

1. Executive Summary

1.1 INTRODUCTION

This Draft Program Environmental Impact Report (Draft PEIR) addresses the environmental effects associated with the implementation of the proposed General Plan and Development Code Update. The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that local government agencies, prior to taking action on projects over which they have discretionary approval authority, consider the environmental consequences of such projects. An environmental impact report (EIR) is a public document designed to provide the public and local and state governmental agency decision makers with an analysis of potential environmental consequences to support informed decision-making. This document focuses on those impacts determined to be potentially significant as discussed in the Initial Study completed for this project (see Appendix A).

This Draft PEIR has been prepared pursuant to the requirements of CEQA, and the City of Clovis' CEQA procedures. The City of Clovis, as the lead agency, has reviewed and revised as necessary all submitted drafts, technical studies, and reports to reflect its own independent judgment, including reliance on applicable City technical personnel from other departments and review of all technical subconsultant reports.

Data for this Draft PEIR was obtained from onsite field observations, discussions with affected agencies, analysis of adopted plans and policies, review of available studies, reports, data and similar literature, and specialized environmental assessments (aesthetics, agricultural resources, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, geological resources, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use, mineral resources, noise, population and housing, public services, recreation, transportation and traffic, and utilities and service systems).

1.2 ENVIRONMENTAL PROCEDURES

This Draft PEIR has been prepared pursuant to CEQA to assess the environmental effects associated with implementation of the proposed project, as well as anticipated future discretionary actions and approvals. The six main objectives of this document as established by CEQA are listed below:

1. To disclose to decision makers and the public the significant environmental effects of proposed activities.
2. To identify ways to avoid or reduce environmental damage.
3. To prevent environmental damage by requiring implementation of feasible alternatives or mitigation measures.
4. To disclose to the public reasons for agency approval of projects with significant environmental effects.

1. Executive Summary

5. To foster interagency coordination in the review of projects.
6. To enhance public participation in the planning process.

An EIR is the most comprehensive form of environmental documentation identified in CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines and provides the information needed to assess the environmental consequences of a proposed project, to the extent feasible. EIRs are intended to provide an objective, factually supported, full-disclosure analysis of the environmental consequences associated with a proposed project that has the potential to result in significant, adverse environmental impacts.

An EIR is also one of various decision-making tools used by a lead agency to consider the merits and disadvantages of a project that is subject to its discretionary authority. Prior to approving a proposed project, the lead agency must consider the information contained in the EIR, determine whether the EIR was properly prepared in accordance with CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines, determine that it reflects the independent judgment of the lead agency, adopt findings concerning the project's significant environmental impacts and alternatives, and must adopt a Statement of Overriding Considerations if the proposed project would result in significant impacts that cannot be avoided.

1.2.1 PEIR Format

This Draft PEIR has been formatted as described below.

Section 1. Executive Summary: Summarizes the background and description of the proposed project, the format of this PEIR, project alternatives, any critical issues remaining to be resolved, and the potential environmental impacts and mitigation measures identified for the project.

Section 2. Introduction: Describes the purpose of this Draft PEIR, background on the project, the Notice of Preparation, the use of incorporation by reference, and Final PEIR certification.

Section 3. Project Description: A detailed description of the project, the objectives of the proposed project, the project area and location, approvals anticipated to be included as part of the project, the necessary environmental clearances for the project, and the intended uses of this Draft PEIR.

Section 4. Environmental Setting: A description of the physical environmental conditions in the vicinity of the project as they existed at the time the Notice of Preparation was published, from both a local and regional perspective. The environmental setting provides baseline physical conditions from which the lead agency determines the significance of environmental impacts resulting from the proposed project.

Section 5. Environmental Analysis: Provides, for each environmental parameter analyzed, a description of the thresholds used to determine if a significant impact would occur; the methodology to identify and evaluate the potential impacts of the project; the existing environmental setting; the potential adverse and beneficial effects of the project; the level of impact significance before mitigation; the mitigation measures for the proposed project; the level of significance of the adverse impacts of the project after mitigation is incorporated and the potential cumulative impacts associated with the proposed project and other existing, approved, and proposed development in the area.

1. Executive Summary

Section 6. Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts: Describes the significant unavoidable adverse impacts of the proposed project.

Section 7. Alternatives to the Proposed Project: Describes the impacts of the alternatives to the proposed project, including the No Project Alternative and three alternative land use plans. In accordance with the CEQA Guidelines, this section identifies a superior environmental alternative among the alternatives (exclusive of the No Project alternative) and evaluates the potential for each alternative to achieve the project objectives.

Section 8. Impacts Found Not to Be Significant: Briefly describes the potential impacts of the project that were determined not to be significant by the Initial Study and were therefore not discussed in detail in this Draft PEIR.

Section 9. Significant Irreversible Changes Due to the Proposed Project: Describes the significant irreversible environmental changes associated with the project.

Section 10. Growth-Inducing Impacts of the Project: Describes the ways in which the proposed project would cause increases in employment or population that could result in new physical or environmental impacts.

Section 11. Organizations and Persons Consulted: Lists the people and organizations that were contacted during the preparation of this Draft PEIR for the proposed project.

Section 12. Qualifications of Persons Preparing EIR: Lists the people who prepared this Draft PEIR.

Section 13. Bibliography: A bibliography of the technical reports and other documentation used in the preparation of this Draft PEIR for the proposed project.

Appendices. The appendices for this document (presented in PDF format on a CD attached to the front cover) contain the following supporting documents:

- Appendix A: Initial Study/Notice of Preparation (NOP)
- Appendix B: NOP Comment Letters
- Appendix C: Scoping Meeting Sign-In Sheet
- Appendix D: Proposed General Plan Update Policies
- Appendix E: Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions Modeling
- Appendix F: Biological Evaluation Report
- Appendix G: Cultural Resources Study
- Appendix H: Noise Measurements and Calculations Output
- Appendix I: Fiscal Impact Analysis
- Appendix J: Service Provider Responses
- Appendix K: Automatic Aid Fire Protection Services Agreement
- Appendix L: Transportation Impact Study

1. Executive Summary

1.2.2 Type and Purpose of This PEIR

This Draft PEIR fulfills the requirements for a Program EIR. Although the legally required contents of a Program EIR are the same as those of a Project EIR, Program EIRs are typically more conceptual and may contain a more general discussion of impacts, alternatives, and mitigation measures than a Project EIR. As provided in Section 15168 of the State CEQA Guidelines, a Program EIR may be prepared on a series of actions that may be characterized as one large project. Use of a Program EIR provides the City (as lead agency) with the opportunity to consider broad policy alternatives and program-wide mitigation measures and provides the City with greater flexibility to address project-specific and cumulative environmental impacts on a comprehensive basis.

Agencies generally prepare Program EIRs for programs or a series of related actions that are linked geographically, are logical parts of a chain of contemplated events, rules, regulations, or plans that govern the conduct of a continuing program, or are individual activities carried out under the same authority and having generally similar environmental effects that can be mitigated in similar ways.

Once a Program EIR has been prepared, subsequent activities within the program must be evaluated to determine whether an additional CEQA document needs to be prepared. However, if the Program EIR addresses the program's effects as specifically and comprehensively as possible, many subsequent activities could be found to be within the Program EIR scope and additional environmental documents may not be required (Guidelines Section 15168[c]). When a Program EIR is relied on for a subsequent activity, the lead agency must incorporate feasible mitigation measures and alternatives developed in the Program EIR into the subsequent activities (Guidelines Section 15168[c][3]). If a subsequent activity would have effects not within the scope of the Program EIR, the lead agency must prepare a new Initial Study leading to a Negative Declaration, Mitigated Negative Declaration, or an EIR. In this case, the Program EIR still serves a valuable purpose as the first-tier environmental analysis. The CEQA Guidelines (Section 15168[h]) encourage the use of Program EIRs, citing five advantages:

- Provide a more exhaustive consideration of impacts and alternatives than would be practical in an individual EIR;
- Focus on cumulative impacts that might be slighted in a case-by-case analysis;
- Avoid continual reconsideration of recurring policy issues;
- Consider broad policy alternatives and programmatic mitigation measures at an early stage when the agency has greater flexibility to deal with them;
- Reduce paperwork by encouraging the reuse of data (through tiering).

1. Executive Summary

1.3 PROJECT LOCATION

The City of Clovis (City) is in the central portion of Fresno County, approximately 6.5 miles northeast of the City of Fresno downtown area (see Figure 3-1, *Regional Vicinity*). The City is in the San Joaquin Valley; the foothills of the Sierra Nevada begin several miles northeast of the City. Clovis is in the northeast part of the Fresno Metropolitan Area, and is one of two incorporated cities—the other being Fresno—in the Metropolitan Area. As shown in Figure 3-2, *Citywide Aerial*, the City is surrounded by portions of unincorporated Fresno County to the north, east, and south and by the City of Fresno to the west and southwest. The City, its sphere of influence (SOI), and non-SOI Plan Area are defined and referred to herein as the Plan Area.

The Plan Area is generally bound by Copper Avenue on the north, Willow Avenue on the west, Academy Avenue on the east, and Shields Avenue on the south. State Route 168 (SR-168) bisects the City from the southwest to the northeast. These boundaries are roughly the same as those established in the current General Plan, which was adopted in 1993.

1.4 PROJECT SUMMARY

The proposed project is a comprehensive update to the current City of Clovis General Plan and Development Code. The General Plan Update is intended to guide growth and development in the Plan Area through 2035 and beyond, and the update to the Development Code is intended to consolidate and compile amendments adopted since the 1970s into a reorganized and reformatted document that also reflects changes to the General Plan. The two project components include 1) the General Plan Update and 2) the Development Code Update.

1.4.1 General Plan Update

The General Plan Update involves revising the current land use map and updating the current General Plan into the following chapters and sections.

- Introduction
- Land Use Element
- Economic Development Element (new)
- Circulation Element
- Housing Element (updated in 2010, not included in General Plan Update)
- Public Facilities and Service Element
- Environmental Safety Element
- Open Space and Conservation Element
- Air Quality Element

It would guide growth and development (e.g., infill development, redevelopment, and revitalization/restoration) in the Plan Area by designating land uses in the proposed land use map (see Figure 3-5, *Proposed General Plan Land Uses*) and through implementation of updated goals and policies of the General Plan Update. Table 1-1 outlines the proposed land use designations under the General Plan Update. The proposed land use map and General Plan goals and policies are detailed in Section 3.3.3, *General Plan Update*.

1. Executive Summary

Table 1-1 Proposed Land Use Designations

Land Use Designation	Acres	% of Total
City Boundary	14,859	—
Rural Residential	17	<1%
Very Low Density Residential	563	4%
Low Density Residential	4,127	28%
Medium Density Residential	1,622	11%
Medium High Density Residential	752	5%
High Density Residential	255	2%
General Commercial	816	6%
Neighborhood Commercial	19	<1%
Office	277	2%
Industrial	548	4%
Mixed Use Business Campus	419	3%
Mixed Use Village	190	1%
Park	181	1%
School	679	5%
Public/Quasi-Public Facilities	229	3%
Open Space	117	1%
Water	552	4%
Right-of-Way ¹	3,279	22%
Sphere of Influence (SOI)	5,633	—
Agriculture	68	1%
Rural Residential	941	17%
Very Low Density Residential	108	2%
Low Density Residential	1,068	19%
Medium Density Residential	1,143	20%
Medium High Density Residential	336	6%
High Density Residential	191	3%
Very High Density Residential	21	<1%
General Commercial	35	<1%
Neighborhood Commercial	15	<1%
Office	69	1%
Mixed Use Business Campus	185	3%
Mixed Use Village	488	9%
Park	118	2%
School	34	1%
Public/Quasi-Public Facilities	46	1%
Open Space	93	2%
Water	55	1%
Right-of-Way ¹	617	11%
Non-SOI Plan Areas	27,313	—
Agriculture	5,521	20%
Rural Residential	10,147	37%
Very Low Density Residential	104	<1%
Low Density Residential	1,044	4%
Medium Density Residential	1,635	6%
Medium High Density	663	2%
High Density Residential	286	1%
Very High Density Residential	102	<1%
General Commercial	30	<1%
Neighborhood Commercial	9	<1%
Mixed Use Business Campus	360	1%

1. Executive Summary

Table 1-1 Proposed Land Use Designations

Land Use Designation	Acres	% of Total
Mixed Use Village	324	1%
Park	235	1%
School	361	1%
Public/Quasi-Public Facilities	11	<1%
Open Space	4,067	15%
Water	427	2%
Planned Rural Community ²	325	1%
Special Commercial ²	170	1%
Right-of-Way ¹	1,493	5%
TOTAL	47,805³	100%

¹ Includes parcelized and nonparcelized right-of-way acreages.

² Areas in the Plan Area beyond the City and SOI that apply Fresno County land use designations.

³ Total acreage includes the parcelized (43,569 acres) and nonparcelized right-of-way (4,236) acreages in the overall Plan Area.

Buildout Scenarios

Per CEQA requirements, this Draft PEIR has to analyze potential environmental impacts and identify feasible mitigation measures for significant impacts for the entire project. However, buildout in accordance with the proposed land uses for the entire Plan Area may not occur for 70 to 80 years. This extended time period does not allow for quantifiable, meaningful analysis. Future conditions, including potential technological advances that would modify impacts, are highly speculative. Moreover, quantified analysis for many impacts are reliant on models and projections from responsible and regulatory agencies that do not extend beyond 20 years (e.g., Urban Water Management Plan for water supply and the 2035 Fresno Council of Governments' Transportation Demand Forecasts). Therefore, this Draft PEIR analyzes potential impacts using two scenarios—1) projected development by 2035, and 2) development at full buildout (anticipated to be many years beyond 2035)—in comparison to existing conditions. Table 1-2 details buildout statistics for each of the scenarios under the proposed project. Refer to Section 3.3.3.1, *General Plan Buildout Scenarios*, which describes assumptions under the two scenarios. Similarly, this PEIR provides conclusions regarding impact significance for these scenarios for both the proposed General Plan Update and project alternatives.

1. Executive Summary

Table 1-2 Buildout Statistical Summary

Scenario	Acres	Units	Household	Population	Employment	Building SF
Existing Conditions (2013)	47,805	42,000	40,500	115,000	31,500¹	13,050,000
City Boundary	14,859	36,500	35,000	100,000	30,000	12,600,000
SOI	5,633	2,000	2,000	6,000	1,000	200,000
Non-SOI Plan Areas	27,313	3,500	3,500	9,000	500	210,000
Proposed General Plan Update (2035 Scenario)	47,805	67,200	63,900	184,100	62,400	37,410,000
City Boundary	14,859	45,400	43,100	124,400	50,000	30,625,000
SOI	5,633	13,200	12,600	36,100	6,300	2,545,000
Non-SOI Plan Areas	27,313	8,600	8,200	23,600	6,100	4,240,000
Proposed General Plan Update (Full Buildout)	47,805	107,100	101,800	294,300	106,900	51,300,000
City Boundary	14,859	46,000	43,700	126,800	63,200	32,300,000
SOI	5,633	22,600	21,500	61,800	15,000	7,700,000
Non-SOI Plan Areas	27,313	38,500	36,600	105,700	28,700	11,300,000

Note: SF = square feet

¹ At the time this Draft PEIR was prepared, the most recent employment data was for 2011.

1.4.2 Development Code Update

The Development Code Update provides standards for orderly growth and development and would assist in implementing the goals, policies, and actions in the General Plan Update and applicable specific plans. The update would reflect changes in the updated General Plan goals, policies, and land use designations, and be integrated as Title 9, Development Code, in the City of Clovis Municipal Code.

1.5 SUMMARY OF PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

The CEQA Guidelines (§ 15126.6[a]) state that an EIR must address “a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project, which could feasibly attain the basic objectives of the project, but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives.” The alternatives in this Draft PEIR were based, in part, on their potential ability to reduce or eliminate the following impacts determined to be significant and unavoidable for implementation of the Clovis General Plan and Development Code Update under the 2035 Scenario and/or Full Buildout condition (see Table 1-4, *Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation*, for additional detail):

- **Both 2035 Scenario and Full Buildout:** Agricultural Resources; Air Quality; Cultural Resources (historic resources); Greenhouse Gas Emissions; Hydrology and Water Quality (groundwater use); Noise; Transportation and Traffic; and Utilities and Service Systems (water supply)
- **Full Buildout only:** Population and Housing (population growth)

1. Executive Summary

As described in Chapter 7, *Alternatives*, four project alternatives were identified and analyzed for relative impacts compared to the proposed General Plan Update:

- No Project/Existing General Plan
- Moderate Growth within SOI
- Concentrated Growth within SOI
- Low Density Growth

A statistical analysis of the alternatives is provided in Table 1-3, *Alternatives Statistical Summary*. Land use designations for each of the alternatives are provided in Chapter 7, *Alternatives*, with the exception of the No Project Alternative, which is shown as Figure 3-4, *Current General Plan Land Uses*.

Table 1-3 Alternatives Statistical Summary

	Acres	Units	Household	Population	Employment	Building SF
Proposed Project						
2035 Scenario	47,805	67,200	63,900	184,100	62,400	37,410,000
Full Buildout	47,805	107,100	101,800	294,300	106,900	51,300,000
Alternatives						
No Project/Existing General Plan						
2035 Scenario	47,805	66,825	63,425	184,185	50,422	25,950,000
Full Buildout	47,805	80,100	76,000	221,400	87,200	52,000,000
Moderate Growth within SOI						
2035 Scenario	47,805	66,990	63,930	183,240	49,003	40,262,500
Full Buildout	47,805	73,850	70,450	202,100	73,925	40,262,500
Concentrated Growth within SOI						
2035 Scenario	47,805	50,470	48,085	138,285	43,060	15,537,000
Full Buildout	47,805	107,450	102,150	295,200	106,900	51,300,000
Low Density Growth						
2035 Scenario	47,805	54,050	51,650	148,125	43,550	18,507,500
Full Buildout	47,805	54,050	51,650	148,125	43,550	18,507,500

Source: City of Clovis 1993 General Plan Land Use Element.
Alternative buildout statistics generated by PlaceWorks.

1.5.1 No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative

Section 15126.6(e) of the CEQA Guidelines requires that an EIR evaluate and analyze the impacts of the “No-Project” Alternative. When the project is the revision of an existing land use or regulatory plan, policy, or ongoing operation, the no-project alternative is the continuation of the plan, policy, or operation into the future. Therefore, in the No Project / Existing General Plan Alternative, the current 1993 General Plan would remain in effect, including the land use designations shown in Figure 3-4, *Current General Plan Land Uses*. The 1993 General Plan addresses the same overall geographic boundaries and applies similar land use designations as the proposed General Plan (especially within the current City boundaries and the Loma Vista area). However, the current land

1. Executive Summary

use plan covers a smaller geographic footprint and designates less development, at lower intensities, in the Northeast and Northwest Urban Centers. Development in accordance with the 1993 General Plan would continue to occur, allowing for up to: 221,400 residents, 80,100 housing units, 76,000 households, 87,200 jobs, and 52,000,000 square feet of nonresidential buildings.

1.5.2 Moderate Growth within SOI Alternative

The Moderate Growth within SOI Alternative would assume the same land use designations as the proposed project; however, there would be no change to designations outside of the current SOI boundary. The non-SOI Plan Area would maintain its existing land use designations per the County of Fresno General Plan. The only change in land use designation within the SOI boundary would be to the eastern Loma Vista parcels adjacent to McCall Avenue. These parcels would be lowered in density from the proposed Mixed Use Business Campus to Low Density Residential, because McCall Avenue would not be developed to accommodate high use if development does not extend farther into the non-SOI Plan Area but stays within the SOI boundary. Buildout of this alternative would permit development of 73,850 residential units and 40,262,500 square feet of nonresidential land uses; corresponding figures for the proposed project are 107,100 units and 51,300,000 square feet.

1.5.3 Concentrated Growth within SOI Alternative

The Concentrated Growth within SOI Alternative would accommodate the same level of development as the proposed project, but development would be limited to areas within the SOI boundaries. Thus, there would be no change to designations outside of the SOI, and the non-SOI Plan Area would maintain its existing land use designations in the County of Fresno land use plan. In order to accommodate the same level of development, this alternative would substantially increase density in various areas of the City and SOI, particularly in Loma Vista and the Northwest Urban Center. For example, proposed residential uses would increase from Very Low or Low Density Residential to Medium High, High, and Very High Density Residential. At buildout of this alternative, over 96 percent of residential units and over 99 percent of nonresidential building square footage in the Plan Area would be in the SOI.

1.5.4 Low Density Growth Alternative

Similar to the proposed General Plan Update, the Low Density Growth Alternative would designate land uses across the entire Plan Area. However, it would substantially reduce overall development intensity. This alternative would significantly lower density in various areas in the City's SOI and the Northeast and Northwest Urban Centers. For example, the highest density residential designation would be Medium Density Residential, with a maximum density of seven units per acre. In the three urban centers, parcels adjacent to agricultural uses and rural residential areas are further reduced to Very Low Density Residential. Employment is also limited to a handful of retail and business centers. Population and the number of housing units at buildout of this alternative would each be reduced by about half compared to the proposed project; employment would be reduced by about 59 percent; and nonresidential building square footage would be reduced by approximately 64 percent.

1. Executive Summary

1.6 ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED

Section 15123(b)(3) of the CEQA Guidelines requires that an EIR contain issues to be resolved, including the choice among alternatives and whether or how to mitigate significant impacts. With regard to the proposed project, the major issues to be resolved include decisions by the lead agency as to:

1. Whether this Draft PEIR adequately describes the environmental impacts of the project.
2. Whether the benefits of the project override the environmental impacts that cannot be feasibly avoided or mitigated to a level of insignificance.
3. Whether the proposed land use changes are compatible with the character of the existing area.
4. Whether the identified goals, policies, or mitigation measures should be adopted or modified.
5. Whether other mitigation measures should be applied to the project besides those identified in the Draft PEIR.
6. Whether any alternatives to the project would substantially lessen any of the significant impacts of the proposed project and achieve most of the basic project objectives.

1.7 AREAS OF CONTROVERSY

In accordance with Section 15123(b)(2) of the CEQA Guidelines, the EIR summary must identify areas of controversy known to the lead agency, including issues raised by agencies and the public. There are no specific areas of known controversy concerning the proposed project. Although the City of Clovis has no knowledge of expressed opposition to the project, several comments have been received related to traffic impacts, intensification of land uses, and adequacy of public services and utilities. These comments are summarized in Tables 2-1 and 2-2, from the NOP comments and public scoping meeting, respectively.

Prior to preparation of the Draft PEIR, the Notice of Preparation was distributed for comment, which extended from June 20, 2012, to July 19, 2012. A public scoping meeting was held on June 27, 2012. The NOP comment letters received and testimony at the public scoping meeting are summarized in Section 2.0, *Introduction* (see Tables 2-1 and 2-2). The scoping meeting was held at the City of Clovis and attended by a number of community members and interested parties. Comments were voiced about traffic impacts to Clovis's circulation network; land use issues associated with growth in three different growth areas; and adequacy of public services and utilities (fire, police, water and wastewater facilities, etc.). Agency letters in response to the NOP included requests to address topical concerns such as agricultural resources, air quality, biological resources, hydrology and water quality, noise, and transportation and traffic.

1. Executive Summary

1.8 SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND LEVELS OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

Table 1-4 summarizes the conclusions of the environmental analysis in this Draft PEIR. Impacts are identified as significant or less than significant, and mitigation measures are identified for all significant impacts. The level of significance after application of the mitigation measures is also presented.

1. Executive Summary

Table 1-4 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
5.1 AESTHETICS			
2035 Scenario and Full Buildout			
Impact 5.1-1: Development in accordance with the General Plan Update would not substantially alter or damage scenic vistas or resources in the Plan Area or along a state scenic highway.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant
Impact 5.1-2: Buildout in accordance with the proposed land use plan would alter the visual appearance of the City and its Plan Area, but would not substantially degrade its existing visual character or quality.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant
Impact 5.1-3: Future development in accordance with the General Plan Update would generate additional light and glare in the Plan Area that would impact surrounding existing land uses.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant
5.2 AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES			
2035 Scenario			
Impact 5.2-1: Development in accordance with the General Plan land use designations would convert all of the important farmland within the City limits and SOI to nonagricultural land uses, including: 1,751 acres Prime Farmland, 319 acres of Farmland of Statewide Importance, and 462 acres of Unique Farmland. Additional acres within the non-SOI Plan Area would also likely be converted to nonagricultural uses within the 2035 Scenario.	Potentially significant	2-1 Project applicants for properties that include 20 acres or more designated as Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, or Unique Farmland shall be required to prepare or fund an agricultural resource evaluation prior to project approval. The resource evaluation shall use generally accepted methodologies (such as The Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model) to identify the potentially significant impact of the loss of agricultural land as well as the economic viability of future agricultural use of the property. If the conversion is deemed significant, the City shall require mitigation at a 1:1 ratio of converted to preserved acreage, or payment of its valuation equivalent if a fee mitigation program is established. Conservation mitigation could be achieved alternatively through a regional agricultural preservation program, such as the Model Farmland or SJV Greenprint, if adopted by the City.	Significant and unavoidable

1. Executive Summary

Table 1-4 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Impact 5.2-2: Anticipated development within the 2035 time horizon would convert 3,072 acres designated for agriculture to other land use designations.	Potentially significant	See Mitigation Measure 2-1.	Significant and unavoidable
Impact 5.2-3: Within the 2035 time horizon, development in accordance with the General Plan Update within the SOI would result in conversion of 476 acres of Prime Farmland and 16 acres of nonprime farmland bearing Williamson Act contracts to nonagricultural land uses.	Potentially significant	See Mitigation Measure 2-1.	Significant and unavoidable
Impact 5.2-4: Buildout of the General Plan Update would potentially impact riparian forests.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant
Impact 5.2-5: Buildout of the General Plan Update would cause other changes to the environment that could cause conversion of farmland to nonagricultural land uses.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant
Full Buildout			
Impact 5.2-1: Buildout of the proposed General Plan Update would convert 2,651 acres of Prime Farmland, 1,528 acres of Farmland of Statewide Importance, and 1,411 acres of Unique Farmland to non-agricultural land uses.	Potentially significant	See Mitigation Measure 2-1.	Significant and unavoidable
Impact 5.2-2: The General Plan Update would change the land use designation of 4,610 acres designated for agriculture to other land use designations.	Potentially significant	See Mitigation Measure 2-1.	Significant and unavoidable
Impact 5.2-3: General Plan Update buildout would convert 3,047 acres of farmland bearing Williamson act contracts to non-agricultural land uses	Potentially significant	See Mitigation Measure 2-1.	Significant and unavoidable

1. Executive Summary

Table 1-4 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Impact 5.2-4: Buildout of the General Plan Update would potentially impact riparian forests.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant
Impact 5.2-5: Buildout of the General Plan Update would cause other changes to the environment which could cause conversion of farmland to non-agricultural land uses	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant
5.3 AIR QUALITY			
2035 Scenario and Full Buildout			
Impact 5.3-1: The General Plan Update would be consistent with the SJVAPCD control measures; however, development associated with the buildout of the General Plan Update would exceed SJVAPCD significance thresholds and be inconsistent with the applicable air quality management plans.	Potentially significant	No feasible mitigation is available.	Significant and unavoidable
Impact 5.3-2: Construction activities associated with buildout of the General Plan Update would generate short-term emissions in exceedance of SJVAPCD'S significance threshold criteria and would contribute to the ozone and particulate matter nonattainment designations of the SJVAB.	Potentially significant	<p>Standard Condition</p> <p>SC-1 Prior to project approval, each applicant for individual, site-specific developments under the General Plan shall comply with the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District rules and regulations, including, without limitation, Indirect Source Rule 9510. The applicant shall document, to the City's reasonable satisfaction, its compliance with this standard condition.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>3-1 Prior to issuance of any construction permits, development project applicants shall prepare and submit to the City of Clovis Planning Division a technical assessment evaluating potential project construction-related air quality impacts. The evaluation shall be prepared in conformance with San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD) methodology in assessing air quality impacts. If construction-related criteria air pollutants are determined to have the potential to exceed the SJVAPCD adopted thresholds of significance, as identified in the Guidance for Assessing and Mitigating Air Quality Impacts (GAMAQI), the City of Clovis Planning Division shall require that applicants for new development projects incorporate</p>	Significant and unavoidable

1. Executive Summary

Table 1-4 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>mitigation measures to reduce air pollutant emissions during construction activities. These identified measures shall be incorporated into all appropriate construction documents (e.g., construction management plans) submitted to the City and shall be verified by the City's Planning Division. Mitigation measures to reduce construction-related emissions include, but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Using construction equipment rated by the United States Environmental Protection Agency as having Tier 3 (model year 2006 or newer) or Tier 4 (model year 2008 or newer) emission limits, applicable for engines between 50 and 750 horsepower. A list of construction equipment by type and model year shall be maintained by the construction contractor onsite, which shall be available for City review upon request. • Ensuring construction equipment is properly serviced and maintained to the manufacturer's standards. • Use of alternative-fueled or catalyst-equipped diesel construction equipment, if available and feasible. • Clearly posted signs that require operators of trucks and construction equipment to minimize idling time (e.g., 5-minute maximum). • Preparation and implementation of a fugitive dust control plan that may include the following measures: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Disturbed areas (including storage piles) that are not being actively utilized for construction purposes shall be effectively stabilized using water, chemical stabilizer/suppressant, or covered with a tarp or other suitable cover (e.g., revegetated). ▪ Onsite unpaved roads and offsite unpaved access roads shall be effectively stabilized using water or chemical stabilizer/suppressant. ▪ Land clearing, grubbing, scraping, excavation, land leveling, grading, cut and fill, and demolition activities shall be effectively controlled utilizing application of water or by presoaking. ▪ 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 when materials are transported offsite. 	

1. Executive Summary

Table 1-4 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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, trackout 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 trackout. ▪ Limit traffic speeds on unpaved roads to 15 mph. ▪ Install sandbags or other erosion control measures to prevent silt runoff to public roadways from sites with a slope greater than 1 percent. ▪ Install wheel washers for all exiting trucks or wash off all trucks and equipment leaving the project area. ▪ Adhere to Regulation VIII's 20 percent opacity limitation, as applicable. <p>3-2 Prior to discretionary approval, applicants for phased development projects (i.e., construction would overlap operation/opening of the project) involving residential land uses shall coordinate with the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SVJAPCD) or the City of Clovis in conjunction with the SVJAPCD in preparation of a health risk assessment (HRA) for construction activities. If the construction HRA identifies risk impacts that exceed the standards as determined by the SVJAPCD at the time the project is considered, it shall identify measures to reduce these impacts. Recommended measures may include those identified in Mitigation Measure 3-1. The recommendations of the construction HRA shall be incorporated into all construction management plans which shall be submitted to the City and verified by the City's Planning Division.</p>	

1. Executive Summary

Table 1-4 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>Impact 5.3-3: Implementation of the Land Use Plan of the proposed General Plan Update would generate long-term emissions that would exceed the SJVAPCD's significance threshold criteria and cumulatively contribute to the ozone and particulate matter nonattainment designations of the SJVAB.</p>	<p>Potentially significant</p>	<p>3-3</p> <p>Prior to project approval, development project applicants shall prepare and submit to the City of Clovis Planning Division a technical assessment evaluating potential project operation phase-related air quality impacts. The evaluation shall be prepared in conformance with San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD) methodology in assessing air quality impacts. If operational-related criteria air pollutants are determined to have the potential to exceed the SJVAPCD adopted thresholds of significance, as identified in the Guidance for Assessing and Mitigating Air Quality Impacts (GAMAQI), the City of Clovis Planning Division shall require that applicants for new development projects incorporate mitigation measures to reduce air pollutant emissions during operational activities. The identified measures shall be included as part of the Standard Conditions of Approval. Mitigation measures to reduce long-term emissions include, but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For site-specific development that requires refrigerated vehicles, the construction documents shall demonstrate an adequate number of electrical service connections at loading docks for plug in of the anticipated number of refrigerated trailers to reduce idling time and emissions. • Applicants for manufacturing and light industrial uses shall consider energy storage and combined heat and power (CHP) in appropriate applications to optimize renewable energy generation systems and avoid peak energy use. • Site-specific developments with truck delivery and loading areas, and truck parking spaces, shall include signage as a reminder to limit idling of vehicles while parked for loading/unloading in accordance with California Air Resources Board Rule 2845 (13 CCR Chapter 10 § 2485). • Site-specific development shall demonstrate an adequate number of electrical vehicle Level 2 charging stations are provided onsite. The location of the electrical outlets shall be specified on building plans, and proper installation shall be verified by the Building Division prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy. • Applicant-provided appliances shall be Energy Star appliances (dishwashers, refrigerators, clothes washers, and dryers). Installation of Energy Star appliances shall be verified by the Building Division during plan check. • Applicants for large development projects shall establish an employee trip 	<p>Significant and unavoidable</p>

1. Executive Summary

Table 1-4 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>commute reduction program (CTR), in conformance with the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District Rule 9410. The program shall identify South Valley Rideshare and/or Valley Rides commute programs, which provide information about commute options and connect commuters for carpooling, ridesharing, and other activities. The CTR program shall identify alternative modes of transportation to the project site, including transit schedules, bike and pedestrian routes, and carpool/vanpool availability. Information regarding these programs shall be readily available to employees and clients and shall be posted in a highly visible location and/or made available online. The project applicant shall include the following incentives for commuters as part of the CTR program:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ride-matching assistance (e.g., subsidized public transit passes) ▪ Preferential carpool parking ▪ Flexible work schedules for carpools ▪ Vanpool assistance or employer-provided vanpool/shuttle ▪ Telecommute and/or flexible work hour programs ▪ Car-sharing program (e.g., Zipcar) ▪ Bicycle end-trip facilities, including bike parking, showers, and lockers ▪ End-of-trip facilities shall be shown on site plans and architectural plans submitted to the Planning Division Manager. The CTR program shall be prepared to the satisfaction of the Planning Division Manager prior to occupancy permits. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicants for future development projects along existing and planned transit routes shall coordinate with the City of Clovis and City of Fresno to ensure that bus pads and shelters are incorporated, as necessary. <p>3-4 Prior to project approval, the City of Clovis Planning Division shall require applicants for individual, site-specific developments to consider establishing a Voluntary Emission Reduction Agreement (VERA) with the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District. Under this agreement, project proponents may enter into an agreement where funds are used to develop and implement emission reduction projects.</p>	

1. Executive Summary

Table 1-4 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>Impact 5.3-4: Buildout of the proposed General Plan Update could site sensitive land uses near pollution sources and therefore expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.</p>	<p>Potentially significant</p>	<p>3-5</p> <p>Prior to discretionary project approval, the City of Clovis shall evaluate new development proposals for sensitive land uses (e.g., residential, schools, day care centers) within the City for potential incompatibilities with regard to the California Air Resources Board's <i>Air Quality and Land Use Handbook: A Community Health Perspective</i> (April 2005). Applicants for sensitive land uses that are within the recommended buffer distances shall submit a health risk assessment (HRA) to the City of Clovis prior to future discretionary project approval. The HRA shall be prepared in accordance with policies and procedures of the state Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA) and the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District. The latest OEHHA guidelines shall be used for the analysis, including age sensitivity factors, breathing rates, and body weights appropriate for children age 0 to 6 years. If the HRA shows that the incremental cancer risk exceeds ten in one million (10E-06), the appropriate noncancer hazard index exceeds 1.0, or if the PM₁₀ or PM_{2.5} ambient air quality standard increment exceeds 2.5 µg/m³, the applicant will be required to identify and demonstrate that mitigation measures are capable of reducing potential cancer and noncancer risks to an acceptable level (i.e., below ten in one million or a hazard index of 1.0), including appropriate enforcement mechanisms. Measures to reduce risk impacts may include but are not limited to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Placement of air intakes away from high-volume roadways and/or truck loading zones. • Heating, ventilation, and air conditioning systems of the buildings provided with appropriately sized maximum efficiency rating value (MERV) filters. • Heating, ventilation, and air conditioning systems for units that are installed with MERV filters shall maintain positive pressure within the building's filtered ventilation system to reduce infiltration of unfiltered outdoor air. <p>Mitigation measures identified in the HRA shall be identified as mitigation measures in the environmental document and/or incorporated into the site development plan as a component of the proposed project. The air intake design and MERV filter requirements shall be noted and/or reflected on all building plans submitted to the City and shall be verified by the City's Planning Division.</p>	<p>Less than significant</p>

1. Executive Summary

Table 1-4 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>Impact 5.3-5: Buildout of new industrial and commercial land uses under the proposed General Plan Update could expose sensitive receptors to substantial toxic air contaminant concentrations.</p>	<p>Potentially significant</p>	<p>3-6</p> <p>Prior to discretionary project approval, applicants for industrial or warehousing land uses shall coordinate with the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD) or the City of Clovis in conjunction with the SJVAPCD to determine the appropriate level of health risk assessment (HRA) needed. All HRAs shall be submitted to the City of Clovis.</p> <p>The HRA shall be prepared in accordance with policies and procedures of the state Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment and the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD). If the HRA shows that the incremental cancer risk exceeds ten in one million (10E-06) or the risk thresholds in effect at the time a project is considered, the appropriate noncancer hazard index exceeds 1.0, or if the PM₁₀ or PM_{2.5} ambient air quality concentrations exceeds the thresholds as determined by the SJVAPCD at the time a project is considered, the applicant will be required to identify and demonstrate that measures are capable of reducing potential cancer and noncancer risks to an acceptable level, including appropriate enforcement mechanisms.</p> <p>Measures to reduce risk impacts may include but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Restricting idling onsite beyond Air Toxic Control Measures idling restrictions, as feasible • Electrifying warehousing docks • Requiring use of newer equipment and/or vehicles • Restricting offsite truck travel through the creation of truck routes <p>Measures identified in the HRA shall be identified as mitigation measures in the environmental document and/or incorporated into the site development plan as a component of the proposed project.</p>	<p>Less than significant</p>
<p>Impact 5.3-6: Development of new industrial land uses associated with buildout of the proposed General Plan Update have the potential to create objectionable odors that could affect a substantial number of people.</p>	<p>Potentially significant</p>	<p>3-7</p> <p>Prior to project approval, if it is determined during project-level environmental review that a project has the potential to emit nuisance odors beyond the property line, an odor management plan shall be prepared and submitted by the project applicant prior to project approval to ensure compliance with San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD) Rule 4102. The following facilities that are within the buffer distances specified from sensitive receptors (in parentheses) have the potential</p>	<p>Less than significant</p>

1. Executive Summary

Table 1-4 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>to generate substantial odors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wastewater Treatment Plan (2 miles) • Sanitary Landfill (1 mile) • Transfer Station (1 mile) • Composting Facility (1 mile) • Petroleum Refinery (2 miles) • Asphalt Batch Plan (1 mile) • Chemical Manufacturing (1 mile) • Fiberglass Manufacturing (1 mile) • Painting/Coating Operations (1 mile) • Food Processing Facility (1 mile) • Feed Lot/ Dairy (1 mile) • Rendering Plant (1 mile) <p>The Odor Management Plan prepared for these facilities shall identify the Best Available Control Technologies for Toxics (T-BACTs) that will be utilized to reduce potential odors to acceptable levels, including appropriate enforcement mechanisms. T-BACTs may include but are not limited to scrubbers (e.g., air pollution control devices) at an industrial facility. T-BACTs identified in the odor management plan shall be identified as mitigation measures in the environmental document and/or incorporated into the site plan.</p>	

1. Executive Summary

Table 1-4 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
5.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES			
2035 Scenario and Full Buildout			
<p>Impact 5.4-1: Developments pursuant to the General Plan Update could impact plant species listed as endangered or threatened under the federal and/or California endangered species acts and/or by the California Native Plant Society.</p>	Potentially significant	<p>4-1 For each development or redevelopment project that would disturb vegetated, vacant land pursuant to the General Plan Update and subject to CEQA, a qualified biologist shall determine the potential for a potentially significant biological resource impact and determine whether a field survey of the project site is warranted. If warranted, a qualified biologist shall conduct a reconnaissance level field survey for the presence and quality of biological resources potentially affected by project development. These resources include, but are not limited to, special status species or their habitat, sensitive habitats such as wetlands or riparian areas, and jurisdictional waters. If sensitive or protected biological resources are absent from the project site and adjacent lands potentially affected by the project, the biologist shall submit a written report substantiating such to the City of Clovis before issuance of a grading permit by the City, and the project may proceed without any further biological investigation. If sensitive or protected biological resources are present on the project site or may be potentially affected by the project, implementation of Mitigation Measure 4-2 shall be required.</p> <p>4-2 A qualified biologist shall evaluate impacts to sensitive or protected biological resources from development. The impact assessment may require focused surveys that determine absence or presence and distribution of biological resources on the site. These surveys may include, but are not limited to: 1) focused special status animal surveys if suitable habitat is present; 2) appropriately timed focused special status plant surveys that will maximize detection and accurate identification of target plant species; 3) a delineation of jurisdictional boundaries around potential waters of the United States or State. The results of these surveys will assist in assessing actual project impacts. Alternatively, the project applicant may forgo focused plant and animal surveys and assume presence of special status species in all suitable habitats on the project site. The qualified biologist shall substantiate the impact evaluation or the assumed presence of special-status species in all suitable habitats onsite in a written report submitted to the City of Clovis before issuance of a grading permit by the City.</p>	Less than significant

1. Executive Summary

Table 1-4 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>4-3 Proponents of projects developed pursuant to the General Plan Update shall avoid potential impacts to sensitive or protected biological resources. Depending on the resources potentially present on the project site, avoidance may include: 1) establishing appropriate no-disturbance buffers around onsite or adjacent resources and/or 2) initiating construction at a time when special status or protected animal species will not be vulnerable to project-related mortality (e.g. outside the avian nesting season or bat maternal or wintering roosting season). Consultation with relevant regulatory agencies may be required in order to establish suitable buffer areas. If the project avoids all sensitive or protected biological resources, no further action is required. If avoidance of all significant impacts to sensitive or protected biological resources is not feasible, the project shall minimize such impacts as set forth in Mitigation Measure 4-4.</p> <p>4-4 Proponents of projects developed pursuant to the General Plan Update shall design respective projects to minimize potential impacts to sensitive or protected biological resources in consultation with a qualified biologist and/or appropriate regulatory agency staff. In addition to an environmentally sensitive project design, other minimization measures may include: 1) exclusion and/or silt fencing; 2) relocation of impacted resources; 3) construction monitoring by a qualified biologist; and 4) an informative training program conducted by a qualified biologist for construction personnel on sensitive biological resources that may be impacted by project construction. If minimization of all significant impacts to sensitive or protected biological resources is infeasible, the project shall compensate for such impacts as set forth in Mitigation Measure 4-5.</p> <p>4-5 A qualified biologist will develop appropriate mitigations that will reduce project impacts to sensitive or protected biological resources to a less than significant level. The type and amount of mitigation will depend on the resources impacted, the extent of the impacts, and the quality of habitats to be impacted. Mitigations may include, but are not limited to: 1) Compensation for lost habitat or waters in the form of preservation or creation of in-kind habitat or waters, either onsite or offsite, protected by conservation easement; 2) Purchase of appropriate credits from an approved mitigation bank servicing the Clovis General Plan Update Area; 3) Payment of in-lieu fees.</p>	

1. Executive Summary

Table 1-4 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Impact 5.4-2: Developments pursuant to the General Plan Update could impact animal species listed as endangered or threatened under the federal and/or California endangered species acts.	Potentially significant	See Mitigation Measures 4-1 through 4-5.	Less than significant
Impact 5.4-3: Buildout of the General Plan Update could impact animal species listed by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife as California Species of Special Concern or California Fully Protected Animals.	Potentially significant	See Mitigation Measures 4-1 through 4-5.	Less than significant
Impact 5.4-4: Developments pursuant to the General Plan Update could impact sensitive natural communities, including vernal pools and riparian habitats.	Potentially significant	See Mitigation Measures 4-1 through 4-5.	Less than significant
Impact 5.4-5: Buildout of the General Plan Update could impact federally protected wetlands.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant
Impact 5.4-6: Developments pursuant to the General Plan Update could impact local wildlife movement corridors.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant
Impact 5.4-7: Buildout of the General Plan Update could impact migratory birds.	Potentially significant	See Mitigation Measures 4-1 through 4-5.	Less than significant
Impact 5.4-8: Projects developed or redeveloped pursuant to the General Plan Update would comply with general plan policies. There are no habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans in effect in the Plan Area, and General Plan Update implementation would not conflict with any such plan.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant

1. Executive Summary

Table 1-4 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
5.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES			
2035 Scenario and Full Buildout			
<p>Impact 5.5-1: Development in accordance with the General Plan Update could impact up to 30 historic buildings, structures, or objects identified through previous cultural research studies and up to 12 additional historic resources identified and listed on the Fresno County List of Historic Resources.</p>	Potentially significant	<p>5-1 Prior to any construction activities of individual projects that may affect historic resources, a historic resources assessment shall be performed by an architectural historian or historian who meets the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualifications Standards requirements in architectural history or history. The assessment shall include a records search at the Southern San Joaquin Valley Information Center to determine if any resources that may potentially be affected by the project have been previously recorded, evaluated, and/or designated on the National Register of Historic Places or California Register of Historic Resources. Following the records search, the qualified architectural historian or historian will conduct a reconnaissance-level and/or intensive-level survey in accordance with the California Office of Historic Preservation guidelines to identify any previously unrecorded potential historic resources that may potentially be affected by the proposed project. If the resource meets the criteria for listing on the California Register of Historical Resources (Pub. Res. Code Section 5024.1, Title 14 CCR, Section 4852), mitigation shall be identified within the technical study that ensures the value of the historic resource is maintained.</p> <p>5-2 To ensure that individual projects requiring the relocation, rehabilitation, or alteration of a historic resource do not impair its significance, the Interior’s Standards for the Treatments of Historic Properties (Standards) shall be used. The application of the standards shall be overseen by a qualified architectural historian or historic architect meeting the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualifications Standards. Prior to any construction activities that may affect the historic resource, a report identifying and specifying the treatment of character-defining features and construction activities shall be provided to the City of Clovis.</p> <p>5-3 If an individual project would result in the demolition or significant alteration of a historic resource, it cannot be mitigated to a less than significant level. However, recordation of the resource prior to construction activities will assist in reducing adverse impacts to the resource to the greatest extent possible (but not avoid a significant impact). Recordation shall take the form of Historic American Buildings</p>	Significant and unavoidable

1. Executive Summary

Table 1-4 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		Survey, Historic American Engineering Record, or Historic American Landscape Survey documentation, and shall be performed by an architectural historian or historian who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards. Documentation shall include an architectural and historical narrative; medium- or large-format black-and-white photographs, negatives, and prints; and supplementary information such as building plans and elevations and/or historic photographs. Documentation shall be reproduced on archival paper and placed in appropriate local, state, or federal institutions. The specific scope and details of documentation will be developed at the project level.	
<p>Impact 5.5-2: Development in accordance with the General Plan Update could impact up to 25 prehistoric sites, four historic sites, and one combined prehistoric/historic resource site.</p>	Potentially significant	<p>5-4 City staff shall require applicants for grading permits in areas requiring grading of undisturbed soil to provide studies by qualified archaeologists assessing the cultural and historical significance of any known archaeological resources on or next to each respective development site, and assessing the sensitivity of sites for buried archaeological resources. On properties where resources are identified, or that are determined to be moderately to highly sensitive for buried archaeological resources, such studies shall provide a detailed mitigation plan, including a monitoring program and recovery and/or in situ preservation plan, based on the recommendations of a qualified cultural preservation expert. The mitigation plan shall include the following requirements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. An archaeologist shall be retained for the project and will be on call during grading and other significant ground-disturbing activities. b. Should any cultural/scientific resources be discovered, no further grading shall occur in the area of the discovery until the Planning Director concurs in writing that adequate provisions are in place to protect these resources. <p>Unanticipated discoveries shall be evaluated for significance by a certified professional archaeologist that meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards. If significance criteria are met, then the project shall be required to perform data recovery, professional identification, radiocarbon dates as applicable, and other special studies; curate materials with a recognized scientific or educational repository; and provide a comprehensive final report including appropriate records for the California Department of Parks and Recreation (Building, Structure, and Object Record; Archaeological Site Record; or District Record, as applicable).</p>	Less than significant

1. Executive Summary

Table 1-4 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>Impact 5.5-3: Development in accordance with the General Plan Update could destroy paleontological resources or a unique geologic feature.</p>	<p>Potentially significant</p>	<p>5-5 City staff shall require applicants for grading permits in areas requiring grading of undisturbed soil to provide studies by qualified paleontologists assessing the sensitivity of sites for buried paleontological resources. On properties determined to be moderately to highly sensitive for paleontological resources, such studies shall provide a detailed mitigation plan, including a monitoring program and recovery and/or in situ preservation plan, based on the recommendations of a qualified paleontologist. The mitigation plan shall include the following requirements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. A paleontologist shall be retained for the project and will be on call during grading and other significant ground-disturbing activities. b. Should any potentially significant fossil resources be discovered, no further grading shall occur in the area of the discovery until the Planning Director concurs in writing that adequate provisions are in place to protect these resources. c. Unanticipated discoveries shall be evaluated for significance by certified professional paleontologist that meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards. If significance criteria are met, then the project shall be required to perform data recovery, professional identification, radiocarbon dates as applicable, and other special studies; curate materials with a recognized scientific or educational repository; and provide a comprehensive final report, including catalog with museum numbers. 	<p>Less than significant</p>
<p>Impact 5.5-4: Development in accordance with the General Plan Update could potentially disturb human remains.</p>	<p>Less than significant</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>Less than significant</p>
<p>5.6 GEOLOGY AND SOILS</p>			
<p>2035 Scenario and Full Buildout</p>			
<p>Impact 5.6-1: Substantial hazards from liquefaction or earthquake-induced ground settlement are not expected in the Plan Area; however, project-specific geotechnical investigations would be required to evaluate potentials for liquefaction and for earthquake-induced ground settlement on individual project sites.</p>	<p>Less than significant</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>Less than significant</p>

1. Executive Summary

Table 1-4 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Impact 5.6-2: Implementation of the General Plan Update would not subject people or structures to substantial hazards from earthquake-induced landslides.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant
Impact 5.6-3: Buildout of the proposed General Plan Update would not subject people or structures to substantial hazards from ground subsidence.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant
Impact 5.6-4: Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update could result in substantial soil erosion.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant
Impact 5.6-5: Buildout of the General Plan Update could expose people and structures to substantial hazards arising from expansive soils.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant
Impact 5.6-6: Soil conditions may not adequately support proposed septic tanks.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant
5.7 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS			
2035 Scenario and Full Buildout			
Impact 5.7-1: Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would result in a substantial increase in GHG emissions for year 2035 and full buildout compared to existing conditions. Additionally, although community-wide GHG emissions of the proposed General Plan Update at year 2035 and full buildout would be less under adjusted BAU conditions than under BAU conditions, the proposed General Plan Update would not meet the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District's threshold of 29 percent below BAU and would not meet the long-term reduction target of Executive Order S-03-05.	Potentially significant	See SC-1 and Mitigation Measures 3-3 and 3-4. 7-1 Prior to issuance of construction permits, the City of Clovis Planning Division shall require that applicants for new development projects submit documentation showing that greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions meet a 29 percent reduction from business-as-usual (BAU) in accordance with the methodology identified by the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD). The documentation shall identify measures to be incorporated into the considered project that would reduce GHG emissions from BAU. Such measures include, but are not limited to the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide a pedestrian access network that internally links all uses and connects to existing external streets and pedestrian facilities. • Provide the minimum number of parking spaces required. 	Significant and unavoidable

1. Executive Summary

Table 1-4 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create a shared parking program, as feasible. • Provide bicycle end-of-trip facilities (e.g., bike parking, showers, and lockers). • Develop rideshare and ride-matching assistance programs. • For planned residential development, design and incorporate a neighborhood electric vehicle system. • Design buildings to be electric vehicle charging-station-ready. • Coordinate with the City of Clovis and/or the Fresno Area Express to install bus stops at or near the project site. • Design buildings to be energy efficient beyond the requirements of Title 24. • Design and orient structures to maximize shade in the summer and sun exposure in the winter. • Install vegetative roofs that cover at least 50 percent of the roof area. • Design buildings to incorporate passive solar design and solar heaters. • Install solar panels on carports and parking areas. • Limit nonessential idling of commercial vehicles beyond Air Toxic Control Measures idling restrictions. 	
<p>Impact 5.7-2: The proposed General Plan Update would not conflict with the CARB Scoping Plan or Fresno COG's proposed 2014–2040 RTP/SCS.</p>	<p>Less than significant</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>Less than significant</p>
<p>5.8 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS</p>			
<p>2035 Scenario and Full Buildout</p>			
<p>Impact 5.8.1: Construction and operation of projects developed pursuant to the proposed General Plan Update would involve the transport, use, and/or disposal of hazardous materials.</p>	<p>Less than significant</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>Less than significant</p>
<p>Impact 5.8-2: Hazardous materials sites are located within the General Plan Update Plan Area.</p>	<p>Less than significant</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>Less than significant</p>

1. Executive Summary

Table 1-4 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Impact 5.8-3: Parts of the Plan Area are within the Safety Compatibility Zones and under the Airspace Protection Surface for Fresno-Yosemite International Airport, which is outside of the Plan Area near the southwest corner of the City.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant
Impact 5.8-4: Buildout of the proposed General Plan Update would not substantially interfere with the implementation of an emergency response or evacuation plan.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant
Impact 5.8-5: Portions of the northern and northeastern parts of the Plan Area are within a designated moderate fire hazard severity zone and could expose structures and/or residents to fire danger.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant

5.9 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

2035 Scenario and Full Buildout

Impact 5.9-1: Development pursuant to the proposed project would increase the amount of impervious surfaces in the Plan Area and would therefore increase surface water flows into drainage systems within the Fresno and Academy watersheds.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant
Impact 5.9-2: Development pursuant to the General Plan Update would increase the demand on groundwater use and also increase impervious surfaces in the Plan Area, which would impact opportunities for groundwater recharge.	Potentially significant	No feasible mitigation is available.	Significant and unavoidable
Impact 5.9-3: Portions of the Plan Area proposed for development are within a 100-year flood hazard area.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant

1. Executive Summary

Table 1-4 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Impact 5.9-4: Construction of development projects pursuant to the General Plan Update may cause short-term increases in pollutant concentrations. Postdevelopment, the quality of storm runoff may be altered (sediment, nutrients, metals, pesticides, pathogens, and hydrocarbons).	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant
Impact 5.9-5: Portions of the Plan Area are within the inundation area of the Big Dry Creek Reservoir, the Redbank Reservoir, and Fancher Creek Reservoir.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant
Impact 5.9-6: The City would not be subject to inundation by tsunami or mudflow; inundation by seiche would present a low risk.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant
5.10 LAND USE AND PLANNING			
2035 Scenario and Full Buildout			
Impact 5.10-1: Implementation of the General Plan and Development Code Update would not divide an established community.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant
Impact 5.10-2: The proposed General Plan and Development Code Update complies with the state planning law and California Complete Streets Act.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant
Impact 5.10-3: Land use designations and policies of the General Plan Update are consistent with the Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP) for the Fresno Yosemite International.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant
Impact 5.10-4: Implementation of the General Plan Update would be consistent with the goals of the Fresno Council of Governments (COG) Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant

1. Executive Summary

Table 1-4 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Impact 5.10-5: Development in accordance with the proposed General Plan Update would be consistent with the San Joaquin Valley Blueprint 12 Smart Growth Principles.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant
Impact 5.10-6: Development in accordance with the proposed General Plan Update would not interfere with growth plans of neighboring San Joaquin Valley jurisdictions.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant
Impact 5.10-7: The General Plan Update and Development Code Update would not conflict with an adopted habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant
5.11 MINERAL RESOURCES			
2035 Scenario and Full Buildout			
Impact 5.11-1: Implementation of the General Plan Update would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant
5.12 NOISE			
2035 Scenario and Full Buildout			
Impact 5.12-1: Development of the proposed land use plan would result in an increase in traffic, which would cause a substantial environmental noise increase to noise-sensitive uses adjacent to roadways.	Potentially significant	No feasible mitigation is available.	Significant and unavoidable
Impact 5.12-2: Future noise-sensitive uses developed as part of the proposed land use plan could be exposed to elevated noise levels from traffic noise.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant

1. Executive Summary

Table 1-4 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Impact 5.12-3: Noise-sensitive uses would not be exposed to elevated noise levels from stationary sources.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant
Impact 5.12-4: Buildout of the individual land uses and projects for implementation of the General Plan Update could expose sensitive uses to strong groundborne vibration.	Potentially significant	12-1 Individual projects that involve vibration-intensive construction activities within 200 feet of sensitive receptors, such as blasting, pile drivers, jack hammers, and vibratory rollers, shall be evaluated for potential vibration impacts. A study shall be conducted for individual projects where vibration-intensive impacts may occur. If construction-related vibration is determined to be perceptible at vibration-sensitive uses, additional requirements, such as use of less-vibration-intensive equipment or construction techniques, shall be implemented during construction (e.g., nonexplosive blasting methods, drilled piles as opposed to pile driving, etc.).	Significant and unavoidable
Impact 5.12-5: Construction activities associated with buildout of the individual land uses and projects for implementation of the General Plan Update would substantially elevate noise levels in the vicinity of noise-sensitive land uses.	Potentially significant	12-2 Applicants for new development projects within 500 feet of sensitive receptors shall implement the following best management practices to reduce construction noise levels: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider the installation of temporary sound barriers for construction activities immediately adjacent to occupied noise-sensitive structures. • Equip construction equipment with mufflers. • Restrict haul routes and construction-related traffic. • Reduce nonessential idling of construction equipment to no more than five minutes. 	Significant and unavoidable
Impact 5.12-6: Sensitive land uses would not be exposed to substantial levels of aircraft noise.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant
5.13 POPULATION AND HOUSING			
2035 Scenario			
Impact 5.13-1: Under the 2035 Scenario, buildout of the General Plan Update would result in similar population growth as projected by the Fresno COG; however, full buildout of the proposed project would substantially increase population in the Plan Area by over 150 percent by year 2080, which is also beyond Fresno COG's planning horizon.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant

1. Executive Summary

Table 1-4 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>Impact 5.13-2: The proposed General Plan Update would designate approximately 753 acres of existing residential land for nonresidential uses in the Plan Area. However, the proposed project would provide more housing opportunities than currently exist. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not displace people and/or housing.</p>	<p>Less than significant</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>Less than significant</p>
<p>Full Buildout</p>			
<p>Impact 5.13-1: Under the 2035 Scenario, buildout of the General Plan Update would result in similar population growth as projected by the Fresno COG; however, full buildout of the proposed project would substantially increase population in the Plan Area by over 150 percent by year 2080, which is also beyond Fresno COG's planning horizon.</p>	<p>Potentially significant</p>	<p>No feasible mitigation measure available.</p>	<p>Significant and unavoidable</p>
<p>Impact 5.13-2: The proposed General Plan Update would designate approximately 753 acres of existing residential land for nonresidential uses in the Plan Area. However, the proposed project would provide more housing opportunities than currently exist. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not displace people and/or housing.</p>	<p>Less than significant</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>Less than significant</p>
<p>5.14 PUBLIC SERVICES</p>			
<p>FIRE PROTECTION AND EMERGENCY SERVICES</p>			
<p>2035 Scenario and Full Buildout</p>			
<p>Impact 5.14-1: Development in accordance with the Clovis General Plan Update would introduce new structures, residents, and workers into the Plan Area, thereby increasing the demand for fire services served by the Clovis Fire Department and Fresno County Fire Protection District.</p>	<p>Potentially significant</p>	<p>14-1 Proponents of noncontiguous development (defined as new development that, on all sides, is adjacent to or immediately across the street from vacant or agricultural land uses or other uses that do not have existing City water and sewer service) shall provide an analysis of the fiscal impacts of the proposed development. The analysis shall quantify, to the satisfaction of the City, the likely and potential increase in capital costs and ongoing operations and maintenance costs over and above that expected</p>	<p>Less than significant</p>

1. Executive Summary

Table 1-4 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		from development that is contiguous. The project proponents shall provide for a funding mechanism to pay for the increase in costs associated with the development being noncontiguous, and the funding mechanism shall be in addition to the taxes and other funding sources used for development that is contiguous.	
POLICE PROTECTION			
2035 Scenario and Full Buildout			
Impact 5.14-2: Development in accordance with the Clovis General Plan Update would introduce new structures, residents, and workers into the Clovis Police Department and Fresno County Sheriff's Department service areas, thereby increasing the demand for police protection services.	Potentially significant	See Mitigation Measure 14-1.	Less than significant
SCHOOL SERVICES			
2035 Scenario and Full Buildout			
Impact 5.14-3: Development in accordance with the Clovis General Plan Update would generate new students who would impact the school enrollment capacities of area schools in CUSD, FUSD, and SUSD.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant
LIBRARY SERVICES			
2035 Scenario and Full Buildout			
Impact 5.14-4: Development in accordance with the Clovis General Plan Update would generate additional population, increasing the service demands for the Clovis Regional Library.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant

1. Executive Summary

Table 1-4 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
5.15 RECREATION			
2035 Scenario and Full Buildout			
Impact 5.15-1: Implementation of the General Plan Update would allow for substantial population growth and increased use and demand on existing parks and recreational facilities.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant
Impact 5.15-2: Development in accordance with the General Plan Update could result in environmental impacts from the provision of new and/or expanded recreational facilities.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant
5.16 TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC			
2035 Scenario and Full Buildout			
Impact 5.16-1: Project-related trip generation would impact levels of service for the existing area roadway system.	Potentially significant	No feasible mitigation is available.	Significant and unavoidable
Impact 5.16-2: Project-related trip generation in combination with existing and proposed cumulative development would not result in designated road and/or highways exceeding county congestion management program service standards.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant
Impact 5.16-3: The project would not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant

1. Executive Summary

Table 1-4 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Impact 5.16-4: Circulation improvements associated with future development that would be accommodated by the General Plan would be designed to adequately address potentially hazardous conditions (sharp curves, etc.), potential conflicting uses, and emergency access.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant
Impact 5.16-5: The project would not result in a change in air traffic patterns, including no significant increase in traffic levels or a change in location	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant
5.17 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS			
WATER SERVICE			
2035 Scenario and Full Buildout			
Impact 5.17-1: Projected water supply is inadequate to meet projected water demand at both 2035 Scenario and Full Buildout of the proposed General Plan.	Potentially significant	No feasible mitigation is available.	Significant and unavoidable
Impact 5.17-2: Development pursuant to the General Plan Update would require the expansion or construction of surface water treatment facilities and water delivery systems.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant
WASTEWATER SERVICE			
2035 Scenario and Full Buildout			
Impact 5.17-3: Full Buildout of the proposed General Plan would require construction of additional wastewater treatment capacity beyond currently planned expansion of the City of Clovis' water reuse facility.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant

1. Executive Summary

Table 1-4 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Impact 5.17-4: The proposed General Plan, in 2035 and Full Buildout scenarios, would require construction of additional City sewer mains.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant
STORM DRAINAGE SYSTEMS			
2035 Scenario and Full Buildout			
Impact 5.17-5: Buildout of the proposed General Plan Update, in 2035 and Full Buildout Scenarios, would require construction of additional storm drainage facilities.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant
SOLID WASTE			
2035 Scenario and Full Buildout			
Impact 5.17-6: Existing facilities could accommodate project-generated solid waste for the 2035 Scenario but not for Full Buildout.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant
Impact 5.17-7: Projects developed pursuant to the General Plan Update would comply with regulations governing solid waste disposal and diversion.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant
OTHER UTILITIES			
2035 Scenario and Full Buildout			
Impact 5.14-8: Existing and/or proposed facilities would be able to accommodate project-generated utility demands.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant

1. Executive Summary

This page intentionally left blank.