and phone number:**  ***[Planner Name]***, ***[Title]***  City of Fresno  Planning and Development Department  (559) 621-XXXX |
| 4. | **Project location:**  ***[Address]***: ***[Description of location relative to cross streets]***  (APN: XXX-XXX-XX) |
| 5. | **Project sponsor's name and address:**  ***[Applicant Name]***  ***[Applicant Company]***  ***[Street Address]***  ***[City, State, Zip Code]*** |
| 6. | **General & Community plan land use designation:**  \_\_ |
| 7. | **Zoning:**  \_\_ |
| 8. | **Description of project:**  Development Permit Application No. P20-XXXXX was filed by ***[Applicant’s name]***, on behalf of ***[Owner, if applicable]***. The applicant proposes to \_\_ ***[Describe the whole action involved, including but not limited to later phases of the project, and any secondary, support, or off-site features necessary for its implementation. Attach additional sheets if necessary.]*** |
| 9. | **Surrounding land uses and setting:**   |  | Planned Land Use | **Existing Zoning** | **Existing Land Use** | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | North | \_\_ | \_\_ | \_\_ | | **East** | \_\_ | \_\_ | \_\_ | | **South** | \_\_ | \_\_ | \_\_ | | **West** | \_\_ | \_\_ | \_\_ | |
| 10. | **Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement):**  \_\_ |
| 11. | **Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 21080.3.1? If so, has consultation begun?**  The State requires lead agencies to consider the potential effects of proposed projects and consult with California Native American tribes during the local planning process for the purpose of protecting Traditional Tribal Cultural Resources through the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines. Pursuant to PRC Section 21080.3.1, the lead agency shall begin consultation with the California Native American tribe that is traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographical area of the proposed project. Such significant cultural resources are either sites, features, places, cultural landscapes, sacred places, and objects with cultural value to a tribe which is either on or eligible for inclusion in the California Historic Register or local historic register, or, the lead agency, at its discretion, and support by substantial evidence, choose to treat the resources as a Tribal Cultural Resources (PRC Section 21074(a)(1-2)). According to the most recent census data, California is home to 109 currently recognized Indian tribes. Tribes in California currently have nearly 100 separate reservations or Rancherias. Fresno County has a number of Rancherias such as Table Mountain Rancheria, Millerton Rancheria, Big Sandy Rancheria, Cold Springs Rancheria, and Squaw Valley Rancheria. These Rancherias are not located within the city limits.  Conducting consultation early in the CEQA process allows tribal governments, lead agencies, and project proponents to discuss the level of environmental review, identify and address potential adverse impacts to tribal cultural resources, and reduce the potential for delay and conflict in the environmental review process. (See PRC Section 21083.3.2.) Information may also be available from the California Native American Heritage Commission’s Sacred Lands File per PRC Section 5097.96 and the California Historical Resources Information System administered by the California Office of Historic Preservation. Please also note that PRC Section 21082.3(c) contains provisions specific to confidentiality.  ***[Include this paragraph if a General Plan Amendment is required as part of this project.]*** Pursuant to Senate Bill 18 (SB 18), Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area were invited to consult regarding the project based on a list of contacts provided by the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). This list includes tribes that requested notification pursuant to Assembly Bill 52 (AB 52). The City of Fresno mailed notices of the proposed project to each of these tribes on ***[date]*** which included the required 90-day time period for tribes to request consultation, which ended on ***[date]***.  ***[Include this paragraph if the paragraph above is not used for the project.]*** Currently, the Table Mountain Rancheria Tribe and the Dumna Wo Wah Tribe have requested to be notified pursuant to Assembly Bill 52 (AB 52) ***[Confirm that these are still the Tribes that have requested to be notified under AB 52]***. A certified letter was mailed to the above mentioned tribes on ***[date]***. The 30-day comment period ended on ***[date]***. Both tribes did not request consultation.  [***Include this paragraph if a tribe elected to consult with the City.]*** Under invitations to consult under SB 18 ***[if applicable]*** and AB 52, ***[name of tribe]*** elected to consult on the proposed project on ***[date]*** under SB 18/AB 52 guidelines. Mitigation measures were agreed upon for the protection of tribal cultural resources and included in the Project Specific Mitigation Monitoring Checklist dated ***[date]***. |

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

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

|  |
| --- |
| \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Planner Name, Title Date |

EVALUATION OF ADDITIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS NOT ASSESSED IN Program Environmental Impact Report SCH No. 2019050005 prepared for the approved Fresno General Plan (GP PEIR):

Note to preparer: For projects that are consistent with the Fresno General Plan and Zoning (or where the zoning will be changed only for the purposes of achieving consistency with the General Plan), tiering pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15152 may be used. If tiering will be used, please comply with the requirements of Section 15152(g).

For projects that are not completely consistent with the Fresno General Plan and Zoning (i.e. projects that include a General Plan Amendment and/or Rezone), the provisions of CEQA Guidelines Section 15152 do not apply. However, the GP PEIR and its analysis may still be incorporated by reference to provide a basis for the project’s initial study, to address regional influences, secondary effects, cumulative impacts, and broad alternatives pursuant to CEQA Guidelines 15168(d).

1. For purposes of this Initial Study, the following answers have the corresponding meanings:
   1. “No Impact” means the specific impact category does not apply to the project, or that the record sufficiently demonstrates that project specific factors or general standards applicable to the project will result in no impact for the threshold under consideration.
   2. “Less Than Significant Impact” means there is an impact related to the threshold under consideration, but that impact is less than significant.
   3. “Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation” means there is a potentially significant impact related to the threshold under consideration, however, with the mitigation incorporated into the project, the impact is less than significant. For purposes of this Initial Study “mitigation incorporated into the project” means mitigation originally described in the GP PEIR and applied to an individual project, as well as mitigation developed specifically for an individual project.
   4. “Potentially Significant Impact” means there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant related to the threshold under consideration.

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 (6) 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:
   1. Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
   2. Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in the PEIR or another earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
   3. 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. The explanation of each issue should identify:
   1. The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
   2. The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance.

| ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **I. AESTHETICS** – Except as provided in PRC Section 21099, would the project: | | | | |
| a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? |  |  |  |  |
| b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock out-croppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? |  |  |  |  |
| c) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality? |  |  |  |  |
| d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? |  |  |  |  |

**DISCUSSION**

1. **Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?**

[*Provide analysis]*

1. **Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?**

[*Provide analysis]*

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

[*Provide analysis]*

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

[*Provide analysis]*

*Mitigation Measures*

1. The proposed project shall implement and incorporate, as applicable, the aesthetic related mitigation measures as identified in the attached Project Specific Mitigation Monitoring Checklist dated [insert date]. ***[Note to preparer: only use this if there are project specific mitigations related to aesthetics. For the purposes of this Initial Study, “project specific mitigations” include both mitigation measures carried over from the PEIR and imposed on a project level basis, and measures developed specifically for a project.]***

| ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES –** In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the 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 (Farm-land), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monito-ring 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? |  |  |  |  |

**DISCUSSION**

1. **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?**

[*Provide analysis]* Practice pointer: please note that the GP PEIR requires that conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance be mitigated on a project-by-project basis, until a Citywide Farmland Preservation Program has been adopted. The determination that farmland conversion does not need to be mitigated due to the statement of overriding considerations is no longer a recommended practice due to the updated language.

1. **Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract?**

[*Provide analysis]*

1. **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))?**

[*Provide analysis]*

1. **Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?**

[*Provide analysis]*

1. **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?**

[*Provide analysis]*

*Mitigation Measure*

1. The proposed project shall implement and incorporate the agriculture and forestry resource related mitigation measures as identified in the attached Project Specific Mitigation Monitoring Checklist dated [insert date]. ***[Note to preparer: only use this if there are project specific mitigations related to agriculture or forestry resources. For the purposes of this Initial Study, “project specific mitigations” include both mitigation measures carried over from the PEIR and imposed on a project level basis, and measures developed specifically for a project.]***

| ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **III. AIR QUALITY** – Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project: | | | | |
| a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan (*e.g*., by having potential emissions of regulated criterion pollutants which exceed the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control Districts (SJVAPCD) adopted thresholds for these pollutants)? |  |  |  |  |
| b) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? |  |  |  |  |
| c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? |  |  |  |  |
| d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people? |  |  |  |  |

***[Note to preparer: An Air Quality technical report that provides the construction and operation emissions of the proposed project is required for certain projects (See Environmental Assessment Form). Incorporate findings below.]***

**DISCUSSION**

1. **Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?**

[*Provide analysis]*

1. **Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?**

[*Provide analysis]*

1. **Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?**

[*Provide analysis]*

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

*[Provide analysis]*

*Mitigation Measures*

1. The proposed project shall implement and incorporate the air quality related mitigation measures as identified in the attached Project Specific Mitigation Monitoring Checklist dated [insert date]. ***[Note to preparer: only use this if there are project specific mitigations related to air quality. For the purposes of this Initial Study, “project specific mitigations” include both mitigation measures carried over from the PEIR and imposed on a project level basis, and measures developed specifically for a project.]***

| ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES** – Would the project: | | | | |
| a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the 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 US 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? |  |  |  |  |

***[Note to Preparer: To confirm whether or not adverse impacts to biological resources could occur, a biological resources assessment may be required.]***

**DISCUSSION**

1. **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 Wildlife or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?**

[*Provide analysis]*

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

[*Provide analysis]*

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

[*Provide analysis]*

1. **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?**

[*Provide analysis]*

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

[*Provide analysis]*

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

[*Provide analysis]*

*Mitigation Measures*

1. The proposed project shall implement and incorporate the biological resource related mitigation measures as identified in the attached Project Specific Mitigation Monitoring Checklist dated [insert date]. ***[Note to preparer: only use this if there are project specific mitigations related to biological resources. For the purposes of this Initial Study, “project specific mitigations” include both mitigation measures carried over from the PEIR and imposed on a project level basis, and measures developed specifically for a project.]***

| ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **V. CULTURAL RESOURCES** – Would the project: | | | | |
| a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5? |  |  |  |  |
| b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5? |  |  |  |  |
| c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? |  |  |  |  |

**DISCUSSION**

***[Note to Preparer: If the project site is undisturbed or minimally disturbed, requesting an Extended California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) Records Search from the Southern San Joaquin Valley Information Center should be requested. If necessary, a cultural resources report, consisting of on-site evaluation may be required to fully address or mitigate any potential impacts to cultural resources. In addition, if the project site contains a structure over 45 years in age, a historic resources report may also be required to determine eligibility to the State or local register.]***

1. **Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?**

[*Provide analysis]*

1. **Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?**

[*Provide analysis]*

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

[*Provide analysis]*

*Mitigation Measures*

1. The proposed project shall implement and incorporate the cultural resource related mitigation measures as identified in the attached Project Specific Mitigation Monitoring Checklist dated [insert date]. ***[Note to preparer: only use this if there are project specific mitigations related to cultural resources. For the purposes of this Initial Study, “project specific mitigations” include both mitigation measures carried over from the PEIR and imposed on a project level basis, and measures developed specifically for a project.]***

| ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **VI. ENERGY** – Would the project: | | | | |
| a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation? | \_\_ |  |  |  |
| b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency? | \_\_ |  |  |  |

**DISCUSSION**

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

[*Provide analysis]*

1. **Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?**

[*Provide analysis]*

*Mitigation Measures*

1. The proposed project shall implement and incorporate the energy related mitigation measures as identified in the attached Project Specific Mitigation Monitoring Checklist dated [insert date]. ***[Note to preparer: only use this if there are project specific mitigations related to energy. For the purposes of this Initial Study, “project specific mitigations” include both mitigation measures carried over from the PEIR and imposed on a project level basis, and measures developed specifically for a project.]***

| ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS** – Would the project: | | | | |
| a) Directly or Indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: |  |  |  |  |
| i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42. |  |  |  |  |
| 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? |  |  |  |  |
| f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? |  |  |  |  |

***[Note to Preparer: Prior to conducting this analysis, a Geology/Soils report for the subject project site may be required in order for a determination to be made.]***

**DISCUSSION**

1. **Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:**
2. **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.**

[*Provide analysis]*

1. **Strong seismic ground shaking?**

[*Provide analysis]*

1. **Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?**

[*Provide analysis]*

1. **Landslides?**

[*Provide analysis]*

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

[*Provide analysis]*

1. **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?**

[*Provide analysis]*

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

[*Provide analysis]*

1. **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?**

[*Provide analysis]*

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

[*Provide analysis]*

*Mitigation Measures*

1. The proposed project shall implement and incorporate the geology and soils related mitigation measures as identified in the attached Project Specific Mitigation Monitoring Checklist dated [insert date]. ***[Note to preparer: only use this if there are project specific mitigations related to geology and soils. For the purposes of this Initial Study, “project specific mitigations” include both mitigation measures carried over from the PEIR and imposed on a project level basis, and measures developed specifically for a project.]***

| ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS** – Would the project: | | | | |
| a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment? |  |  |  |  |
| b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases? |  |  |  |  |

**DISCUSSION**

* + 1. **Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?**

[*Provide analysis]*

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

[*Provide analysis] Note to preparer: please make sure to use the Recirculated GHG Reduction Checklist from 2021.*

*Mitigation Measures*

1. The proposed project shall implement and incorporate the greenhouse gas emission related mitigation measures as identified in the attached Project Specific Mitigation Monitoring Checklist dated [insert date]. ***[Note to preparer: only use this if there are project specific mitigations related to greenhouse gas emissions. For the purposes of this Initial Study, “project specific mitigations” include both mitigation measures carried over from the PEIR and imposed on a project level basis, and measures developed specifically for a project.]***

| ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIAL** – Would the project: | | | | |
| a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? |  |  |  |  |
| b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? |  |  |  |  |
| c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? |  |  |  |  |
| d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? |  |  |  |  |
| e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in  a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? |  |  |  |  |
| f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? |  |  |  |  |
| g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires? |  |  |  |  |

**DISCUSSION**

* + 1. **Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?**

[*Provide analysis]*

1. **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?**

[*Provide analysis]*

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

[*Provide analysis]*

1. **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?**

[*Provide analysis]*

1. **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?**

[*Provide analysis]*

1. **Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?**

[*Provide analysis]*

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

[*Provide analysis]*

*Mitigation Measures*

1. The proposed project shall implement and incorporate the hazards and hazardous material related mitigation measures as identified in the attached Project Specific Mitigation Monitoring Checklist dated [insert date]. ***[Note to preparer: only use this if there are project specific mitigations related to hazards and hazardous materials. For the purposes of this Initial Study, “project specific mitigations” include both mitigation measures carried over from the PEIR and imposed on a project level basis, and measures developed specifically for a project.]***

| ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY** – Would the project: | | | | |
| a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality? |  |  |  |  |
| b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin? |  |  |  |  |
| c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would: |  |  |  |  |
| i) Result in a substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site; |  |  |  |  |
| ii) Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site: |  |  |  |  |
| iii) create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or |  |  |  |  |
| iv) impede or redirect flood flows? |  |  |  |  |
| d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation? |  |  |  |  |
| e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan? |  |  |  |  |

**DISCUSSION**

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

[*Provide analysis]*

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

[*Provide analysis]*

1. **Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:**
2. **Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?**

[*Provide analysis]*

1. **Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner, which would result in flooding on- or off-site?**

[*Provide analysis]*

1. **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?**

[*Provide analysis]*

1. **Impede or redirect flood flows?**

[*Provide analysis]*

1. **In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?**

[*Provide analysis]*

1. **Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?**

[*Provide analysis]*

*Mitigation Measures*

1. The proposed project shall implement and incorporate the hydrology and water quality related mitigation measures as identified in the attached Project Specific Mitigation Monitoring Checklist dated [insert date]. ***[Note to preparer: only use this if there are project specific mitigations related to hydrology and water quality. For the purposes of this Initial Study, “project specific mitigations” include both mitigation measures carried over from the PEIR and imposed on a project level basis, and measures developed specifically for a project.]***

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
| **XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING** – Would the project: | | | | |
| a) Physically divide an established community? |  |  |  |  |
| b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? |  |  |  |  |

**DISCUSSION**

1. **Physically divide an established community?**

[*Provide analysis]*

1. **Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?**

[*Provide analysis]*

*Mitigation Measures*

1. The proposed project shall implement and incorporate the land use and planning related mitigation measures as identified in the attached Project Specific Mitigation Monitoring Checklist dated [insert date]. ***[Note to preparer: only use this if there are project specific mitigations related to land use and planning. For the purposes of this Initial Study, “project specific mitigations” include both mitigation measures carried over from the PEIR and imposed on a project level basis, and measures developed specifically for a project.]***

| ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **XII. 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? |  |  |  |  |

**DISCUSSION**

1. **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?**

[*Provide analysis]*

1. **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?**

[*Provide analysis]*

*Mitigation Measures*

1. The proposed project shall implement and incorporate the mineral resource related mitigation measures as identified in the attached Project Specific Mitigation Monitoring Checklist dated [insert date]. ***[Note to preparer: only use this if there are project specific mitigations related to mineral resources. For the purposes of this Initial Study, “project specific mitigations” include both mitigation measures carried over from the PEIR and imposed on a project level basis, and measures developed specifically for a project.]***

| ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **XIII. NOISE** – Would the project result in: | | | | |
| a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? |  |  |  |  |
| b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels? |  |  |  |  |
| c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? |  |  |  |  |

**DISCUSSION**

1. **Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or in other applicable local, state, or federal standards?**

[*Provide analysis]*

1. **Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?**

[*Provide analysis]*

1. **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?**

[*Provide analysis]*

*Mitigation Measures*

1. The proposed project shall implement and incorporate the noise related mitigation measures as identified in the attached Project Specific Mitigation Monitoring Checklist dated [insert date]. ***[Note to preparer: only use this if there are project specific mitigations related to noise. For the purposes of this Initial Study, “project specific mitigations” include both mitigation measures carried over from the PEIR and imposed on a project level basis, and measures developed specifically for a project.]***

| ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING** – Would the project: | | | | |
| a) Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)? |  |  |  |  |
| b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? |  |  |  |  |

**DISCUSSION**

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

[*Provide analysis]*

1. **Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?**

[*Provide analysis]*

*Mitigation Measures*

1. The proposed project shall implement and incorporate the population and housing related mitigation measures as identified in the attached Project Specific Mitigation Monitoring Checklist dated [insert date]. ***[Note to preparer: only use this if there are project specific mitigations related to population and housing. For the purposes of this Initial Study, “project specific mitigations” include both mitigation measures carried over from the PEIR and imposed on a project level basis, and measures developed specifically for a project.]***

| ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **XV. PUBLIC SERVICES** – Would the project: | | | | |
| a) Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services: |  |  |  |  |
| Fire protection? |  |  |  |  |
| Police protection? |  |  |  |  |
| Schools? |  |  |  |  |
| Parks? |  |  |  |  |
| Other public facilities? |  |  |  |  |

**DISCUSSION**

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

[*Provide analysis]*

1. **Police protection?**

[*Provide analysis]*

1. **Schools?**

[*Provide analysis]*

1. **Parks?**

[*Provide analysis]*

1. **Other public facilities?**

[*Provide analysis]*

*Mitigation Measures*

1. The proposed project shall implement and incorporate the public service related mitigation measures as identified in the attached Project Specific Mitigation Monitoring Checklist dated [insert date]. ***[Note to preparer: only use this if there are project specific mitigations related to public service. For the purposes of this Initial Study, “project specific mitigations” include both mitigation measures carried over from the PEIR and imposed on a project level basis, and measures developed specifically for a project.]***

| ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **XVI. RECREATION** - Would the project: | | | | |
| a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? |  |  |  |  |
| 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? |  |  |  |  |

**DISCUSSION**

1. **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?**

[*Provide analysis]*

1. **Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?**

[*Provide analysis]*

*Mitigation Measures*

1. The proposed project shall implement and incorporate the recreation related mitigation measures as identified in the attached Project Specific Mitigation Monitoring Checklist dated [insert date]. ***[Note to preparer: only use this if there are project specific mitigations related to recreation. For the purposes of this Initial Study, “project specific mitigations” include both mitigation measures carried over from the PEIR and imposed on a project level basis, and measures developed specifically for a project.]***

| ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **XVII. TRANSPORTATION** – Would the project: | | | | |
| a) Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities? |  |  |  |  |
| b) Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines § 15064.3, subdivision (b)? |  |  |  |  |
| c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? |  |  |  |  |
| d) Result in inadequate emergency access? |  |  |  |  |

***[Note to Preparer: Depending on the size of the project, and local context, a traffic study may be required to determine the number of trips that could be generated by the project. Please note that Vehicle Miles Traveled thresholds for the City will need to be implemented. Please refer to the City’s “CEQA Guidelines for Vehicle Miles Traveled Thresholds” adopted on June 25, 2020 for thresholds and screening criteria. Do not rely solely on the Technical Advisory prepared by OPR.]***

**DISCUSSION**

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

[*Provide analysis] Note to preparer: if the project will cause an increase to LOS in conflict with the Mobility and Transportation Element, that may be discussed in this section.*

1. **Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?**

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

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

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

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

The City of Fresno VMT Thresholds adopted a screening standard and criteria that can be used to screen out qualified projects that meet the adopted criteria from needing to prepare a detailed VMT analysis.

FOR PROJECTS THAT ARE **NOT** ELIGIBLE TO SCREEN OUT, USE THE FOLLOWING FORMAT:

[For a General Plan Amendment or Rezone] The City of Fresno VMT Thresholds Section 3.1 regarding Development Projects states that if a project constitutes a General Plan Amendment or a Rezone, none of the screening criteria may apply, and that the City must evaluate such projects on a case-by-case basis. Here the Project includes both a General Plan Amendment and a Rezone and does not meet the screening criteria. As such, a quantitative VMT analysis is required.

[IF THE PROJECT IS NOT A GPA OR REZONE, INSERT A BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE SCREENING CRITERIA AND A CONCLUSION AS TO WHY THIS PROJECT DOES NOT SCREEN OUT.]

For projects that are not screened out, a quantitative analysis of VMT impacts must be prepared and compared against the adopted VMT thresholds of significance. The Fresno VMT Thresholds document includes thresholds of significance for development projects, transportation projects, and land use plans. These thresholds of significance were developed using the County of Fresno as the applicable region, and the required reduction of VMT (as adopted in the Fresno VMT Thresholds) corresponds to Fresno County’s contribution to the statewide GHG emission reduction target. In order to reach the statewide GHG reduction target of 15%, Fresno County must reduce its GHG emissions by 13%. The method of reducing GHG by 13% is to reduce VMT by 13% as well.

The City’s adopted thresholds for development projects correspond to the regional thresholds set by the Fresno Council of Governments (COG). For residential and non-residential (except retail) development projects, the adopted threshold of significance is a 13% reduction, which means that projects that generate VMT in excess of a 13% reduction from the existing regional VMT per capita or per employee would have a significant environmental impact. Projects that reduce VMT by more than 13% are less than significant. For retail projects, the adopted threshold is any net increase in VMT per employee compared to existing VMT per employee.

Quantitative assessments of the VMT generated by a development project are determined using the COG Activity Based Model (ABM), which is a tour-based model.

For mixed use projects, the City of Fresno VMT Thresholds state that the VMT can be estimated based on each component of the project, independently, after taking credit for internal trip capture. It also confirms that mixed use projects must use the Fresno COG’s Activity Based Model. The VMT per capita (for the residential component) and the total VMT (for the retail component) is then compared against the relevant threshold.

[INSERT PARAGRAPH REGARDING PROJECT ABM MODEL INFORMATION HERE, FOR ALL EVALUATED LAND USES.] **Sample Paragraph follows**: *The Traffic Consultant requested from Fresno COG to run its ABM model to determine the Project's VMT for these land uses. Based on the Fresno COG VMT output the residential, non-retail commercial, and retail commercial are projected to yield less than significant impacts to VMT. Based on the ABM model output, the Project's VMT for the residential component was calculated to be 10.31 VMT per capita which is less than the City of Fresno maximum threshold of 14.01 VMT per capita. Similarly, the Fresno COG VMT output for the non-retail commercial component was calculated to be 21.06 VMT per employee which is less than the City of Fresno maximum threshold of 22.27 VMT per employee. On the other hand, the VMT threshold for retail commercial is no net increase in regional VMT by the Project when compared to the No Project. At present the Fresno County No Project Regional VMT is an average of 23,544,527, while the Fresno County with Project Regional VMT is 23,406,520. Therefore, the retail commercial component of the Project results in a Fresno County Regional VMT which is less than the Fresno County No Project Regional VMT. As a result, the residential, non-retail commercial, and retail commercial components will not have a significant impact to VMT.*

In conclusion, the Project will result in [INSERT CONCLUSION] concerning consistency with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3(b).

[If the project produces a significant VMT impact, list applicable mitigation in the Project Specific Mitigation Monitoring Checklist.]

FOR PROJECTS THAT **ARE** ELIGIBLE TO SCREEN OUT, USE THE FOLLOWING FORMAT:

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

The proposed project is eligible to screen out because [Enter information, please refer to the City of Fresno VMT Thresholds Section 3.0 Project Screening, at pages 9-21.].

In conclusion, the Project will result in a less than significant VMT impact and is consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3(b).

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

[*Provide analysis]*

1. **Result in inadequate emergency access?**

[*Provide analysis]*

*Mitigation Measures*

1. The proposed project shall implement and incorporate the transportation related mitigation measures as identified in the attached Project Specific Mitigation Monitoring Checklist dated [insert date]. ***[Note to preparer: only use this if there are project specific mitigations related to transportation. For the purposes of this Initial Study, “project specific mitigations” include both mitigation measures carried over from the PEIR and imposed on a project level basis, and measures developed specifically for a project.]***

| **ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES** | **Potentially Significant Impact** | **Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated** | **Less Than Significant Impact** | **No Impact** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **XVII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES** – Would the project: | | | | |
| a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in PRC section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is: |  |  |  |  |
| i) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in PRC section 5020.1(k), or, |  |  |  |  |
| ii) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evi-dence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of PRC section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of PRC section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe. |  |  |  |  |

**DISCUSSION**

1. **Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:**
2. **Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or**

[*Provide analysis]*

1. **A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.**

[*Provide analysis]*

*Mitigation Measures*

1. The proposed project shall implement and incorporate the tribal cultural resource related mitigation measures as identified in the attached Project Specific Mitigation Monitoring Checklist dated [insert date]. ***[Note to preparer: only use this if there are project specific mitigations related to tribal cultural resources. For the purposes of this Initial Study, “project specific mitigations” include both mitigation measures carried over from the PEIR and imposed on a project level basis, and measures developed specifically for a project.]***

| ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS** – Would the project: | | | | |
| a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effect? |  |  |  |  |
| b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years? |  |  |  |  |
| c) Result in a determination by the waste water treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments? |  |  |  |  |
| d) Generate solid waste in excess of state or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals? |  |  |  |  |
| e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste? |  |  |  |  |

**DISCUSSION**

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

[*Provide analysis]*

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

[*Provide analysis]*

1. **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?**

[*Provide analysis]*

1. **Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?**

[*Provide analysis]*

1. **Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?**

[*Provide analysis]*

*Mitigation Measures*

1. The proposed project shall implement and incorporate the utilities and service systems related mitigation measures as identified in the attached Project Specific Mitigation Monitoring Checklist dated [insert date]. ***[Note to preparer: only use this if there are project specific mitigations related to utilities and service systems. For the purposes of this Initial Study, “project specific mitigations” include both mitigation measures carried over from the PEIR and imposed on a project level basis, and measures developed specifically for a project.]***

| ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **XX. WILDFIRE** – If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project: | | | | |
| a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? |  |  |  |  |
| b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire? |  |  |  |  |
| c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment? |  |  |  |  |
| d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes? |  |  |  |  |

**DISCUSSION**

1. **Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?**

[Provide analysis]

1. **Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?**

[Provide analysis]

1. **Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?**

[Provide analysis]

1. **Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?**

[Provide analysis]

*Mitigation Measures*

1. The proposed project shall implement and incorporate the wildfire related mitigation measures as identified in the attached Project Specific Mitigation Monitoring Checklist dated [insert date]. ***[Note to preparer: only use this if there are project specific mitigations related to wildfire. For the purposes of this Initial Study, “project specific mitigations” include both mitigation measures carried over from the PEIR and imposed on a project level basis, and measures developed specifically for a project.]***

| ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **XIX. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE** | | | | | |
| a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory? |  | |  |  |  |
| 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? |  | |  |  |  |

**DISCUSSION**

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

[*Provide analysis]*

1. **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.)**

[*Provide analysis]*

1. **Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?**

[*Provide analysis]*